



**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 48th MEETING**

Chairman: Mr. **ZACHMANN** (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

- CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)**  
**STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN**

\*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 DC2/50, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 46 TO 65 and 144 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will first proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions in cluster 12, A/C.1/41/L.54; in cluster 6, A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1, L.44 and L.50. The Committee will then begin its general debate, consideration of and action upon draft resolutions on the question of Antarctica.

Before proceeding to take action on the draft resolution in the first cluster, it is my intention to call upon those delegations wishing to explain their vote after the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.71/Rev.1.

Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): Very briefly I wish to explain my delegation's vote during yesterday afternoon's voting on the matter of the Director of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research.

I must begin by saying that my delegation's vote was based strictly on matters of principle, which are in no way in conflict with the excellent relations my country entertains with the Government and the people of Romania.

Venezuela considers it necessary to preserve at all costs the independence, integrity and normal operation of all the organs of the United Nations. Such independence can only be assured by means of strict observance of Article 100 of the Charter, according to which Member States entered into the commitment to abide by the exclusively international nature of the Secretariat staff. The commitment goes hand in hand with the obligation of all Member States to refrain from any act that might in one way or another affect the international character of the staff

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

members, **regardless** of nationality, while they are carrying out their **responsibilities in** the service of the **international community**.

In my **delegation's** opinion, it is on the appropriate application of and **strict** adherence to that principle **that** the **Secretary-General's** ability to give **full** effect to the obligation<sup>8</sup> incumbent upon **him** in Article **101** of **the Charter depends**, in particular **with** regard to the paramount **consideration** of **ensuring** the **highest standards of** efficiency, competence and integrity of the • teff.

Therefore our vote **was** motivated by **our strict** adherence to Article **100** of the Charter, **respect** for **which is**, we **believe**, **essential** to **preserve** the independence of the United Nations organ<sup>8</sup> and of **those who** heed them.

(The Chairman)

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.54, under agenda item 61 (i), listed in cluster 12.

First I call on the Secretary of the Committee, who has a statement to make in connection with the programme budget implications of draft resolution L.54.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The attention of representatives is called to document A/C.1/41/L.85, as reissued for technical reasons, in which the conference servicing cost of the third special session devoted to disarmament is estimated on the assumption that 200 meetings of the special session would require the provision of verbatim records.

It is now envisaged that the provision of verbatim records would be required for up to a total of 50 meetings only during the special session, and therefore paragraph 11 of document A/C.1/41/L.85, as reissued, should read as follows:

"In accordance with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the plenary would be entitled to verbatim records. The Committee of the Whole would be analogous to the First Committee of the Assembly, and as such would also be entitled to verbatim records. It is envisaged that up to a total of 50 meetings of both the plenary and the Committee of the Whole would require verbatim records."

The reduction in the number of meetings with verbatim records would result in a corresponding reduction in the conference servicing estimates for the third special session on disarmament. Therefore in paragraph 8 the estimated conference-servicing cost of the third special session should read "\$4,178,400", instead of "\$7,467,000", and the 1988 total should read "\$5,678,200" instead of "\$8,966,800".

Accordingly, item V of part B of the annex should read "50 meetings" instead of "200 meetings", and "\$1,096,200" instead of "\$4,384,800". The total should read "\$4,178,400" instead of "\$7,467,000".

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on the draft resolution in Qcwent A/C.1/41/L.54, listed in cluster 12. I shall now call on those delegations that wish to make statements on that draft resolution. Does any delegation wish to speak at this stage? It appears not.

I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions before a decision is taken on draft resolution L.54. Does a delegation wish to speak? I see none.

We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.54, entitled "Review and implementation of the concluding document of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly: Third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament", which is subtitled "Convening of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament". This draft resolution, which has programme budget implications as contained in document L.85, as reissued and revised orally by the Secretary of the Committee, was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 34th meeting of the First Committee, on 5 November 1986, and has the following sponsors: Algeria, Argentina, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.54 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on delegations wishing to explain their position after the decision on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.54.

Mr. BARTHELEMY (United States of America): The United States expects to participate constructively in the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and in the work of the Preparatory Committee. The United States supports the provisions of the operative part of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.54 that deal with preparations for the third special session.

With respect to its preambular part, my delegation wishes to make the following observations. With respect to the fourth preambular paragraph, it is possible that the Final Document contains views and formulations that, with the passage of time since 1978, may no longer be fully reflective of the international realities or of the views of all Member States. With respect to the penultimate preambular paragraph, we note that the United States has proposed practical steps to reduce nuclear weapons and is actively pursuing the objective of reducing conventional forces. At the same time, we think it is an oversimplification to say that funds allocated for military forces and equipment necessarily represent an inappropriate diversion of scarce economic resources otherwise applicable to development, and we do not agree with that suggestion. There is a broadly held conviction here - and the United States shares it - that nations must turn increasingly from military to peaceful solutions to their disputes. This can open the way to reducing human suffering and increasing human betterment, but it is not responsible to imply criticism of actions by States to meet military requirements in the implementation of the right of individual or collective self-defence.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded our consideration of and action upon draft resolutions in cluster 12.

We turn now to draft resolutions in cluster 6: draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1, L.44 and L.50. I call first on delegations wishing to make statements on those draft resolutions.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation wishes to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1, which is the result of efforts by the three countries that have submitted a draft resolution on the Stockholm Conference and on conventional disarmament: Poland, the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.44, Sweden, the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.50, and France.

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1 came about after considerable effort in consultations and drafting, and I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for all you have done to facilitate that effort. I wish also to thank my colleagues from Poland and Sweden for their assistance in this stimulating exercise, as well as other delegations for their very useful suggestions.

I should like first to mention the intention shared by the sponsors in submitting their own texts: to take note of the conclusion of the Stockholm Conference with the participation of 35 States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), and to bring to the attention of the international community the admittedly limited but none the less concrete results of the Stockholm Conference. It seems to me that this is all the more apparent in the revised text before us.

My country attaches particular importance to the Conference, which it first proposed here in the United Nations eight and a half years ago, at the beginning of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Since

(Mr. Morel, France)

the beginning of our work, my delegation has held that the results of the Stockholm Conference should be marked in a substantive text; in our view, mere formal approval without content would have been insufficient. The amount of work required to formulate a compromise text confirmed that this feeling was widely shared. I would emphasize that during the search for a joint text the three sponsors made a special effort to take into consideration the particular concerns of non-aligned countries.

In that connection, I wish to put forward a number of revisions to two paragraphs of the draft resolution.

In the eleventh preambular paragraph, delete the word "stable"; the phrase involved should now read "aiming, in Europe, at a balance at a lower level of armaments".

In operative paragraph 2, delete the words "the regional approach to"; replace the words "compatible with" by the words "an element of"; replace the words "given the interest and support" by the words "with the support" and move the phrase "with the support of all States concerned" to after the words "to achieve regional disarmament".

(Mr. Morel, France)

Finally, at the end of the paragraph we propose to delete the second "regional" in the next-to-last line, so that the phrase would read "role in reducing tensions and strengthening security". I shall now, for the sake of clarity, read operative paragraph 2 in its entirety, as amended:

"Notes that conventional disarmament is an element of the wider objective of general and complete disarmament and that the measures designed to achieve regional disarmament, with the support of all States concerned, can play a useful role in reducing tensions and strengthening security".

These are the final amendments I would propose on behalf of the three sponsors, which are along the same lines as earlier effort?; aimed specifically at the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement. I shall not go into an elaborate comparison of the three earlier versions of the draft resolution with this new version. I should, however, like to mention three brief points.

First, this draft resolution on confidence-building measures and conventional disarmament should be considered in the context of general and complete disarmament, as is duly mentioned in several of its paragraphs. It does seek to enter into the various debates on matters of principle, with which we are all familiar, with respect to priorities in disarmament questions or with respect to a definition of security. The present text is limited to practical steps and is designed to rest solely upon the experience gained during the seven years of negotiation among countries with widely differing security régimes and social systems.

Secondly, draft resolution A/C.1/41/L. 27/Rev.1 takes full consideration of specific regional situations. In various paragraphs it stresses that each country has its own features and characteristics and that nothing can be done without the consent of all countries involved.

(Mr. Morel, France)

Thirdly, and lastly, as a result the text of the draft resolution brings to the attention of Member States the political and practical measures adopted at the Stockholm Conference, without seeking to impose or transpose upon them a fixed structure defined once and for all. It is up to each State Member of the Organization and interested group to evaluate the situation and to make its own choice. That is the meaning of the open invitation launched in the last operative paragraph of the draft resolution.

Having made a particular effort to meet the concerns of the countries of each region, we have drafted a balanced text that would now, as everyone will understand, be very difficult to modify. We hope that the draft resolution will enjoy broad support within the Committee - and so, indeed, it should, given the changes we have just introduced. We feel that it could even be adopted by consensus. In my event, we feel that its adoption would mark in an appropriate manner the success of a series of disarmament negotiations, in Stockholm, after seven difficult years, and that, at the same time, it could open up highly encouraging prospects for the future, both in Europe and in the rest of the world.

Mr. EKEUS (Sweden): I have asked to speak to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.50, "The Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe". The representatives of 35 States - 33 from Europe, Canada and the United States of America - met at Stockholm from 17 January 1984 to 19 September 1986 and concluded their work by adopting the Document of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. The Stockholm Conference is a substantial and integral part of the multilateral process initiated by the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, and its task was to undertake, in stages, new, effective and concrete actions designed to make progress in strengthening confidence and

(Mr. Ekus, Sweden)

reciprocity and in achieving disarmament. The participating States recognize that the set of mutually complementary confidence and security-building measures that are adopted in the Document of 19 September serve, by their cooperative and nature and by their implementation, to strengthen confidence and security in Europe and thus give effect and expression to the duty of States to refrain from the threat a use of force.

In draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.50, expression is given to the importance of continued efforts to build confidence, to lessen military confrontation and to ensure peace and security for all, and it is stressed that confidence and security-building measures designed to reduce the dangers of armed conflict and of misunderstanding or miscalculation of military activities will contribute to those objectives. The first preambular paragraph underlines the determination, in this context, to achieve progress in disarmament.

In the operative part of the draft resolution, the General Assembly welcomes the adoption by the Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe of the Document of the Stockholm Conference containing concrete, militarily significant, politically binding and verifiable confidence and security-building measures. The Assembly further considers that the Document of the Conference will contribute to furthering the process of improving security and developing co-operation in Europe, thereby contributing to international peace and security in the world as a whole.

In the English version of A/C.1/41/L.50, a minor error should be corrected. The first word of the third preambular paragraph should be "Stressing".

Finally, my delegation hopes that draft resolution L.50 will be adopted without a vote.

(Mr. Ekeus, Sweden)

I should now like to turn to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1. Sweden has co-operated with France and Poland in the shaping of that draft resolution, which represents a considerable effort on the part of its sponsors and by many other delegations to reach a compromise on this very complicated issue. It is the firm opinion of my delegation that draft resolution L.27/Rev.1 is fully compatible with draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.50.

Sweden considers that draft resolution L.27/Rev.1 contains reflections of the important principles adopted at the Stockholm Conference, and that in that draft resolution those principles are developed and some important observations and recommendations of a general character are made.

My delegation therefore fully supports draft resolution L.27/Rev.1, as orally amended by the representative of France, and it is our hope that the First Committee will give that draft resolution broad support.

Mr. STRULAK (Poland) • AR my delegation pointed out in its statement in the general debate, in its foreign policy Poland has for many years attached primary importance to, and has done all it can to secure, peace in Europe through disarmament, détente and co-operation. It was an initiator of the Conference on Security and CO-operation in Europe (CSCE) process and, later, of the Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, which two months ago successfully concluded its first stage at Stockholm.

That is why we so highly value the positive results of the Stockholm Conference and are glad to note that they have met with wide approval throughout the world and, notably, in this debate of the First Committee.

Accordingly, we consider it would be natural and highly desirable for this general appreciation to be expressed in a General Assembly resolution, and we believe that we should be working towards that end in a spirit of consensus, mutual goodwill and compromise, the spirit that characterized the Stockholm Conference itself and made its success possible.

The contents and language of the Stockholm document itself provides the proper basis for such a resolution, which in our view could meet with wide and possibly unanimous support among the CSCE participants, as well as the other Member States of the United Nations. Guided by those considerations, from the very beginning my delegation proposed the joint elaboration of one draft resolution, and, while it was obliged to submit its own draft resolution (A/C.1/41/L.44), we subsequently entered into a painstaking process of consultations with the French and Swedish delegations, respectively the authors of draft resolutions L.27 and L.50, in order to try to arrive at a unified text.

Thanks to the intensive co-operation among the three delegations, as well as the support for our efforts of all CSCE participants represented in this Committee, it was found possible to produce such a unified compromise draft resolution. Then,

(Mr. Strulak, Poland)

because the draft resolution still seemed to encounter some reservations on the part of some non-CSCE Member States, notably the non-aligned countries, the sponsors, running very much against time, made additional efforts including last-minute attempts to meet those reservations through their flexibility by introducing further modifications.

The result of that work is submitted today in the form of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1, as amended by the Ambassador of France and sponsored by the delegations of France, Sweden and Poland. While that draft resolution is not meant to replace the original Swedish draft resolution, L.50, which has just been introduced by the Ambassador of Sweden, which my delegation fully supports, it certainly complements the Swedish draft resolution, making broader reference to the significance of the results of the Stockholm Conference and the military aspects of the CSCE process and confidence and security building, as well as to conventional disarmament, which we hope will actually follow at the next stage.

Since they are based on the typically European experience, the views thus expressed may or may not be pertinent to other regions of the world. We fully realize that. As it is noted in the draft resolution, specific conditions exist, as well as specific perspectives on confidence-building measures and conventional disarmament problems. Since it commends the new draft resolution to the Committee for support, my delegation naturally does not insist that its original draft resolution, L.44, be put to a vote.

I should make one correction to the English interpretation of the amendments introduced by Ambassador Morel. In paragraph 2, the interpretation given for the French word "concoeurs" was "support", while the originally agreed amendment was "concurrence". I shall read out the whole paragraph for the sake of clarity. The second operative paragraph should read as follows:

(Mr. Strulak, Poland)

"Notes that conventional disarmament is part of the wider objective of general and complete disarmament and that measures designed to achieve regional disarmament with the concurrence" -

not "support" -

\*of all States concerned can play a useful role in reducing tensions and strengthening security".

Mr. MORELLI (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish) : The delegation of Peru wishes to state for the record that it agrees in principle with the draft resolution contained in document L.27/Rev.1. However, it also wishes to state that there is an important omission in the text. The draft resolution we are considering makes no mention at all of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament. That omission is important since the draft resolution should contain an express reference to the most complete and advanced document to have been adopted by the General Assembly in the field of disarmament - a Final Document to which at least some reference should be made at this time. Unfortunately, that is not the case.

The delegation of Peru also wishes in particular to draw attention to paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, which invites all States to consider security and confidence-building measures in other regions. This is fully justified, but it should be related to the Final Document of 1978, which, inter alia, attaches special responsibility in the area of disarmament to nuclear-weapon States and the States with the most important military arsenals.

The Peruvian delegation believes that support for the draft resolution we are considering could be very important among countries not related to the European forums, if at least a reference were made in the text to the Final Document of 1978. Perhaps there is still time to insert such a reference. In any event, the sponsors have the last word.

(Mr. Morelli, Peru)

With regard to paragraph 2 of this draft resolution and the more recent amendments introduced by the **sponsors**, I **should** like to make the following **comment**. The original text was very satisfactory because it defined the regional approach to disarmament as being compatible with the wider objective of general and **complete** disarmament. The deletion of the reference to the regional approach **has** resulted in a **sentence** that is not very helpful because it **is** much too general and does not meet the aims of **this discussion**. The deletion of that phrase and of the **regional** reference at the end of the paragraph is not very felicitous. I understand that this **was done** by the sponsors to accommodate delegations which deem it advisable to remove a reference to regional **approaches**. The delegation of Peru regrets that the sponsors agreed to those **changes**.

Draft resolution **L.50**, proposed by Sweden, has the full support of the delegation of Peru.

Mr. **GERMANN** (Federal Republic of Germany): I wish to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution **L.27/Rev.1**. Because of the growing interdependence of States and regions, the maintenance of international **peace** and security is increasingly becoming the common task of all States. In all parts of the world, therefore, vigorous efforts by all States to contribute towards stability and co-operation are called for.

In the long term, international peace **and** security must be founded on mutual confidence. Confidence-building **is** an **indispensable** prerequisite for arms **control** and **disarmament**. Fear of military **threat**, distrust and misunderstandings can only be overcome by a **process** of concrete and continuous confidence-building among States. That is why crucial importance **attaches** to confidence-building **measures** in the military sphere, measures that would render the behaviour of States calculable. The significance of the Final Act of the Conference on **Confidence** and

(Mr. Germann, Federal Republic of Germany)

Security **Building** Measures and **Disarmament** in Europe derives **precisely** from this aspect.

During the **general** debate in this Committee at the **Assembly's** thirty-ninth **session** the **representative** of the Federal **Republic** of Germany **stated**:

"Instability in one part of the world can cause instability elsewhere.

Conversely, **if stability is** achieved in one region there **is** a better **chance** of this **also** happening elsewhere. From this **perspective**, the effort8 to maintain peace and stability in Europe also have **significance** for other **regions**."

(A/C.1/39/PV.13 p.6)

This interrelationship, therefore, *defines* an essential dimension of the results of Stockholm.

It **is** hence the aim of the draft resolution before us - to the preparation of which the Federal Government has significantly contributed from the **outset** and which we could certainly co-sponsor in **its revised** form as well - to underline the wide-ranging dimensions of the **Stockholm** results. Confidence-building and its outstanding importance for world-wide efforts on **arms** control and disarmament have always been a particular concern of the Federal **Government** in **this Committee**. The Federal Government therefore welcomes the fact that, upon **its** initiative, the General **Assembly** adopted at **its** forty-first session a resolution relating to the concept of guidelines for confidence-building measures. With the same goal in mind - that is, promotion of **development** of the concept and delimitation of confidence-building on a broader scale - the Federal Government urges Member States to consider positively the widest **possible** support for the draft resolution before **us**, which **is** fully **compatible** with the Final Document of the first special **session** of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and **complementary** to draft resolution **L.50**.

Mr. PAVLOVSKY (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from **Russian**):

Czechoslovakia **feels** that confidence-building measures are very important, as are **measures** of conventional disarmament, especially in **Europe**. Therefore we welcome the achievement of a joint draft **resolution, L.27/Rev.1**, which in many respects reflects our own views and which we believe to be a **positive** outcome of the intensive and **constructive** work of the **delegations** of Poland, France and Sweden and the consultations with a number of other **delegations**. Therefore we will vote in favour **of** this draft and, **like** some other **delegations, would** have **been** willing to **become** a sponsor.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the representative of Peru whether it was his intention to propose officially an amendment to **draft** resolution **L.27/Rev.1**.

Mr. MORELLI (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish) : **Yes**, Sir, I would **formalize** my request for an amendment as **follows**.

At the end of the preamble, **add** the following paragraph:

(spoke in English)

**"Considering** the **principles** of the Final Document adopted at the tenth special **session** of the General Assembly devoted to **disarmament"**.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to ask **the** sponsors of draft **resolution L.27/Rev.1** if **they** are in a position to accept **this** amendment.

Mr. TEJA (India): I seek clarification as to whether we are now voting on the draft **resolutions** or on amendments to them, because I understand the **Chairman** to ask **delegations** to make statements or to **express** their **views** on the texts which had been **submitted**.

The CHAIRMAN: As the representative of **India** has **just** pointed out, the **Committee** is now hearing statements and **comments** on the draft **resolutions before us**. Amendments may still be proposed **since** we have not yet reached the stage of voting .

I would ask the **sponsors** if they can accept the amendment **proposed** by the representative **of Peru**.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): On behalf of **the sponsors**, I would inform the **Committee** that they can accept this amendment **as a consensus** document. Let me express the hope, however, that we shall try **as far as possible** to maintain the balance in this text, which is rather delicate, as it stands.

The CHAIRMAN: Since **no** other representative wishes to make a statement, I shall now call on **those** who **wish** to explain their votes before the **voting**.

Mr. BENYAMINA (Algeria) (interpretation from French) : My delegation would like to explain its **vote** on draft resolution **A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1**.

My delegation is convinced that, given a negotiating framework that is geographically limited to one region of the world that has a **unique** history and in which there exists a **unique** political and **military** situation, it **is impossible** to derive principles of universal value and application from it.

To try to do so would not only be conceptually false; it could **even** be politically dangerous. It would leave out of consideration the fact that every **existing** or desirable **regional** framework for the strengthening of peace is specific to the region concerned, the problems it **faces** and the **appropriate solutions**.

It is undeniable that the evolution of the political and military situation in **Europe** is of determining importance for world security, since in the recent past **alone** the situation there has twice **endangered** world peace.

(Mr. Benyamina, Algeria)

But however opportune and adequate certain initiatives and **measures** may seem **to be** from the **point** of view of Europe, we should **still** note that the fracture line between East and **West**, which goes through that continent, and the **process** of **détente** it **necessitates**, are not necessarily relevant to initiatives and **measures** concerning the third world, and may provide an **inappropriate** context. It **may** be **impossible** to apply **them** in other regions of the world.

**For** that reason, in general the countries of the third world have often **been** better advised to be concerned about external interference, intimidation or intervention in their regions, which have **often caused** crises, **such** as colonial **wars** or agreeements or further complicated conflicts within the framework of the great Powers' pursuit of strategic advantage.

Therefore the process undertaken in Helsinki should not exempt its initiators from the task of promoting peace, **security** and co-operation in their **relations** with **all the** other regions of the world. The benefits of the **East-West dialogue** should **also** be reflected in **the** North-South **dimension** of international relations.

**Thus** pursuit of the East-West dialogue should in no way **signify** that **crises** and **tensions such** as those persisting or emerging at the very **doors** of **Europe** in the Mediterranean can be tolerated. An adequate framework and **process** must take into account the need to solve them.

Furthermore, the need to do **so** itself indicates the inadequacy of certain initiatives such as those relating to conventional disarmament. However desirable they may be in the European context, they would be inoperable and would **perhaps** even prejudice the desired results, when we take into account a region **such as** southern Africa, where the real problem is the **decolonization** of Namibia and the dismantling of apartheid.

(Mr. Benyamina, Alger is)

That being the case, even if measures designed to increase security in the third world are necessary - and they certainly are - and if a priori they must include certain measures set forth in draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1, they have in fact already been envisaged within the interregional, regional and subregional frameworks, but in terms of strengthening economic co-operation and consolidating political co-operation in order to resolve local conflicts, to resist foreign interference and to preserve and strengthen the capacity for common action. Organized as part of an interregional framework, such as that of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, or on a regional level, say through the Organization of African Unity (OAU), such measures, which open up prospects at the subregional level also, do not reflect confrontation or détente as parts of the forced coexistence of military ideologies or opposed blocs, but rather out of concern for the future essentially at the community level and awareness of the need for co-operation on the political and economic levels in the face of numerous and increasing complex challenges.

My delegation is conscious of the effort that was made to take into account some of the views expressed by the non-aligned countries, which soon came up against deep-rooted reservations and itself got caught up in the problem of confidence-building and the promotion disarmament.

Consequently, confronted with draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1, which is not limited to Europe, though it cannot validly take into consideration specific aspects of regional situations, my delegation will abstain in the voting on it.

nr. **SALLES** (*Brazil*) : My **delegation** wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A. /41/L.27/Rev.1.

As we have said *on* previous occasions, **including** at this **session**, disarmament **is** above all a **global** task that should be pursued with special emphasis on the armed forces and conventional *weapons* of nuclear-weapon States and other militarily **significant** countries. Regional **conventional** disarmament in Europe, the **region** with the heaviest concentration of armed *forces* and conventional weapons, is certainly a commendable goal **because** the continuous piling up of the already huge arsenals of the two military blocs **jeopardizes** international peace and **security**, and **has global implications**.

(Mr. Salles, Brazil)

In that regard, draft resolution L.27/Rev.1 contains some positive elements. However, in other respects some of its passages, even with the amendments introduced, imply dangerous generalizations and assumptions that would tend to promote a shift of emphases away not only from disarmament in Europe but also, and more regrettably, from nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war, which remain the issues having the highest priority on our agenda.

These emphases, which are an integral part of the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, are, notwithstanding the amendments proposed by the representative of Peru, not reflected here.

For those reasons my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution L.27/Rev.1 as amended.

That not being the case with draft resolution L.50, in which there is a correct formulation concerning the results achieved in Stockholm as well as at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, we will give it our support.

Mr. TEJA (India): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolutions L.27/Rev.1 and L.50, on the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

My delegation is gratified to note the measures adopted on 19 September 1986 in Stockholm, within the aegis of that Conference. They show the value of multilateral negotiations. My delegation therefore supports the draft resolution in document L.50, which welcomes the adoption of the Document of the Stockholm Conference and considers that it will contribute to the process of improving security and developing co-operation in Europe, thereby contributing to international peace and security in the world as a whole.

My delegation will not, however, be able to support the draft placed before the Committee in document L.27/Rev.1, also based upon the results achieved in the

(Hr. Teja, India)

Stockholm Conference. This particular draft resolution presents those results in a somewhat different - one could almost say subjective - manner.

First, the sponsors of draft resolution L.27/Rev.1 have extrapolated from the Stockholm Conference and introduced elements in their draft which in our opinion go beyond what was discussed at the Stockholm Conference. For example, the title of the draft resolution itself should have read "Confidence and security-building measures and disarmament in Europe" rather than "Confidence-building and security-building measures and conventional disarmament", as mentioned in draft resolution L.27/Rev.1.

Secondly, some of the formulations and phrases contained in this draft resolution as it has been drafted contain language used in the context of military blocs in Europe. An example is the frequent use of the concept of stability and balance in the preambular paragraphs. My own delegation and several other non-aligned delegations have had occasion to explain in the past in various multilateral disarmament forums to the sponsors of the draft resolution, that neither military balance nor strategic stability are easy to define or can be given any objective content. Perceptions of so-called imbalance or the need to restore an equilibrium, whether in a particular region or globally, are very often the justifications for big powers to seek continuation of the arms race or to interfere in different regions of the world, thereby endangering international peace and security.

Thirdly, the prevention of nuclear war remains, and must remain, to all delegations - certainly it does for my delegation - the issue of highest priority. India is against all wars, both nuclear and conventional. However, increased emphasis on conventional disarmament by some of the very States that keep open their option to use nuclear weapons can only deflect us from the accepted priorities of disarmament.

(Mr. Teja, India)

According to the principles contained in the successive Declarations adopted by the non-aligned Heads of State or Government, enduring international peace and security must be founded on ending the arms race, dismantling military alliances and giving up the doctrines of balance of deterrence and strategic superiority. Even at the most recent Summit of Non-Aligned Countries, in Harare, held earlier this year, the non-aligned Heads of State or Government expressed their conviction that the limitation and reduction of the military activities and rivalries of great Powers and blocs beyond their boundaries would significantly contribute to international security.

We note that the sponsors of draft resolution L. 27/Rev.1 have partially amended their draft resolution orally to accommodate one of our concerns in not laying undue emphasis on regional disarmament. This is a positive element, but apparently it is not sufficient.

In other parts of the draft resolution the sponsors want the whole of this Committee to endorse, as a global prescription, their own specific position elaborated in the context of Europe. This cannot be done without fully taking into account the perceptions and views of other groups and Member States outside that region.

For those reasons, my delegation will be constrained to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document L.27/Rev.1 as orally amended by the sponsors.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): I am seeking clarification. I had really wanted to support my colleague from India when he raised the question, but after the Chairman had made a decision, being an old hand in this Committee, I deferred to the Chairman. We have been deeply impressed by the presentation of the representative of France in submitting the draft resolution and, subsequently, by

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

the representative of Sweden. But what has confused us is this last-minute amendment offered by Poru. I do not understand, at this point, whether the • pmaaa have accepted that amendment. That should be clarified, because it might influence some of our voting on these two • mdmnts.

The CHAIRMAN: In reply to the question of the representative of Liberia, I would refer to the statement made by the representative of France, to the effect that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1 accept the amendment put forward by the representative Of Peru.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1, as revised and subsequently amended. In its statement in the First Committee's general debate on all disarmament items, delivered on 23 October 1986, my delegation welcomed the agreement reached at the Stockholm Conference on confidence and security building measures in Europe as a positive step on the way to achieving the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament. However, we consider that the text of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1 does not confine itself to the issue under discussion.

A good example of this is that the titles draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.44 and L.50 refer to the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, whereas the title of this draft resolution does not specify that it reform to Europe.

Furthermore, draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1 contains many ambiguous terms and implies that the example of confidence-building measures in Europe be applied to different regime of the world, without taking into account the specific regional conditions and priorities of each regfm. What is applicable to Europe cannot be taken in a general manner to be applicable to the search for solutions to important problems of a military nature all over the world. There are conditions to be satisfied in every rogim before that region can commit itself to such a process. Consideration must be given to the political and security conditions in the region in question.

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

To us, confidence-building measures mean an end to collaboration with Israel in the military and nuclear fields. They mean putting an end to the continued aggression by Israel against and occupation of Arab territories and the restoration of the legitimate inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. To us, they mean ending all types of collaboration with the racist régime in South Africa and halting the imperialist military manoeuvres and conspiracies that threaten our security. To us, they mean ending colonial domination.

For those reasons, my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1.

Mr. LAY (Italy): My delegation would like to state its position on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1, as revised and amended. The Italian delegation was among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27, and would be in a position to sponsor the revised version as well, because we share its general thrust, notably as regards the positive role of the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) and, more recently, the Stockholm Conference for our continent and the world in general.

We feel the agreement reached at Stockholm is indeed a valuable example of finding solutions to important problems of military nature, and as such deserves to be brought to the attention of the international community, which the draft resolution before us rightly does.

Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) (interpretation from French): I wish to say first that the Mongolian delegation fully supports draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1, introduced by the representative of France. We congratulate the delegations of France, Poland and Sweden on their joint proposal and feel that it represents the fruit of co-operation and good will. We would wish that all States, irrespective

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

of their **soci**l and political **systems**, could co-operate in all areas, especially in crucially important questions of disarmament.

Mongolia attaches particular importance to confidence and security building measures and feels that these can be adopted and **implemented** in all regions of the world, including in **Asia** and the Pacific. The results of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security **Building** Measures and Disarmament in **Europe** are not limited to the two political-military alliances. Several **years** ago Mongolia proposed a **convention** on a mutual **commitment** not to attack one another and **on the** non-use of force in **relations** among the **States** of Asia and the **Pacific**. That proposal would involve, inter alia, the implementation of confidence-building measures, strengthening **security** in **Asia**, and the **reduction** and elimination of armaments.

For those **reasons**, the **Mongolian** delegation fully **supports** draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1 as further revised and amended, and will vote in favour of it.

Mr. NENGRAHARY (Afghanistan) (interpretation from French): I wish to state the **position** of my delegation on draft **resolution** A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1, on **confidence** and **security** building measures and conventional disarmament. My Government welcomed the progress made at the **Stockholm** Conference, and **considers** it to be a positive step in the direction of general and complete disarmament. We consistently support all measures that can **increase** confidence among **States** with a view to **reaching** agreements on disarmament, and on nuclear disarmament in **particular**, and to preventing **nuclear war**.

I **wish to** make two brief observations on the draft resolution before us. First of all, draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1 by and large **stresses** conventional disarmament, while **passing** in silence over other matters of **particular** importance, including **political**, military and economic measures. **Secondly**, the

(Mr. Nengraharay, Afghanistan)

measures referred to in some of the preambular paragraphs are not equally applicable to all regions of the world, because of the particular conditions in each region.

For those reasons, my delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1 as further revised and amended

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1, entitled "General and complete disarmament: Conventional disarmament; Confidence- and security-building measures and conventional disarmament", as further orally revised today by the sponsors and as subsequently orally amended by the delegation of Peru. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of France at the 25th meeting of the First Committee, held on 29 October 1986, and is sponsored by France, Poland and Sweden. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Congo, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, India, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Nicaragua, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1, as orally revised and orally amended, was adopted by 98 votes to none, with 22 abstentions. \*

The CHAIRMAN: The last draft resolution under the disarmament agenda items before us is contained in document A/C.1/41/L.50, "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions Adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session", and subtitled "The Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 48th meeting of the First Committee today and is sponsored by the delegation of Sweden.

---

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

(The Chairman)

The sponsor has requested that the draft resolution be adopted without A vote. It I hear no objection, I shall take it that the **Committee** wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.50 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: In Accordance with a statement by the representative of Poland, **that delegation** does not insist upon A vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.44. The **Committee** has therefore concluded action on the draft **resolutions** in cluster 6.

I **shall now** call upon those delegations that **wish** to make statements in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mr. SHI Jicheng (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1, as orally amended and revised. However, I should like to take **this opportunity** to make the following clarification. The Chinese delegation is **completely in favour** that States should refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of Any State. **For that reason**, China **welcomes** the outcome of the **Stockholm** Conference on **Confidence And Security-Building Measures And Disarmament in Europe** and hopes that it will lead to the reduction of armaments in Europe and to the relaxation of **tensions**, thereby **contributing** to international peace and security. **Draft** resolution L.27/Rev.1, in this regard, is of positive significance.

However, we would like to point out that different conditions prevail in different parts of the world, and different regions are faced with different **problems**. In **Asia**, for example, hotbeds of tension still exist. For that **reason**,

(Mr. Shi Jicheng, China)

the same method may not be applicable to the different problems that confront **different** parts of the world. The Chinese delegation would **like** to reserve **its** Own views on this matter.

Mr. LE HOAI TRUNG (Viet Nam): It is the consistent policy of **Viet Nam** to support and, together with other countries, to seek **concrete** and effective measures, global as well as regional, **to** achieve further relaxation of **international tension**, to establish international relations based **on** peaceful coexistence and trust between **all** States and to develop broad international m-operation and understanding.

In t **spirit**, Viet Nam has stated on many previous **occasions** its full support for **the** efforts towards promoting disarmament and **consolidating** Peace and co-operation in Europe, the continent **which** was the hotbed of two world wars and where at present the two largest opposing military alliances in the **world** exist. The establishment **and** maintenance of a framework of peaceful coexistence in **Europe**, in spite of numerous challenges, constitutes one of the most **significant** achievements of the struggle of the world's **peace-loving forces** for **peace** and disarmament. The success of the process of the Conference on Security and **Co-operation** in Europe has testified to the realistic **possibility** of establishing a framework of **peaceful** coexistence **between** countries of different **political**, economic and social systems, given goodwill and serious efforts on the part of **all** **concerned**.

Viet Nam supports the further **steps** that may be agreed upon **among** the participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe process in Order **to** make further progress in strengthening confidence and security and in achieving disarmament.

(Hr. Lê Hoai Tru'ng, Viet Nam)

Viet Nam **abstained** in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1, just adopted by the Committee, as it **contains a number** of **provisions that may** lead to the **prejudgement** of the **purposes** as well as the nature of confidence-building measures in regions **other** than Europe, **measures** which would have to **fit** in with the **specific characteristics** of **each region** and would be the **subject** of **delicate negotiations** between **the** countries **concerned** in the **region**.

Mr. J. THURMAY (United States of America): The United States joined in supporting resolution L.27/Rev.1, just adopted. The United States also supported resolution L.50.

Resolution L.50 welcomed the results of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building and Security-Building Measures and conventional Disarmament in Europe in terms consistent both with the mandate of that Conference and with its results. My delegation would have preferred to support a single consensus resolution AS submitted by Sweden, the host country for that important and successful conference, as the appropriate sponsor for a resolution related to confidence-building and security-building measures and conventional disarmament.

The United States is committed to agreement on and implementation of confidence-building measures, specifically measures designed to enhance security for all through increased openness and transparency. As regards conventional disarmament I should like to recall the Halifax Statement on conventional arms control issued on 30 May 1985, at the conclusion of the Halifax Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, at which it was agreed to set up a high-level task force on conventional arms control. In that statement the Alliance reaffirmed its objective of:

\*the strengthening of stability and security in the whole of Europe through increased openness and the establishment of a verifiable, comprehensive and stable balance of conventional forces at lower levels."

The United States is committed to that objective. At the same time, as regards the question raised in operative paragraph 7 of that resolution concerning further steps to follow the adoption of the Stockholm Document, I should like to note that there is no decision by my Government, the NATO alliance or the Vienna follow-up Conference that negotiations on conventional disarmament will follow the Stockholm Conference.

MC. HAGOSS (Ethiopia): Allow me to explain my delegation's vote on the draft resolution, contained in document A/C.1/41/L.27/Rev.1. At the outset let me express my delegation's appreciation to the delegations of France, Poland and Sweden and to you, Mr. Chairman, for the commendable efforts made jointly to submit to the Committee a substantive draft resolution on confidence-building and security-building measures and conventional disarmament.

My delegation believes that there is no single global prescription on confidence-building measures. The situations obtaining in various regions of the world are so varied that it is difficult at best and impossible at worst to adopt and implement a rigid set of recommendations on this vital issue. That is why my delegation would have preferred the title of the draft resolution to reflect clearly, in some form and manifest manner a reference to the European situation.

All the same we believe that the main thrust of the draft resolution before us addresses itself very clearly to the situation obtaining in Europe. Thus it is with that understanding that we have bent our support to this draft-resolution.

In conclusion let me reiterate our conviction that the spirit and letter of the draft resolution before us remains for us, the delegation of Ethiopia, a matter of specific and particular reference to Europe and Europe alone, without prejudice to the exemplary lessons other regions of the world are bound to derive from the historic measures being undertaken with a view to generating an atmosphere of confidence and durable security in Europe.

Mr. YAMADA (Japan): Japan voted in favour of the draft resolution in document L.27/Rev.1 as amended. We support its purpose and main thrust, since we believe that measures to enhance confidence among States will not only serve to prevent conflict but also contribute to the promotion of disarmament. In this connection I should like to recall my statement to the Committee on 21 October and reiterate that the situation in the Asia-Pacific region, with its various unsettled

(Mr Yamada, Japan)

issues, in both politically and militarily quite different from that in Europe, and that it is the belief of my Government that efforts to resolve those outstanding problems should be made as a first step in building mutual confidence among States in the region.

Mr. NANNA (Niger ia): My delegation wishes to explain its positive vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C. 2/41/L.27/Rev.1 and also its joining in the consensus on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.50.

My delegation is of the view that draft resolution L.27/Rev.1, as orally amended, still contains references we consider extraneous to the Final Document of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures in Europe.

Confidence-building measures differ from region to region. We share the view that a regional approach has positive effect in promoting international peace and security. It is because of this consideration that my delegation voted in favour Of draft resolution L.27/Rev.1, with the understanding that it deals exclusively with conventional weapons and the balance of armed forces and conventional weapons and excludes all elements of nuclear weapons.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the third phase of our work, namely, consideration of and action upon draft resolutions on all disarmament agenda items, that is, items 46 to 65 and 144. This afternoon we shall commence our deliberations on agenda item 66 dealing with the question of Antarctica and thereafter proceed to the remaining items on our agenda, namely, items 67, 68, 69 and 141 concerning international security.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: From this vantage point I should like to take this opportunity to review briefly the work accomplished by the Committee during the past weeks, which has culminated in our taking action on the draft resolutions and the decisions submitted for consideration by the Committee.

At the current session the Committee had before it 75 draft resolutions and two draft decisions dealing with disarmament questions. Thus we have rightly recorded last year's record of 75 draft proposals. Of the proposals submitted this year the Committee has adopted 67, including 22 without a vote, while 9 were not pressed respectively.

The majority of the draft resolutions submitted this year once again reaffirms the urgent need for concrete measures both in the nuclear and non-nuclear fields. Among them I may mention those calling for substantive and result-oriented actions towards the prevention of an arms race in outer space, its termination on Earth, the prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters, the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests, a global and comprehensive ban on chemical weapons, measures for conventional disarmament and regional disarmament measures.

(The Chairmen)

As members will recall, in my statement at the very commencement of our deliberations I stressed the need for determined and joint endeavours to conduct our work in a constructive and businesslike manner and to seek as wide a degree of consensus as feasible on the various issues with which the Committee has been grappling during the session. In this respect, I should like to express my deep gratitude for the commendable manner in which all delegations have worked so arduously to harmonize positions wherever and whenever possible. These efforts, which, as I can testify, were undertaken in good faith, resulted in the merging of several draft resolutions that were submitted under the same agenda item.

In this context, I wish to pay a special tribute to the other officers of the Committee, who assisted me greatly in the process of consultations and negotiations. The fruits of these endeavours are manifested most clearly with respect to the item on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, where the Committee, as in previous years, was able to adopt a single draft resolution. Similarly, I should like to mention the adoption of only one draft resolution on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament, reaffirming that efforts should be intensified with a view to initiating, as a matter of highest priority, multilateral negotiations in this field within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament, verification in all its aspects, and compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements, as well as the decision proposed by the Chairman on the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.

On the other hand, I feel constrained to state also that we have not fully exhausted all the possibilities. For example, despite sincere efforts, we were once again this year unable to reconcile the divergent approaches that prevailed on the question of the cessation of all nuclear-test explosions, a matter of great

(The Chairman)

significance, since it is a key instrumentality that would constitute a major step towards the cessation of the nuclear-arms race.

I should like to turn now to another matter. Members will recall that in recent years, particularly since 1983, increasing attention has focused on the question of the method of work of the First Committee. Taking as a point of departure the useful suggestions made by my predecessor and views expressed during our debate at this year's session, I undertook, with the assistance and co-operation of the other officers of the Committee, a series of informal consultations, including those with representatives from regional groups and with a number of former Chairmen of the Committee. These consultations were aimed at exploring the modalities of how best to approach the subject-matter at hand. In the course of these consultations, a number of suggestions were put forward, encompassing a range of ideas, some of a general nature and others having a more specific focus. Although, at the more general level, there was a measure of agreement on certain proposals, it was nevertheless evident at the same time that on certain specific issues there were divergencies on a few points.

Having carefully weighed the suggestions and proposals that emerged, it is my personal assessment, however, that on one or two of these specific aspects agreement could be possible. Thus delegations were generally supportive of the idea that, if more time were made available during the stage of consideration of and action upon draft resolutions, the process of consultations aimed at merging a number of draft resolutions would be greatly facilitated.

I wish to state that the consultations that have taken place on the subject have been a rewarding experience. They have elucidated the various concerns that prevail on the question of how to enhance the effectiveness of the work of the First Committee. At the same time they have highlighted the complex

(The Chairman)

in relationship between procedure and **substance**, and thereby **underlined** the need for examining the matter in **greater** depth.

Hence, **based on** the very useful exchange of **views** that **has transpired** in **this** respect, it is my intention to continue **these consultations** and I am **hopeful that** at **an** appropriate time I **shall** be in **a position** to **inform members further** concerning the substance **and** outcome of **such consultations** and to **see whether any** concrete proposals on the subject **can** be formulated for the **consideration** of the Committee.

Before **proceeding** to the next item on our **agenda** this afternoon, I **wish** to **state** that I am confident that we shall **conduct** our deliberations on **the remaining** agenda items dealing with **the** question of Antarctica and **international security** in **a constructive manner** and with the same degree of **efficiency** that all **members** of the Committee have **displayed** during the **first** three **phases** of our **work**.

To **those representatives** who are now leaving New York, I **should like** once again to **express** my sincere thanks and wish them all the best **and** a **well-deserved** rest.

The **First Committee** will begin its **general** debate, **consideration** of and **adoption** upon draft **resolutions** on the **question** of Antarctica **this afternoon**. I **should like** to announce that the following delegations are inscribed on the **list**  **speakers** for **this afternoon's** meeting on item 66, "**Question of Antarctica**": Antigua and Barbuda, Malaysia, Zimbabwe, Sri Lanka, Ghana, Indonesia, Rwanda and Kenya.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.