



EUROPEAN  
UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE

ISSN 0259-2290

**EUROPEAN  
POLITICAL COOPERATION  
DOCUMENTATION  
BULLETIN**

1986 □ Vol. 2 □ No 2

Edited by  
the European Policy Unit  
at the European University Institute (Florence)  
and  
Institut für Europäische Politik (Bonn)

## **European Political Cooperation Documentation Bulletin**

### *General Editors*

Renaud Dehousse, Florence  
Elfriede Regelsberger, Bonn  
Joseph H.H. Weiler, Ann Arbor and Florence  
Wolfgang Wessels, Bonn

### *Assistant Editor*

Nanette Neuwahl, Florence

### *Editorial Board*

Roland Bieber, Luxembourg  
Robert Danziger, Florence  
Jay Modrall, New York  
Corrado Pettenati, Florence  
Brigitte Schwab, Florence  
Jürgen Schwarze, Florence  
Peter Van den Bossche, Florence

### *Advisory Board*

Gianni Bonvicini, Istituto Affari Internazionali, Rome  
Lady Diana Elles, Chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee of the European Parliament, Luxembourg  
Luca Giansanti, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Rome  
Giovanni Januzzi, Head of the EPC Secretariat, Brussels  
Horst-Günter Krenzler, Director-General, DG I, Commission of the European Communities, Brussels  
Consigliere Ferdinando Nelli Feroci, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Rome  
Simon Nuttall, Commission of the European Communities, Brussels  
Reinhard Rummel, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, Ebenhausen  
Ambassador Philippe de Schoutheete de Tervarent, Director for Political Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Brussels

All correspondence concerning this publication should be addressed to:  
European Policy Unit,  
European University Institute,  
Via dei Roccettini, 9  
I-50016, San Domenico di Fiesole (Italy)

Publication of the *European Political Cooperation Documentation Bulletin* is on a non-profit basis.

**EUROPEAN  
POLITICAL COOPERATION  
DOCUMENTATION  
BULLETIN**

1986 □ Vol. 2 □ No 2

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1988

ISSN 0259-2290

Catalogue number: OY-AA-87-002-2A-C

This publication should be cited as *EPC Bulletin*. All documents may be reproduced provided their source is indicated. No part of the index may be reproduced in any form, by mimeograph film or any other means without prior permission of the copyright holder.

© European University Institute, Florence, 1988

*Printed in Luxembourg*

## Foreword

This fourth issue of the EPC Documentation Bulletin covers the term-of-office of the British Presidency (1 July - 31 December 1986). It includes:

- the official declarations of the European Council, of the Foreign Ministers and of the 'Twelve', including statements in international conferences and organizations, and joint declarations made with other regional groupings;
- all documents related to the European Parliament, i.e. replies to oral and written questions, abstracts related to EPC of the reports presented by the British Presidency at the beginning and at the end of its term-of-office, the reports on the European Council meeting, etc.

In addition an attempt is made to bring into chart the attitudes of the Member States with regard to United Nations resolutions. To this effect this issue contains, besides the documents relating to the 41st session of the United Nations General Assembly, a section on the voting behaviour of the Twelve in 1986 in the General Assembly and the Security Council.

We would like to thank all those who helped us in collecting materials for this issue, and in particular Mr Ramsden and Mr Smith from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in London. Our gratitude also goes to Emir Lawless from the European Documentation Centre of the EUI and to Angelika Lanfranchi, Annette Merlan and Maura O'Shea for their help in the preparation of this fourth issue.

*The Editors*



## How to Use this Volume

The documents issued in the framework of European political cooperation are normally published in English or in French if no official English version is available.

They have been given a unique document number for quick reference in the index of the Bulletin and for purposes of citation. It is our hope that the EPC Documentation Bulletin will become the standard reference work for public domain EPC documents.

The document number indicates the year in which the document is issued, as well as the place of that document in the EPC Bulletin. Documents are ordered chronologically in each issue of the EPC Bulletin, and they are numbered consecutively throughout the volume (two issues) covering one year. Thus, the present issue relating to the British Presidency starts with document number '86/188', because the British term-of-office started on 1 July 1986 and 187 documents of 1986 were contained in the preceding issue of the EPC Bulletin.

The cumulative index of the EPC Bulletin refers to document numbers, and therefore to the place of a document in a given volume. If for technical reasons a document can not be included in the volume concerning the year in which was issued, it will normally be included in the volume which immediately follows. In the cumulative index a reference to such a document will be accompanied by a reference to the volume and issue in which the document can be found.

The EPC Bulletin contains further information on the origin and status of the documents, and on their contents:

At the beginning of each document basic information concerning the date of issue, the city of issue, the country holding the Presidency, the source of the document, and its status can be found.

At the end of each issue the cumulative index can be found, which contains different classes of information for which the documents have been specifically analysed. This index has been developed by members of the European Policy Unit and the Institut für Europäische Politik, aided by a group of experts which included senior diplomats and scholars of several European Community Member States. It is designed to cover all aspects of European political cooperation, its structure and activity. Thus one will find the following classes of information:

- The category *Status of document* permits the location of documents according to their type.
- The category *EPC structure and procedure* contains all references to statements of EPC which comment on or illustrate the working of EPC or its relation with the European Communities.
- The category *Contacts* reports all official relations with third countries, international organizations and political groupings.
- *Geographical reference categories* indicate countries, regions and subregions, whenever these are intrinsically dealt with.
- The category *International organizations and political groupings* does the same for all international organizations, political groupings and conferences of relevance to EPC.
- Finally, issues are classified by subject matter in the general *Issues* category.

The index is open-ended to enable the inclusion of new issues as they arise on the agenda of European political cooperation. It is cumulative from one issue of the EPC Bulletin to the next. By consulting the index in the most recent issue, the user should thus be able to trace all EPC documents relating to a specific country or subject matter and issued during the entire period covered by the Bulletin.

## List of abbreviations

ABM	Anti Ballistic Missile
ACABQ	Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions
ACC	Administrative Committee on Coordination
ACP	African, Caribbean and Pacific States
A.C.P.	Pays d'Afrique, des Caraïbes et du Pacifique
A.G.	Assemblée Générale
A.E.L.E	Association européenne de libre échange
A.I.D.	Association internationale de développement
A.I.E.A.	Agence internationale de l'énergie atomique
A.N.A.S.E.	Association des Nations Unies de l'Asie de l'Est
ANC	African National Congress (South Africa)
A.N.C.	Congrès national africain (Afrique du Sud)
A.P.D.	Assistance publique au développement
ARC	Groupe arc-en-ciel (PE); Rainbow Group (EP)
ESA	European Space Agency
IDA	International Development Association
A.S.E.	Agence spatiale européenne
ASEAN	Association of South-East Asian Nations
Azapo	Azanian People's Organization (South Africa)
B	Belgium; Belgique
BLEU	Belgo-Luxembourg Economic Union
Bull.EC	Bulletin of the Commission of the European Communities; Bulletin des Communautés européennes
C.A.C.	Comité administratif de coordination
C.A.E.M.	Conseil d'assistance économique mutuelle (COMECON)
C.C.I.	Corps commun d'inspection (N.U.)
C.C.Q.A.B.	Comité consultatif pour les questions administratives et budgétaires
CDE	Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe
CDU	Christlich-Demokratische Union (Deutschlands)
C.E.	Communautés européennes
C.E.E.	Communauté économique européenne
CERD	Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination
CMEA	Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON)
C.F.P.I.	Commission de la Fonction Publique Internationale
C.I.J.	Cour internationale de justice
C.N.U.C.E.D.	Conférence des Nations Unies sur le Commerce et le Développement
COM	Communist and Allies Group (EP); Groupe communiste et apparentés (PE)
COMECON	Cf. C.A.E.M., CMEA
CPC	Committee for Programme and Co-ordination
C.P.C.	Commission pour le programme et la coordination



C.P.E.	Coopération politique européenne
CPSU	Communist Party of the Soviet Union; Parti communiste de l'Union Soviétique
CSCE	Conférence on Security and Co-operation in Europe
C.S.C.E.	Conférence sur la Sécurité et la Coopération en Europe
CSU	Christlich-Soziale Union (Bayern)
D	Federal Republic of Germany; République fédérale d'Allemagne
DK	Denmark; Danemark
Doc.	Document
DR	Group of the European Right (EP); Groupe des droites européennes (PE)
Dr	Drachme
E	Spain; Espagne
EC	European Communities
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council
E.C.O.S.O.C.	Conseil économique et social
Ecu	
Unité monétaire européenne	
ECU	European Currency Unit
ED	European Democratic Group (EP); Groupe des démocrates européens (PE)
EEC	European Economic Community
EFTA	European Free Trade Association
EMS	European Monetary System
EP	European Parliament
EPC	European political cooperation
EPP	European People's Party; Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democratic Group) (EP)
ESA	European Space Agency
F	France
FICSA	Federation of International Civil Servants Associations
F.I.C.S.A.	Fédération des associations de fonctionnaires internationaux
F.I.D.A.	Fonds international de développement agricole
F.I.N.U.L.	Force intérimaire des Nations Unies pour le Liban
F.I.S.E.	Fonds des Nations Unies pour l'enfance
F.M.I.	Fonds monétaire international
FRG	Federal Republic of Germany
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
G.A.T.T.	Accord général sur les tarifs douaniers et le commerce
GR	Greece; Grèce
I	Italy; Italie
IAEA	International Economic Energy Agency
IATA	International Air Transport Association
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
ICARA	International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa
I.C.A.R.A.	Conférence internationale sur l'assistance aux réfugiés en Afrique

## List of abbreviations

---

ICJ	International Court of Justice
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
ICSC	International Civil Service Commission
IDA	International Development Association
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IRA	Irish Republican Army
IRL	Ireland; Irlande
JO	Journal Officiel (des Communautés européennes)
JIU	Joint Inspection Unit
KGB	Komitet Gosudarstvnooi Bezopasnosti; Committee of State Security (USSR); Comité de la sécurité d'Etat (U.R.S.S.)
L	Luxembourg; Luxembourg
L	Liberal and Democratic Group (EP); Groupe libéral et démocratique (PE)
LDC	Less developed countries, developing countries
LLDC	Least developed countries
MEP	Member of European Parliament
MFN	Most Favoured Nation
MNR	Mozambique National resistance
MPE	Membre du Parlement européen
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration (United States)
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NDP	New Democratic Party
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NI	Non-inscrits (PE); Non-attached (EP)
NL	The Netherlands; Pays-Bas
N.P.F.	Nation la plus favorisée
N.P.S.A.	Nouveau programme substantiel d'action
NPT	Non Proliferation Treaty, Treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons
O.A.C.I.	Organisation de l'aviation civile internationale
OAS	Organization of American States
OAU	Organization of African Unity
OCT	Overseas Countries and Territories
ODA	Official Development Assistance
O.E.A.	Organisation des Etats américains
O.I.T.	Organisation Internationale du Travail
OJ	Official Journal (of the European Communities)
O.M.I.	Organisation maritime internationale
O.M.S.	Organisation mondiale de la santé
O.N.G.	Organisation non-gouvernementale
O.N.U.	Organisation des Nations Unies
O.N.U.D.I.	Organisation des Nations Unies pour le développement industriel

O.L.P.	Organisation pour la libération de la Palestine
O.T.A.N.	Organisation du traité de l'Atlantique du Nord
O.U.A.	Organisation de l'unité africaine
P	Portugal
PAC	Pan Africanist Congress
PE	Parlement européen
PFPP	Progressive Federal Party of South Africa; Parti progressiste fédéral (Afrique du Sud)
PLO	Palestine Liberation Organization
P.M.A.	Pays les moins avancés
P.M.D.	Pays les moins développés
P.N.U.D.	Programme des Nations Unies pour le développement
PPE	Parti populaire européen; Groupe du Parti populaire européen (Groupe démocrate-chrétien) (PE); Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democratic Group) (EP)
P.V.D.	Pays en voie de développement (developing countries)
RDE	Groupe des rénovateurs et du rassemblement des démocrates européens (PE); Group of the European Renewal and Democratic Alliance (EP)
Res.	Resolution(s); Résolution(s)
R.F.A.	République fédérale d'Allemagne
R.S.F.Y.	République fédérale socialiste de Yougoslavie
RSA	Republic of South Africa
R.S.A.	République sud-africaine
S	Socialist Group (EP); Groupe socialiste (PE)
SADCC	Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference
SALT	Strategic Arms Limitation Talks; Négociations sur la limitation des armements stratégiques
SARC	South Asia Regional Cooperation
SFRY	Social Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
SDI	Strategic Defence Initiative
S.M.E.	Système monétaire européen
SNAP	Substantial New Programme of Action
SWAPO	South West African People's Organization
T.N.P.	Traité de non-prolifération, traité sur la non-prolifération des armes nucléaires
TPA	Turkish Peace Association
TWA	Trans-World Airlines
UDF	Union Defence Force (South Africa)
UDI	Unilateral Declaration of Independence; Déclaration unilatérale d'indépendance
U.E.B.L.	Union économique belgo-luxembourgeoise
U.E.O.	Union de l'Europe occidentale
UK	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Royaume-Uni
UN	United Nations
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDC	United Nations Disarmament Commission

## List of abbreviations

---

UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDRO	Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
U.N.E.S.C.O.	Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'éducation, la science et la culture
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNIFIL	United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon
Unisa	University of South Africa; Université de l'Afrique du Sud
UNITAR	United Nations Institute for Training and Research
U.N.I.T.A.R.	Institut des Nations unies pour la formation et la recherche
UNRWA	United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
U.N.R.W.A.	Office de secours et de travaux des Nations Unies pour les réfugiés de Palestine dans le Proche-Orient
U.R.S.S.	Union des républiques socialistes soviétiques
US; USA	United States of America
U.S.A.	United States of America; Etats Unis d'Amérique
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WEU	Western European Union
WHO	World Health Organization
ZANU	Zimbabwe African National Union
ZAPU	Zimbabwe African People's Union

## Table of contents

86/188. Question No 2846/85 by Ms van den Heuvel (S-NL) Concerning the Bombing Raids in El Salvador Date of Issue: 2 July 1986 .....	27
86/189. Question No 2956/85 by Ms Dury (S-B) Concerning a Belgian Citizen Held in South Africa Date of Issue: 2 July 1986 .....	27
86/190. Question No 2962/85 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning the Relations Between the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the Republic of South Africa Date of Issue: 2 July 1986 .....	28
86/191. Question No 2997/85 by Mr Pisoni and Mr Selva (PPE-I) Concerning the Situation in Iran Date of Issue: 2 July 1986 .....	28
86/192. Question No 3008/85 by Ms Dury (S-B) Concerning the Relations Between the European Community and Turkey Date of Issue: 2 July 1986 .....	29
86/193. Question No 3161/85 by Mr Boesmans (S-B) Concerning the Imprisonment of Rosa Flores Flores in El Salvador Date of Issue: 2 July 1986 .....	29
86/194. Question No 199/86 by Ms Lizin (S-B) Concerning the Trevi Group Date of Issue: 2 July 1986 .....	30
86/195. Question No 3064/85 by Ms Jackson (ED-UK) Concerning the Code of Conduct for European Companies Operating in South Africa Date of Issue: 2 July 1986 .....	30
86/196. Statement on the Internal Dialogue in El Salvador Date of Issue: 3 July 1986 .....	31
86/197. Question No 15/86 by Mr Martin (S-UK) Concerning the Exploitation of Namibian Natural Resources Date of Issue: 7 July 1986 .....	31
86/198. Statement on the Programme of the British Presidency for the Second Half of 1986 Date of Issue: 8 July 1986 .....	32
86/199. Statement at the International Conference on Namibia Date of Issue: 8 July 1986 .....	34
86/200. Question No H-933/85 by Mr Maher Concerning the Common Declaration on International Terrorism Date of Issue: 8 July 1986 .....	35
86/201. Question No H-1017/85 by Mr Tzounis Concerning the Amnesty International Report on Torture in Turkey Date of Issue: 8 July 1986 .....	38

## **Table of contents**

---

86/202. Question No H-115/86 by Mr Martin Concerning the UN Council for Namibia Decree No 1 Date of Issue: 8 July 1986 .....	39
86/203. Question No H-143/86 by Sir James Scott-Hopkins on Combating International Terrorism Date of Issue: 9 July 1986 .....	41
86/204. Question No H-170/86 by Mr Ephremidis Concerning South African Air Strikes on Three Neighbouring Countries Date of Issue: 9 July 1986 .....	41
86/205. Question No H-171/86 by Mr Adamou Concerning the Signing of the UN Convention Excluding South Africa from Sporting Events and Question No H-173/86 by Mr Wurtz Concerning the International Convention Against Apartheid in Sport Date of Issue: 9 July 1986 .....	42
86/206. Question No H-192/86 by Mr Ulburghs Concerning the Imprisonment of a Belgian Oblate in South Africa Date of Issue: 9 July 1986 .....	43
86/207. Question No H-193/86 by Mr Alavanos Concerning the Production of Chemical Weapons Date of Issue: 9 July 1986 .....	43
86/208. Question No H-201/86 by Mr Pranchère Concerning the Fate of Twenty-Six Young Political Prisoners in Morocco Date of Issue: 9 July 1986 .....	43
86/209. Question No H-219/86 by Sir Peter Vanneck Concerning the Freedom of Navigation in International Waters Through the Gulf Date of Issue: 9 July 1986 .....	44
86/210. Question No H-226/86 by Lord Bethell Concerning the Reception of the Human Rights Subcommittee Date of Issue: 9 July 1986 .....	44
86/211. Question No H-258/86 by Mr Raftery Concerning Sanctions Against South Africa Date of Issue: 9 July 1986 .....	45
86/212. Question No 2939/85 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning the Unrepresentative and Unlawful 'Interim Government' of Namibia Date of Issue: 11 July 1986 .....	45
86/213. Question No 3081/85 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning the Complaint Lodged with the International Labour Organization Against Fernando Marcos's Government in the Philippines Date of Issue: 11 July 1986 .....	47
86/214. Question No 3085/85 by Mr Collins (S-UK) Concerning Prisoners in Southern Turkey Date of Issue: 11 July 1986 .....	47
86/215. Question No 41/86 by Ms Piermont (ARC-D) Concerning the Expulsion from French Polynesia and New Caledonia of Ms Dorothée Piermont and the Ban on her from Entering the Territory Date of Issue: 11 July 1986 .....	48

86/216. Question No 58/86 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning Overfishing in the South Atlantic, Especially in the Namibian Territorial Waters Date of Issue: 11 July 1986.....	49
86/217. Question No 73/86 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning Over-Mining of Diamond Deposits in Namibia Date of Issue: 11 July 1986.....	49
86/218. Question No 203/86 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning the Cessation of Exports of Petroleum Products to the Republic of South Africa and Occupied Namibia Date of Issue: 11 July 1986.....	50
86/219. Question No 204/86 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning the Involvement of Royal Dutch Shell in Supplying Oil to the Republic of South Africa Date of Issue: 11 July 1986.....	51
86/220. Question No 220/86 by Mr Kuijpers (ARC-B) Concerning the Imprisonment of Vladimir Poresj Date of Issue: 11 July 1986.....	52
86/221. Question No 247/86 by Mr Ephremidis, Mr Adamou and Mr Alavanos (COM-GR) Concerning the Bellicose US Provocations Against Libya in the Gulf of Sirte Date of Issue: 11 July 1986.....	52
86/222. Question No 316/86 by Mr Pordea (DR-F) Concerning the Importance of Community Support for the Firm American Line Towards the Soviet Union Date of Issue: 11 July 1986.....	53
86/223. Question No 334/86 by Mr Schwalba-Hoth (ARC-D) Concerning the US Terrorism Task Force in Stuttgart Date of Issue: 11 July 1987.....	54
86/224. Question No 350/86 by Mr Balfé (S-UK) Concerning the Raid on Libya Date of Issue: 11 July 1986.....	55
86/225. Question No 371/86 by Mr Schwalba-Hoth (ARC-D) Concerning Strip-Searching in Northern Ireland Date of Issue: 11 July 1986.....	55
86/226. Question No 430/86 by Ms Lizin (S-B) on Strengthening the Trevi Group Date of Issue: 11 July 1986.....	55
86/227. Question No 439/86 by Mr De Vries (LDR-NL) Concerning the State of Ratification of the Protocols to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms Date of Issue: 11 July 1986.....	56
86/228. Statement on Sri Lanka Date of Issue: 14 July 1986.....	56
86/229. Statement on the Execution of Six Opposition Leaders in Guinea-Bissau Date of Issue: 21 July 1986.....	57
86/230. Declaration on Human Rights Date of Issue: 21 July 1986.....	57

## Table of contents

---

86/231. Statement on Ethiopia and the Horn of Africa Date of Issue: 21 July 1986.....	58
86/232. Question No 2610/85 by Mr Iversen (COM-DK) Concerning Afghanistan Date of Issue: 23 July 1986.....	58
86/233. Question No 2901/85 by Ms van den Heuvel (S-NL) Concerning International Military Observers on Nicaraguan Borders Date of Issue: 23 July 1986.....	59
86/234. Question No 2937/85 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning the Conscription of Community Nationals into South African Armed Forces Date of Issue: 23 July 1986.....	59
86/235. Question No 3121/85 by Mr Kuijpers (ARC-B) Concerning the Rejection of the Contadora Agreement Date of Issue: 23 July 1986.....	60
86/236. Question No 222/86 by Mr van der Waal (NI-NL) Concerning the Circulation of Bibles in Turkey Date of Issue: 23 July 1986.....	61
86/237. Question No 233/86 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning Economic Sanctions Against Apartheid Date of Issue: 23 July 1986.....	61
86/238. Question No 297/86 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning Additional Contributions to SADCC Date of Issue: 23 July 1986.....	62
86/239. Question No 349/86 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning the Contadora Process Date of Issue: 23 July 1986.....	62
86/240. Question No 379/86 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning UNESCO and Afghanistan Date of Issue: 23 July 1986.....	63
86/241. Question No 440/86 by Mr De Vries (LDR-NL) Concerning the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms Date of Issue: 23 July 1986.....	64
86/242. Question No 515/86 by Mr Perinat Elio (ED-E) Concerning a Common European Defence Market Date of Issue: 23 July 1986.....	64
86/243. Question No 530/86 by Mr Antony (DR-F) Concerning the Treatment of Lebanese Christians by the Cypriot Authorities Date of Issue: 23 July 1986.....	65
86/244. Question No 575/86 by Mr Cottrell (ED-UK) Concerning the Reaction of Greece to the Accord on Terrorism Date of Issue: 23 July 1986.....	65
86/245. Statement Concerning Chile Date of Issue: 1 August 1986.....	66
86/246. Statement on the War Between Iran and Iraq Date of Issue: 6 August 1986.....	66



86/247. Circular Concerning the Namibia Day Date of Issue: 19 August 1986.....	66
86/248. Message to the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement Date of Issue: 28 August 1986.....	67
86/249. Statement Concerning Chile Date of Issue: 29 August 1986.....	68
86/250. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly on the Biological Weapons Convention Review Conference (BWCRC) Date of Issue: 9 September 1986 .....	68
86/251. Question No H-71/86 by Mr McMahon, Question No H-236/86 by Mr Cryer and Question No H-213/86 by Ms Dury Concerning the USA and the Political Situation in Nicaragua Date of Issue: 9 September 1986 .....	70
86/252. Question No H-80/86 by Mr Balfe Concerning the US Air Raid on Tripoli Date of Issue: 9 September 1986 .....	72
86/253. Question No H-101/86 by Mr Schwalba-Hoth Concerning the Expulsion of Fourteen Thousand American Indians from their Reservation in Arizona and their Compulsory Resettlement Date of Issue: 9 September 1986 .....	75
86/254. Question No H-231/86 by Mr Habsburg Concerning the Implementation of the Yalta Agreement Date of Issue: 10 September 1986.....	75
86/255. Question No H-202/86 by Mr Wurtz Concerning the Wrongful Imprisonment of Mr Serfati, the Former Director of Moroccan Phosphates Date of Issue: 10 September 1986.....	76
86/256. Question No H-358/86 by Mr Kolokotronis Concerning the Turkish Policy on the Islands of Imvros and Tenedos Date of Issue: 10 September 1986 .....	76
86/257. Question No H-227/86 by Mr Iversen Concerning the Wages Policy of UK Companies in South Africa Date of Issue: 10 September 1986.....	77
86/258. Question No H-278/86 by Mr Griffiths Concerning Exit Visas for Israel to Jews by the Soviet Union Date of Issue: 10 September 1986.....	77
86/259. Question No H-280/86 by Mr Papoutsis Concerning the Reduction of Conventional Forces and Arms on European Territory Date of Issue: 10 September 1986.....	78
86/260. Question No H-288/86 by Mr Saridakis Concerning the Action to Be Taken Following Mr A. Papandreou's Briefing of the European Council (The Hague, 26-27 June) Date of Issue: 10 September 1986.....	78
86/261. Question No H-292/86 by Mr Gerontopoulos Concerning the Meeting of the States of Central America in Esquipulas Date of Issue: 10 September 1986.....	78

## Table of contents

---

86/262. Question No H-300/86 by Mr Filinis Concerning the Summit Meeting in The Hague and Statements on South Africa Date of Issue: 10 September 1986 .....	79
86/263. Question No H-303/86 by Sir Peter Vanneck Concerning the Possible Implications of Sanctions Against the Republic of South Africa Date of Issue: 10 September 1986 .....	79
86/264. Question No H-317/86 by Ms Lienemann Concerning the Situation in South Africa Date of Issue: 10 September 1986 .....	80
86/265. Question No H-318/86 by Ms Daly Concerning the Soviet Persecution of Christian Activist Irina Ratushinskaya Date of Issue: 10 September 1986 .....	80
86/266. Question No H-319/86 by Ms Crawley Concerning the Meeting of European Women with Lord Carrington Date of Issue: 10 September 1986 .....	81
86/267. Question No H-331/86 by Mr Newens Concerning the Views of the British Prime Minister on the PLO Date of Issue: 10 September 1986 .....	81
86/268. Question No H-360/86 by Mr Seligman Concerning Human Rights for the Baha'i in Iran Date of Issue: 10 September 1986 .....	82
86/269. Question No H-371/86 by Mr Hutton Concerning Chemical Weapon Disarmament Date of Issue: 10 September 1986 .....	82
86/270. Statement Concerning the Release of Political Prisoners in Poland Date of Issue: 15 September 1986 .....	82
86/271. Statement on South Africa Date of Issue: 16 September 1986 .....	83
86/272. Statement on Chile Date of Issue: 16 September 1986 .....	84
86/273. Statement at the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Namibia, Held on 17-20 October 1986 Date of Issue: 18 September 1986 .....	84
86/274. Explanation of Vote on the Resolution Presented to the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Namibia Date of Issue: 18 September 1986 .....	86
86/275. Speech Made by Sir Geoffrey Howe to the UN General Assembly Date of Issue: 23 September 1986 .....	86
86/276. Statement on Libyan Arab Airlines Date of Issue: 4 October 1986 .....	96
86/277. Statement in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly on Racism and Racial Discrimination Date of Issue: 6 October 1986 .....	96

86/278. Question No H-110/86 by Mr Marshall Concerning Interference with Mail in Russia Date of Issue: 7 October 1986 .....	99
86/279. Question No H-363/86 by Mr Ford Concerning the European Community Political Map Published the 4th Quarter 1985 Date of Issue: 7 October 1986 .....	101
86/280. Question No H-238/86 by Ms Castle Concerning Cyprus Date of Issue: 7 October 1986 .....	101
86/281. Question No H-328/86 by Mr Adamou Concerning the Continued Violation of Human Rights in Turkey Date of Issue: 7 October 1986 .....	104
86/282. Question No H-208/86 by Mr Maher Concerning European Defence Expenditure Date of Issue: 8 October 1986 .....	105
86/283. Question No H-438/86 by Ms Lizin Concerning WEU Date of Issue: 8 October 1986 .....	105
86/284. Question No H-359/86 by Ms Boot Concerning the Case of Ms Guadeloupe Ccallocunta Olano De Quiste Under Arrest in Ayacucho, Peru Date of Issue: 8 October 1986 .....	105
86/285. Question No H-467/86 by Mr Arbeloa Muru Concerning Efforts to Abolish the Death Penalty in the World Date of Issue: 8 October 1986 .....	106
86/286. Question No H-340/86 by Sir Peter Vanneck Concerning the Resolution on the Political Situation in the Middle East Date of Issue: 8 October 1986 .....	107
86/287. Question No H-390/86 by Mr Ephremidis Concerning the Extension of the Moratorium on Nuclear Tests Date of Issue: 8 October 1986 .....	107
86/288. Question No H-391/86 by Ms Crawley Concerning Irina Raturhinskaya Date of Issue: 8 October 1986 .....	107
86/289. Question No H-408/86 by Mr Newton Dunn Concerning Gabcikovo-Nagymaros Hydroelectric Project and the Duna Kor Environmentalists Date of Issue: 8 October 1986 .....	108
86/290. Question No H-413/86 by Mr Ulburghs Concerning the Arrest of Ms Butto in Pakistan Date of Issue: 8 October 1986 .....	108
86/291. Question No H-413/86 by Mr Boesmans Concerning the Fate of the Flemish Priest, Father Vandesompele Date of Issue: 8 October 1986 .....	109
86/292. Question No H-429/86 by Mr Iversen Concerning Refugees in Europe Date of Issue: 8 October 1986 .....	109

## Table of contents

---

86/293. Question No H-430/86 by Mr Habsburg Concerning the Yalta Agreement Date of Issue: 8 October 1986 .....	110
86/294. Question No H-446/86 by Mr Alavanos Concerning Measures Against the Chilean Regime Date of Issue: 8 October 1986 .....	110
86/295. Statement in the Fifth Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Report of the Committee on Conferences and on the Pattern of Conferences Date of Issue: 8 October 1986 .....	111
86/296. Statement in the Special Committee Against Apartheid, to Mark the Day of Solidarity with South African Political Prisoners Date of Issue: 10 October 1986 .....	112
86/297. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Review of the Efficiency of the Administrative and Financial Functioning of the United Nations: Report of the Group of High-Level Intergovernmental Experts, etc. Date of Issue: 14 October 1986 .....	113
86/298. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Date of Issue: 14 October 1986 .....	115
86/299. Statement in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Importance of the Universal Realization of the Right of Peoples to Self-Determination Date of Issue: 15 October 1986 .....	120
86/300. Statement in the Special Political Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Peace-Keeping Date of Issue: 16 October 1986 .....	121
86/301. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning Cooperation Between the UN and the League of Arab States Date of Issue: 17 October 1986 .....	123
86/302. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning Cooperation Between the UN and the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee (AALCC) Date of Issue: 17 October 1986 .....	123
86/303. Statement on South Africa Date of Issue: 17 October 1986 .....	124
86/304. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Situation in Kampuchea Date of Issue: 20 October 1986 .....	124
86/305. Statement in the Sixth Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Consideration of Effective Measures to Enhance the Protection, Security and Safety of Diplomatic Missions and Representatives: Report of the Secretary-General Date of Issue: 20 October 1986 .....	126
86/306. Joint Declaration of the 6th EC-ASEAN Ministerial Meeting (20-21 October 1986) Date of Issue: 21 October 1986 .....	127

86/307. Questions Concerning South Africa Date of Issue: 21 October 1986 .....	129
86/308. Question No O-30/86/rev. by Mr Elles and Others Concerning a Common Industrial Policy and Purchases of Military Equipment and Question No O-103/86 by Mr Poettering and Others on the Political and Economic Aspects of Security Date of Issue: 21 October 1986 .....	135
86/309. Question No H-395/86 by Mr Saridakis Concerning Turkey's Application for Accession to the European Communities Date of Issue: 21 October 1986 .....	139
86/310. Question No H-397/86 by Mr De Vries Concerning the 1986 UN Human Rights Programme Date of Issue: 21 October 1986 .....	140
86/311. Question No H-463/86 by Mr Christensen Concerning Nordic Foreign Policy Cooperation <i>vis-à-vis</i> European Political Cooperation Date of Issue: 21 October 1986 .....	141
86/312. Question No H-469/86 by Mr Arbeloa Muru Concerning Maltreatment and Torture in El Salvador Date of Issue: 21 October 1986 .....	141
86/313. Question No H-365/86 by Mr Marshall Concerning Cyprus Date of Issue: 21 October 1986 .....	143
86/314. Question No H-527/86 by Ms Simons Concerning the Conflict in the Western Sahara and EEC-Mahgreb Relations Date of Issue: 21 October 1986 .....	144
86/315. Question No H-415/86 by Mr Pranchère Concerning the Restrictions on the Movement of a Member of Parliament in Israel Date of Issue: 22 October 1986 .....	145
86/316. Question No H-434/86 by Mr Gerontopoulos Concerning the Continued Illegal Settlement of Turks in Cypriot Territory Occupied by Turkey Date of Issue: 22 October 1986 .....	145
86/317. Question No H-481/86 by Mr Megahy Concerning Turkey Date of Issue: 22 October 1986 .....	146
86/318. Question No H-505/86 by Mr Marleix Concerning the Fight Against Terrorism Date of Issue: 22 October 1986 .....	146
86/319. Question No H-515/86 by Mr Boesmans Concerning Nicaragua Date of Issue: 22 October 1986 .....	147
86/320. Question No H-526/86 by Mr Garcia Arias Concerning the Dahrawi Civilians Reported Missing Since 1975-1976 Date of Issue: 22 October 1986 .....	147
86/321. Statement Concerning the PLO Attack on the Wailing Wall Date of Issue: 22 October 1986 .....	148

## Table of contents

---

86/322. Statement in the Fourth Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Non-Selfgoverning Territories Date of Issue: 22 October 1986 .....	148
86/323. Explanation of Vote Presented at the 25th International Conference of the Red Cross Date of Issue: 22 October 1986 .....	148
86/324. Statement in the Special Political Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning UNRWA Date of Issue: 27 October 1986 .....	149
86/325. Explanation of Vote in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolutions Concerning the Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination Date of Issue: 27 October 1986 .....	151
86/326. Explanation of Vote in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolution Concerning Adverse Consequences for the Enjoyment of Political, Military, Economic and Other Forms of Assistance Given to the Racist and Colonialist Regime of South Africa Date of Issue: 27 October 1986 .....	151
86/327. Explanation of Vote in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolution Concerning the Importance of the Universal Realization of the Right to Self-Determination Date of Issue: 27 October 1986 .....	152
86/328. Explanation of Vote in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolution Concerning the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid Date of Issue: 27 October 1986 .....	152
86/329. Statement in the Sixth Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention Against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries Date of Issue: 28 October 1986 .....	153
86/330. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Armed Israeli Aggression Against the Iraqi Nuclear Installations and its Grave Consequences for the Established International System Concerning the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and International Peace and Security Date of Issue: 29 October 1986 .....	154
86/331. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies, and the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research Date of Issue: 29 October 1986 .....	155
86/332. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Chemical and Biological Weapons Date of Issue: 30 October 1986 .....	156
86/333. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Review of the Role of the UN in the Field of Disarmament Date of Issue: 30 October 1986 .....	157

86/334. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Review and Appraisal of the Implementation of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade Date of Issue: 30 October 1986 .....	158
86/335. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Reduction of Military Budgets Date of Issue: 31 October 1986 .....	159
86/336. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Confidence-Building Measures Date of Issue: 31 October 1986 .....	160
86/337. Statement in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the International Campaign Against Traffic in Drugs Date of Issue: 31 October 1986 .....	162
86/338. Explanation of Vote in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Resolution Concerning the Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination Date of Issue: 31 October 1986 .....	164
86/339. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Twentieth Anniversary of the Adoption of the International Covenants on Human Rights Date of Issue: 3 November 1986 .....	165
86/340. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning Afghanistan Date of Issue: 4 November 1986 .....	166
86/341. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Conventional Disarmament Date of Issue: 4 November 1986 .....	168
86/342. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Disarmament and Development Date of Issue: 4 November 1986 .....	169
86/343. Opening Statement for the CSCE Vienna Follow-up Meeting Date of Issue: 4 November 1986 .....	170
86/344. Question No 1364/86 by Mr Beyer de Ryke (LDR-B) Concerning the USSR's Diplomatic and Trade Offensive in the South Pacific Date of Issue: 4 November 1986 .....	174
86/345. Statement in the Special Political Committee of the UN General Assembly on Questions Relating to Information Date of Issue: 5 November 1986 .....	175
86/346. Statement in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Importance of the Universal Realization of the Right of Peoples to Self-Determination and on the Use of Mercenaries Date of Issue: 5 November 1986 .....	177
86/347. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning Apartheid Date of Issue: 6 November 1986 .....	178

## Table of contents

---

86/348. Statement in the Fifth Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Report of the Committee on Contributions on the Scale of Assessment Date of Issue: 7 November 1986 .....	180
86/349. Explanation of Vote at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly on the Resolutions Concerning Apartheid Date of Issue: 10 November 1986 .....	181
86/350. Explanation of Vote in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolution Concerning New Weapons of Mass Destruction Date of Issue: 10 November 1986 .....	182
86/351. Press Statement on Terrorism Date of Issue: 10 November 1986 .....	183
86/352. Statement on the Philippines Date of Issue: 10 November 1986 .....	184
86/353. Explanation of Vote in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolution Concerning the World Disarmament Campaign Date of Issue: 11 November 1986 .....	184
86/354. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning Namibia Date of Issue: 12 November 1986 .....	184
86/355. Explanation of Vote in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolution Concerning the Contribution of the Specialized Agencies and Other Organizations and Programmes of the United Nations to the Cause of Arms Limitation and Disarmament Date of Issue: 12 November 1986 .....	185
86/356. Statement in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Apparently Arbitrary 'Cost Saving' Measure of Restricting the Circulation of Certain Documents in the United Nations Date of Issue: 12 November 1986 .....	186
86/357. Explanation of Vote in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly 'Concerning Draft Resolution L.37/Rev.1 on the Reduction of Military Budgets Date of Issue: 12 November 1986 .....	186
86/358. Explanation of Vote in the Sixth Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Byelorussian Draft Resolution Concerning the Protection of Diplomats Date of Issue: 12 November 1986 .....	187
86/359. Statement in the Special Political Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories Date of Issue: 13 November 1986 .....	188
86/360. Statement in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Refugees Date of Issue: 14 November 1986 .....	190



86/361. Press Statement Concerning Possible Forced Removals of Residents of Oukasie, South Africa Date of Issue: 14 November 1986 .....	190
86/362. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Situation in Central America: Threats to International Peace and Security and Peace Initiatives Date of Issue: 17 November 1986 .....	190
86/363. Statement in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Report of the ECOSOC Date of Issue: 18 November 1986 .....	193
86/364. Explanation of Vote in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolution Concerning Alternative Approaches and Ways and Means Within the United Nations System for Improving the Effective Enjoyment of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms Date of Issue: 19 November 1986 .....	199
86/365. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Resolutions on Namibia Date of Issue: 20 November 1986 .....	200
86/366. Statement in the Fifth Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Programme Planning: Report of the Committee on Programme and Coordination Date of Issue: 20 November 1986 .....	201
86/367. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning International Security Date of Issue: 21 November 1986 .....	202
86/368. Explanation of Vote in the Second Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Draft Resolution L.29 on a Trade Embargo Against Nicaragua Date of Issue: 21 November 1986 .....	204
86/369. Explanation of Vote in the Second Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolution L.33 Concerning International Economic Security Date of Issue: 21 November 1986 .....	205
86/370. Explanation of Vote in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolution Concerning the International Covenants on Human Rights Date of Issue: 21 November 1986 .....	205
86/371. Statement in the Fifth Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Personnel Questions Date of Issue: 21 November 1986 .....	206
86/372. Statement in the Sixth Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Development and Strengthening of Good-Neighbourliness Between States Date of Issue: 21 November 1986 .....	207
86/373. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Question of Palestine Date of Issue: 25 November 1986 .....	208
86/374. Statement in the Special Political Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning International Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space Date of Issue: 25 November 1986 .....	210

## Table of contents

---

86/375. Statement in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Programme of Work of the Third Committee Date of Issue: 25 November 1986 .....	211
86/376. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Situation in the Middle East Date of Issue: 28 November 1986 .....	212
86/377. Statement on Syria – the Hasi and Salameh Trials in Berlin Date of Issue: 29 November 1986 .....	214
86/378. Press Release at the Occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People Date of Issue: 1 December 1986 .....	214
86/379. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Resolutions on the Question of Palestine Date of Issue: 2 December 1986 .....	215
86/380. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Resolutions on the Situation in the Middle East Date of Issue: 4 December 1986 .....	216
86/381. Explanation of Vote at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Draft Resolution on a Trade Embargo Against Nicaragua Date of Issue: 5 December 1986 .....	216
86/382. Conclusions of the European Council Date of Issue: 6 December 1986 .....	217
86/383. Statement by the European Council on Afghanistan Date of Issue: 6 December 1986 .....	218
86/384. Statement on the Results of the European Council Meeting of 5 and 6 December 1986 Date of Issue: 9 December 1986 .....	219
86/385. Question No H-409/86 by Mr Mavros Concerning the Implementation of European Parliament Resolutions on Cyprus Date of Issue: 9 December 1986 .....	221
86/386. Question No H-284/86 by Ms Castle Concerning South Africa Date of Issue: 9 December 1986 .....	223
86/387. Question No H-341/86 by Sir Peter Vanneck Concerning the Secretariat for European Political Cooperation Date of Issue: 10 December 1986 .....	225
86/388. Question No H-366/86 by Mr Marshall Concerning the Plight of Mr Zalmon Apter mann and Ms Rimma Shmukler Date of Issue: 10 December 1986 .....	226
86/389. Question No H-416/86 by Mr Pranchère Concerning the Conditions of Mr Turki, a Political Prisoner in Israel Date of Issue: 10 December 1986 .....	226

86/390. Question No H-534/86 by Mr Brandés Molet Concerning the EEC's Role in Promoting a Peaceful Solution to the Conflict in the Western Sahara Date of Issue: 10 December 1986.....	227
86/391. Question No H-554/86 by Ms Lizin Concerning the Fate of Prisoners of War Taken in the Conflict Between the Democratic Saharan Arab Republic and Morocco Date of Issue: 10 December 1986.....	227
86/392. Question No H-553/86 by Mr Campinos Concerning the Situation in Southern Africa Date of Issue: 10 December 1986.....	227
86/393. Question No H-561/86 by Ms Fontaine Concerning the Organization of an International Conference on the Middle East Date of Issue: 10 December 1986.....	228
86/394. Question No H-570/86 by Sir James Scott-Hopkins Concerning the Occupation of Afghanistan Date of Issue: 10 December 1986.....	228
86/395. Question No H-590/86 by Mr Arbeola Muru Concerning Nationalizations in the Republic of Burundi Date of Issue: 10 December 1986.....	229
86/396. Question No H-604/86 by Mr Ephremidis Concerning the Extension of the Moratorium on Nuclear Tests Date of Issue: 10 December 1986.....	229
86/397. Question No H-608/86 by Mr Adamou Concerning Sanctions Against South Africa Date of Issue: 10 December 1986.....	230
86/398. Question No H-624/86 by Mr Baillot Concerning the Position of the Twelve with Regard to the Vote by the UN General Assembly on Respect for the Ruling of the International Court of Justice in The Hague Concerning the Dispute Between the United States and Nicaragua Date of Issue: 10 December 1986.....	230
86/399. Question No H-632/86 by Mr MacSharry Concerning the Libyan Crisis Date of Issue: 10 December 1986.....	231
86/400. Question No H-660/86 by Mr Alavanos Concerning the Principle of Unanimity in Matters of Political Cooperation Date of Issue: 10 December 1986.....	231
86/401. Question No H-696/86 by Mr Wedekind Concerning the Declaration of Friendship, Good Neighbourly Relations and Cooperation Signed Between the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Republic of Greece Date of Issue: 10 December 1986.....	232
86/402. Statement on the Term-of-Office of the British Presidency Date of Issue: 10 December 1986.....	232
86/403. Questions Concerning Turkey Date of Issue: 10 December 1986.....	235
86/404. Statement on the Death of Anatoly Marchenko Date of Issue: 12 December 1986.....	238

**Table of contents**

---

86/405. Statement at the CSCE Vienna Follow-up Meeting Date of Issue: 19 December 1986.....	239
86/406. Statement on the Violation of Human Rights in South Africa Date of Issue: 19 December 1986.....	241
86/407. Report of the European Council on European Union: European Political Cooperation Date of Issue: 19 December 1986.....	241
86/408. Statement on the Deportation of Mr Akram Haniyya Date of Issue: 28 December 1986.....	247

**86/188. Question No 2846/85 by Ms van den Heuvel (S-NL)  
Concerning the Bombing Raids in El Salvador**

Date of Issue: 2 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 21 February 1986

Are the Foreign Ministers now prepared to give a specific answer to my Written Question No 553/85<sup>1</sup>, since their 'answer' of 9 January 1986 which:

1. merely set out matters of common knowledge, and
2. contained no reply to the question of whether the Foreign Ministers were willing to draw the attention of the Government of El Salvador to the violations of the Geneva Convention which had been committed?

*Answer:*

As explained in the answer to the Honourable Member's previous question on this subject, the problem raised is the direct result of the continuing conflict between the Government of El Salvador and the armed opposition. While this armed conflict persists, there can be little prospect of an end to the suffering of the country's innocent civilian population. The Twelve therefore hope that the talks between the Government of El Salvador and the armed opposition, which were initiated in October 1984, can be resumed in the near future.

Against this background, the Twelve welcome the directive issued by the Government of El Salvador in late 1984 instructing the Armed Forces to humanize the fight against the guerillas by avoiding indiscriminate bombing and the fact that, as the UN Special Rapporteur noted in his report issued in February 1986, fewer casualties were caused among the non-combatant population during the last year.

More generally the Twelve have frequently made clear their view that all the Governments of Central America, including that of El Salvador, should strive to end human rights abuses. In a recent Resolution in the UN Commission on Human Rights, all the partners represented on the Commission noted the Government of El Salvador's policy of reducing human rights abuses, but called for further improvement.

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/001.

**86/189. Question No 2956/85 by Ms Dury (S-B) Concerning a  
Belgian Citizen Held in South Africa**

Date of Issue: 2 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 7 March 1986

Ms Hélène Passtoors has been held in a South African prison for more than seven months. She has now been taken to hospital. No one knows as yet what charges have been made against her.

What steps do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation intend to take to ensure that Ms Passtoors is allowed to contact her defence counsel to put an end to the regime of isolation to which she is being subjected and to learn what charges are to be made against her?

*Answer:*

Ms Hélène Passtoors's trial on charges under *inter alia* the Internal Security Act, started on 14 April 1986. Amongst others, diplomatic and consular representatives of Belgium and the Netherlands in South Africa are attending the trial.

This subject has not, however, been discussed by the Foreign Ministers in the framework of European political cooperation.

**86/190. Question No 2962/85 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning the Relations Between the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the Republic of South Africa**

Date of Issue: 2 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 7 March 1986

Further to my Written Question No 1879/85 of 24 October 1985 and the Foreign Ministers' answer of 22 January 1986<sup>1</sup>, which Member States abstained on the resolution tabled by Nigeria on 27 September 1985 at the IAEA meeting in Vienna?

*Answer:*

A majority of EPC-partners abstained on the Nigerian resolution. Their voting behaviour was fully explained in the answer to Written Question No 1879/85. Since the proceedings of IAEA meetings are public, further details of national attitudes and voting are freely available.

---

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/058.

**86/191. Question No 2997/85 by Mr Pisoni and Mr Selva (PPE-I) Concerning the Situation in Iran**

Date of Issue: 2 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 13 March 1986

In view of the continuing violations of human rights by the Khomeini regime and the recent resolution by the United Nations General Assembly condemning this regime, can the Foreign Ministers say:

1. What effective measures they have taken to put an end to the violations of human rights and the suppression of fundamental freedoms in Iran and the senseless war between Iran and Iraq?
2. Whether they have considered the possibility of discontinuing supplies of arms to the Khomeini regime, which help it to perpetuate the war and the oppression of its own people?
3. Whether they do not feel it necessary to boycott imports of oil from Iran, in view of the fact that the Khomeini regime spends a substantial portion of its income from oil on arms which it uses to prolong the war and continue executions?

*Answer:*

The Honourable Members are referred to the answer given by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs to Written Question No 2859/85 by Ms Dorothee Piermont on the same subject<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/177.

## **86/192. Question No 3008/85 by Ms Dury (S-B) Concerning the Relations Between the European Community and Turkey**

Date of Issue: 2 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 13 March 1986

Despite the Ministers' silence as regards normalization of relations between Turkey and the European Community, these are tending to improve rapidly.

However, contrary to statements by the Turkish Government, the human rights situation in this country has not altered radically. Amnesty International's last report is definite on this subject.

Although martial law has been lifted in 58 of the 67 Turkish provinces, many laws still permit the constant infringement of fundamental rights such as the freedom of expression and of association. Torture in military prisons and capital punishment are still current practices and the number of political prisoners is estimated at 15 000.

1. How do the Ministers explain the inconsistency of refusing to normalize relations with Turkey while making clear gestures of good will and *rapprochement*, such as the unblocking of a loan of Bfrs 1.3 billion, which had been frozen for five years, or the approval of a Financial Protocol with Turkey worth Bfrs 27 billion?

2. On what reports or statistics have certain Ministers based their statements that there is an improvement as regards human rights in Turkey, when the latest Amnesty International report states the opposite?

3. Can the Ministers report on representations made recently to the Turkish authorities as regards human rights and state whether these were in any way linked to the unfreezing of the amounts referred to above?

*Answer:*

The attention of the Honourable Member of Parliament is drawn to the following:

- On March 11th the Turkish parliament passed a law providing for an automatic commutation of the death penalty into a prison sentence of 30 years. It should be noticed also, that as far as is known, no death sentences have been carried out in Turkey since October 1984.
- Since these questions were asked, martial law has been lifted in four more Turkish provinces (bringing the total to 62).
- Turkish parliament is also taking an active interest in the situation in Turkish prisons and detention centres, and a special parliamentary commission issued a report at the end of 1985 containing a large number of recommendations aimed at preventing the use of torture. This parliamentary commission will continue to monitor developments in the future.

Furthermore it may be stated that the Twelve have agreed to pursue a policy of gradual normalization of relations between the Community and Turkey. However, it should be emphasized that they none the less continue to follow with close attention the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, as well as the democratization process in Turkey. The Turkish authorities are well aware of the concern of the Twelve about the human rights situation as mentioned by the Honourable Member.

## **86/193. Question No 3161/85 by Mr Boesmans (S-B) Concerning the Imprisonment of Rosa Flores Flores in El Salvador**

Date of Issue: 2 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 24 March 1986

Since October 1985, Rosa Flores Flores, aged 22, has been held in the women's prison of Llopango. She is not accused of a single crime but is simply suspected of belonging to the Peoples' Liberation Forces (FPL).

Have the Foreign Ministers already taken steps to obtain the immediate release of Flores? If not, why not?

If so, what results were obtained and what specific information do they now have about the Flores case?

*Answer:*

According to the information available to the Twelve, Rosa Flores Flores was arrested on 6 October 1985 and was accused of being a member of FMLN. Under Law 50 of 25 February 1984 suspected membership of an organization considered to be 'subversive and terrorist' was generally sufficient justification for ordering initial detention. The Twelve understand that, according to calculations made by the International Red Cross, in such circumstances detainees are usually released after spending on average seven to eight months in prison.

While the Twelve take a close and active interest in human rights in Central America, this specific case has not been discussed in the framework of European political cooperation.

#### **86/194. Question No 199/86 by Ms Lizin (S-B) Concerning the Trevi Group**

Date of Issue: 2 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 24 April 1986

In its answer to my Written Question No 2048/85<sup>1</sup>, the Ministers referred to Trevi Group 1 which deals more specifically with measures to combat terrorism and Trevi Group 3 which is responsible for examining the problem of international organized crime.

Can the Ministers state whether there is a Trevi Group 2 and, if so, what its function is?

*Answer:*

Trevi is the framework for cooperation between the Ministers of Justice and of the Interior of the Twelve responsible for security. The following factual information would seem to provide an answer to the question raised by the Honourable Member of Parliament:

- Trevi 1 Working Group exchanges information on terrorist plans and activities and also deals with mutual assistance in specific cases;
- Trevi 2 Working Group exchanges technical information with a view to combating terrorism and disturbance of public order;
- Trevi 3 Working Group deals with internationally organized crime.

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/039.

#### **86/195. Question No 3064/85 by Mr Jackson (ED-UK) Concerning the Code of Conduct for European Companies Operating in South Africa**

Date of Issue: 2 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 2 June 1986



In its response to the debate on the De Backer report on the Code of Conduct for European companies operating in South Africa, the Commission expressed its willingness to undertake the task of monitoring the implementation of the Code if so requested.

In view of this and the resolution of Parliament will the Foreign Ministers ask the Commission to perform this monitoring function and report both to them and to Parliament?

*Answer:*

The Twelve undertook an extensive review of the Code of Conduct during the second half of 1985. This resulted in the adoption by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Twelve of a considerably strengthened Code of Conduct on 19 November 1985<sup>1</sup>.

The Twelve are presently preparing a common reporting format for European companies in South Africa, which is a further step in improving the Code and ensuring its effective implementation.

Under the present arrangements, each Member State draws up a national report which is submitted to the Presidency of European political cooperation which in turn prepares a summary report for the European Parliament. The embassies of Member States in South Africa play an important role in the drafting of national reports. As the Twelve believe that this arrangement is working satisfactorily there are no immediate plans to enhance the role of the Commission in the monitoring of the Code.

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 85/291.

### **86/196. Statement on the Internal Dialogue in El Salvador**

Date of Issue: 3 July 1986  
 Place of Issue: London  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: The Twelve  
 Status of Document: Declaration

The Twelve welcome and support President Napoleon Duarte's proposal, and its acceptance by the FDR/FMLN, to resume with the assistance of the Church the internal dialogue aimed at reaching a true and just peace within a pluralist democracy in El Salvador.

As made clear *inter alia* during the Luxembourg Ministerial Conference in November 1985, the Twelve consider that national reconciliation, within the framework of pluralist political and social systems, is an important prerequisite for resolving the conflicts and tensions that beset the Central American region.

### **86/197. Question No 15/86 by Mr Martin (S-UK) Concerning the Exploitation of Namibian Natural Resources**

Date of Issue: 7 July 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency (on behalf of the Foreign Ministers and the Council)  
 Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 10 April 1986

Decree No 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia, adopted on 27 September 1974 and approved by the General Assembly on 13 December 1974, aims to protect the natural resources of the people of Namibia.

Does the Council agree that the EEC has a responsibility to abide by the terms of this decree and to ensure that all persons and entities subject to EEC legislation also observe its terms?

*Answer:*

The Council would not fail to examine, in the context of the relevant provisions of the Treaties, any question within its sphere of competence regarding Decree No 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia of 27 September 1974 to which the Honourable Member refers.

The Council would point out that when the United Nations General Assembly adopted Resolution 3295 (XXIX) of 13 December 1974 approving the abovementioned Decree, the nine Member States of the Community abstained, as several of them considered that this Decree carried no obligations under international law<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> This paragraph has been approved by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs (European political cooperation), who are responsible for these matters.

### **86/198. Statement on the Programme of the British Presidency for the Second Half of 1986<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 8 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Programme Speech to European Parliament

*Sir Geoffrey Howe, President-in-Office of the Council:* Mr President, the story is told that when Winston Churchill addressed the Icelandic Parliament, which is known as the *Alting*, many years ago, he began his speech with the following words: 'I come here from the mother of Parliaments'. Now the *Alting* which had been sitting continuously since the 10th century, although it has moved indoors from its original site beside a waterfall, gasped at this impertinence. Churchill then went on to say: 'I come here from the mother of Parliaments but to address the grandmother of Parliaments'. Today, if I may develop the same concept, Mr President, I come here also from the mother of Parliaments but to address the daughter of twelve Parliaments. A profoundly legitimate daughter with the advantage of having no less than twelve mothers.

I am conscious that your very existence more than anything that you have as yet done, and whatever you may grow to achieve, is what itself signifies one of the great hinges on which European history has turned.

Twelve nations which last year commemorated the events of 1945 and only last week were remembering the Battle of the Somme now sit here together in peaceful democratic debate.

To the young, to those younger than ourselves, Mr President, it may look easy, even banal. But in terms of history the incredible has already been achieved, for it is here and here alone that the leaders of the outside world can and do come to address us. The combined peoples of the European Community, growing together into one family. We have no need to deny – rather we should make a virtue of the diversity in our unity. But now that we have elected to live as one, we must not cease to strive to understand one another, our worries, our passions, yes, and our eccentricities, which so often do not correspond. I go back only as far as Voltaire to illustrate what I mean. When Candide arrived in Portsmouth on a Dutch boat, in time to witness the bizarre execution of Admiral Bing, Candide said to his friend Martin: '*Vous connaissez l'Angleterre? Y est-on aussi fou qu'en France?*' '*C'est une autre espèce de folie*' said Martin.

You here in Strasbourg have indeed a broader view of the follies, the eccentricities, the qualities, the aspirations of the Member Governments of the Community. You will appreciate that each in its turn takes over the privilege of the Presidency with mingled trepidation, hope and determination. I would like to assure you that the United Kingdom recognizes first and foremost that there has to be a change, not in the powers but in the relationships between Parliament and Council if the Community is to move strongly ahead as we should all wish.

On behalf of the entire Council, I am in no doubt of the genuine desire of my colleagues to improve our consultation, make it effective and genuine and positive for the Community. That requires an effort on all sides — from the Commission, which is certainly willing to make it, from the Council, which I know is willing to make an extra effort, and from all of you.

What are the tasks that we must now tackle together over the next six months? The first thing to be said is that just as most major achievements span the generations, so the achievements of the Community cannot be a matter of one Presidency, only six months long. If the trees which our Presidency plants may only grow to shelter our successors, we may nevertheless gather fruit from the trees planted by our predecessors. I pay particular tribute, and gladly, to the good husbandry and energetic leadership of the Netherlands Presidency. [...]

The security of the West depends upon a strong United States committed to the defence of Europe. The security of Europe depends upon a strong and prosperous Community. The Community is one of the leading political, as well as economic, power groups in the democratic West. We should be equal partners with our American allies in sharing responsibility for upholding and protecting Western values.

Such a Europe has long been recognized as a vital interest of the United States. Spanish and Portuguese accession represents a significant gain for freedom, and democracy. I am sure the people and Government of the United States share our own judgement of the gains to our mutual security from the fact that Spain and Portugal have emerged from years of dictatorship and taken their rightful place among the family of democratic nations. Of course there will be some changes to trade flows. The welcome fact that the Commission has succeeded in reaching a sensible accommodation with the United States, enabling both sides to refrain from being sucked into a tightening spiral of retaliation and counter-retaliation, shows that any problems can be managed, as they must be.

If we are equal partners with the United States, then we are also equal interlocutors with the Soviet Union and the countries in Eastern Europe. This is a testing time for East-West relations. We have a new Soviet leadership. We see many of the old policies presented in new packages. There is a lot of old wine in new bottles. But we should not assume that the mixture is exactly as it was before. We all hope that a second summit between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union will take place this year. We hope it will lead to genuine and verifiable progress in the arms control field, as well as progress on regional and human rights issues.

Moreover, the improvement of relations between East and West, which we all seek, does not depend exclusively on the behaviour of the superpowers. *We* must take every opportunity to seek common ground and real progress. All of us, not just the superpowers, can help build the relationships that make these achievements possible. We cannot hope to respond as a Community to events which affect our vital interests unless the growing habit of cooperation in foreign policy becomes second nature. The new treaty provisions in the Single European Act, which are the result of a British initiative, are designed to reinforce our ability to act together.

The first major issue for foreign policy to arise during the British Presidency has, of course, been South Africa. This will be a real test of our ability to create a constructive European policy that can contribute to our agreed goal. I leave tonight for Southern Africa to begin to fulfil the mandate given to me by the European Council. The policy of the Twelve on South Africa is clear. Our goal is the end of apartheid.

The specifically European contribution we hope to make is to help bring about a willingness on the part of all those who bear responsibility for South Africa's future to begin a serious national dialogue on the future of that country. John Donne said, 'No man is an island entire of itself. Any man's death diminishes me.'

We here in Europe, in a Community which rose out of the ashes of war as a lasting answer to the demand of the people of Europe for peace, freedom and prosperity, cannot turn our backs on the plight of the people of South Africa. The alternative to dialogue and negotiation can only be increasing repression, polarization and bloodshed.

I hope, Mr President, that I shall go to Southern Africa with the full backing of this Parliament for a mission whose success is obviously in the interests of all the people of South Africa and of Africa as a whole.

I will not attempt to predict what other problems we may have to face together in the coming six months. I look forward to discussing them with some of you in the two political cooperation colloquies I shall have with the Political Affairs Committee. Ms Chalker and I will be answering your questions in the coming months. Your understanding and support for what we and our Partners are trying to achieve in the name of the Twelve will be important to our success.

There will be no Euro-pessimism from the British Presidency. We shall be proud of what we have achieved together over the past few years: two new democracies successfully welcomed into membership; a new agreement with seventy of the world's developing countries; significant internal changes to equip ourselves for the tasks of the eighties and the nineties. Together we must be sure that these advances pave the way to the next stage of European unity; together, because the Community is a partnership of institutions each with its distinct role. It is our enterprise. In our Presidency we shall devote ourselves to that, our common cause.

[After the debates Sir Geoffrey Howe stated the following:] I close with just one comment on the political points made, and that is on the mission which the Council has entrusted to me to visit Southern Africa. I heard with interest the observations [...] During the weeks that remain in this month, I shall be visiting in the next few days the Governments of Zambia and Zimbabwe and perhaps others. Before the end of the month I shall be meeting the President and other members of the South African Government. So, there is no question of a rebuff.

There is a recognition that, into these difficult areas of Southern Africa, I am going as Foreign Minister of the current Presidency. I recognize the difficulties of the task, but I hope nobody will question the singleness of purpose with which I and I think everyone in this Chamber addresses it. The European Council, like the European Parliament, is united in its goal of securing the total abolition of apartheid, united in its call for the release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners, united in its call for the ban on political parties to be lifted, united in its determination to provide financial and material assistance to the victims of apartheid and, above all, united in its determination to do everything in its power to promote peaceful change in South Africa; united in the measures it has already taken and united – and I say this with due humility – in placing its trust in me as President-in-Office to undertake this hard and crucial task.

Of course it is hard. I go on this mission with that fully recognized. But I go, I hope, conscious that I have the support of the strong feelings felt around this Chamber, conscious of my responsibilities not just to my own Government, not just to the Council of Ministers, not just even to this Parliament, but to the people of all twelve Member States in addressing myself to one of the most urgent and most desperately human problems on the political agenda of the world today.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *OJ* No 2-341 of 8 July 1986, pp. 59-78.

## **86/199. Statement at the International Conference on Namibia**

Date of Issue: 8 July 1986

Place of Issue: Unknown

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Unknown

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community, some of whom are participating in this Conference fully and some of whom are represented as observers.

Namibia has been an acknowledged international responsibility for more than sixty years and an issue which has been before the United Nations virtually since the inception of the organization and especially since the termination of South Africa's mandate over the territory: this year sees the 20th anniversary of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI).

The attitude of the twelve Member States of the Community has been made clear on a great number of occasions. The Twelve have consistently reiterated their view that the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa must be brought to an end. The right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and

independence must be exercised through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations in keeping with the provisions of the Settlement Plan set forth in Security Council Resolution 435 (1978). This plan has been accepted both by the Government of South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and provides for the peaceful transition of Namibia to internationally recognized independence. It embodies the only universally accepted framework for a peaceful transition to independence in a manner which is guaranteed by the United Nations to be free and fair. It is essential that South Africa should refrain from subordinating the application of Security Council Resolution 435 (1978) to the fulfilment of conditions which are extraneous to the problem, and cease now its illegal occupation of the territory so that the Namibian people can freely exercise their right to self-determination. The Twelve do not accept that the Settlement Plan should be delayed or set aside for extraneous reasons or for arrangements inconsistent with Resolution 435 (1978).

It is a cause for deep regret that South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia in defiance of Security Council Resolution 385 (1976) continues and that hopes for a peaceful solution remain as yet unfulfilled. In this context the Twelve particularly regret the decision of the South African authorities to establish a so-called 'provisional government' in Namibia in violation of the explicit provisions of Security Council Resolution 435 (1978). The Twelve consider as null and void the measures taken by Pretoria and categorically reject its unilateral internal settlements. The eventual subsequent decisions by the *de facto* administering authorities can have no effect on the United Nations plan.

The Twelve also deplore the policy of intimidation and repression pursued by South Africa against the inhabitants of the country in the form of arbitrary arrests and detentions as well as the forced conscription of Namibian adults in the occupation army. South Africa has also, in defiance of international law, continued its armed incursions into Namibia's neighbours, particularly Angola, thus imperilling their sovereignty and creating a grave danger to peace and security in the region.

In spite of these most disappointing developments the Twelve share the view that the United Nations has a primary duty to promote peaceful solutions and in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.

The European Community and its Member States will also continue their aid to the Namibian people, particularly through their support for the United Nations Institute for Namibia. They reaffirm their readiness to assist in the development of a free and independent Namibia. They will continue to press South Africa to abide by the clearly expressed decisions of the entire international community by withdrawing the constitutional arrangements put into effect in 1985 and by terminating her illegal occupation, thus allowing Namibians to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

As this Conference shows, there is deep international concern about the delay in securing Namibian independence. Implementation of the United Nations Settlement Plan is an urgent requirement. We share the disappointment and bitterness of the African States over this long-lasting impasse. Nearly eight years have now passed since the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 435 (1978) endorsing the plan. The Twelve will continue to work for and support all efforts aimed at the urgent implementation of the Settlement Plan. They give particular support to the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative to this end.

## **86/200. Question No H-933/85 by Mr Maher Concerning the Common Declaration on International Terrorism**

Date of Issue: 8 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Would the Foreign Ministers state, in the context of the recent declaration on international terrorism, whether or not they intend initiating dialogue with countries where international terrorism is an ongoing

problem, and in particular with the Arab League, and are the Foreign Ministers willing to set up a permanent forum in which such countries would participate in combating terrorism on a continual basis and which would be addressed as appropriate by experts, spokespersons and public representatives?

*Sir Geoffrey Howe, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers:* On 27 January this year the Twelve expressed the wish to cooperate with all States, including those in the Middle East region, to deny terrorists support, cover or refuge and voiced their readiness to embark on a dialogue in the most appropriate manner with the countries of the Middle East on the problems of international terrorism and the need to tackle its roots<sup>1</sup>. It has not yet been decided what form contacts on this issue between the Twelve and third countries should take.

*Mr Maher (LDR):* Would the President-in-Office agree that the suggestion of a permanent forum where the representatives of the various countries could meet, and where hearings could be held with parliamentarians from the various countries including this Parliament, would be a suitable basis on which to have ongoing dialogue? I ask that question because we tend, when there is a rise in terrorist activities, to heighten the contact, but when that declines, then there is a decline in the contact. So, do you recognize the need for a permanent forum and would you agree with the suggestion I have made in the question?

*Sir Geoffrey Howe:* I think there is rather a complex set propositions lurking alongside one other there. If one is talking about the underlying causes of terrorism, then there is obviously something to be said for consultation between all countries concerned with those causes, including those where the causes may be said to arise and those that may be affected by terrorism, to discuss the political causes, which is why, for example, the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation have long been interested in the underlying political problems of the Middle East, to take the case in point.

Now if one is addressing oneself to the preparation of defences and action against terrorism as such, I would not instinctively incline towards the creation of an additional forum for that. It seems to me that for that purpose one needs an intensification of the practical cooperation between governments, between security forces, between the agencies that are actually concerned with the day-to-day battle against terrorism. And although my respect for parliamentarians is second to none, I am not sure that that kind of cooperation would necessarily be enhanced by the establishment of another democratic forum.

*Mr Blumenfeld (PPE):* My question to President-in-Office of the Council of Foreign Affairs Ministers follows on directly from his answer to Mr Maher. Would you be prepared, together with your counterparts in the Council of Foreign Affairs Ministers, to consider whether an extension to the Vienna Convention is called for in order to forestall the diplomatic immunity that many terrorists have hitherto been able to claim with a series of embassies? The Vienna Convention was drafted over a century ago. It is an honourable document and has a proud tradition, but there is no doubt whatsoever that it stands in need of review and enlargement in relation to the need to combat international terrorism effectively. I may add that the European Parliament delegation to America a few weeks ago took an active interest in this question. The American reactions seemed to be quite favourable.

*Sir Geoffrey Howe:* The House will understand that this is a topic that the United Kingdom Government has considered very closely, as have the governments of many other Member States, not least in the light of the incident that took place at the Libyan People's Bureau in London some two years ago when an unlawful killing took place from premises protected by diplomatic immunity.

The studies that have been undertaken of the Vienna Convention, nationally and internationally, have, I think, tended to lead people to the conclusion that there is not much if any scope for amending the Convention, quite apart from the difficulty of securing agreement on such an amendment, by the wide range of countries that would have to be involved. The provisions of the Convention are designed to provide protection that can be essential for legitimate diplomatic activity in certain very difficult circumstances.

The conclusion, I think, which has tended to emerge is that it is important to ensure strict and rigorous enforcement and limitation of the availability of such privileges. It was on that basis that we ourselves closed down the Libyan People's Bureau in London after that incident. It is on the same kind of basis that most if not all Member States, since the most recent terrorist incidents in Europe, have been

taking action to reduce very substantially the number of people entitled to diplomatic privilege in existing Libyan People's Bureaus. I take that as an example. I think the right response has tended to be seen as more effective enforcement, more rigorous curtailment of the privileges rather than what could be a fruitless search for agreement on amendment to the underlying convention.

*Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED)*: I am sure that the President-in-Office meant to include my Question No */H-143/86/* in his answer to Question No */H-933/85/* because he has in point of fact answered that question as well.

Would he not agree, in the context both of that and of Question No */H-933/85/*, that one of the practical steps he referred to certainly is the tracing of terrorists throughout the Community and elsewhere? Is he satisfied that there is sufficient machinery to coordinate this tracing of known terrorists who have not been apprehended in the country where they carried out the act of terrorism but who are known to be living elsewhere in the world? It seems to me that this is lacking at the moment.

*Sir Geoffrey Howe*: I had not realized that I was achieving the double of answering Question No */H-143/86/* at the same time and we may well reach it in due course. However, I agree with the point made by my honourable friend that the exchange and transmission of information about known or suspected terrorists is of crucial importance. The terrorist actions are so often undertaken from bases that are internationally distributed. The response has therefore got to be internationally coordinated.

It is for that reason that the Community has addressed itself time and time again to this. It is for that reason that the so-called Trevi Group exists to provide cooperation on matters of the kind referred to by my honourable friend. It is not something for which the habit is yet established, it is something which will grow as confidence between governments grows, and it is therefore by no means yet complete. He is right to draw attention to the need to go further.

*Mr De Vries (LDR)*: The President-in-Office of the Council said in answer to Mr Maher's question that he was in favour of an improvement in the current procedures for consultations among the Member States on the fight against terrorism. I should like to make a proposal in this context. Where the fight against drugs is concerned, the Commission is, as the President-in-Office of the Council knows, represented in the Pompidou Group. But it is not represented at the Trevi consultations on the fight against terrorism. And yet the Commission has extensive powers with respect to the transfrontier transport of people, an aspect which is, of course, inseparably linked with terrorism. My question is therefore this: is the President-in-Office prepared to ensure that the Commission is henceforth represented at the meetings of the Trevi Group so that consultations with this important Community organ may also be improved?

*Sir Geoffrey Howe*: I do not think I am qualified by experience to comment precisely on the points made by the Honourable Member, but there is no doubt that the Commission does have a role in relation to these matters, whether drugs or illegal crossing of frontiers or terrorism. The Honourable Member may know that the Interior Minister of the Presidency, the British Home Secretary, will be holding an informal meeting, I think in October, of Interior Ministers of Member States to consider all these questions, including those that he has raised, that the Commission will be represented at that meeting and that the European Council in The Hague specifically noted the importance of that meeting in the context of the study of drugs<sup>2</sup>. So I shall undertake to draw to the attention of my right honourable friend, the Home-Secretary, the point made by the Honourable Member in the context of that meeting.

*Ms Dury (S)*: I am somewhat perplexed. A few months ago I tabled a Written Question to the Council about the Trevi Group. I was told that it was no longer meeting.

I should therefore like to know when the Trevi Group resumed its work and what its timetable is for the immediate future.

*Sir Geoffrey Howe*: My best understanding is that the Trevi Group does indeed still exist and that it has recently agreed to continue meeting at six-monthly intervals.

I am in no position, therefore, to diminish the perplexity of the honourable lady, but perhaps we may get together afterwards and see if we can arrive at some common ground.

*Mr Morris (S)*: Since the EEC Foreign Ministers have committed themselves to rooting out — that is the term they have used — State-sponsored terrorism from wherever it emanates, will the President-in-Office of the Council give a pledge that EEC Ministers will not only condemn the flagrant breach of the

Contadora Agreement by the United States but will insist that the US Government withdraw its support for the US financed, supplied, trained and led Contra terrorists operating in Nicaragua? Should they refuse, although I certainly would not suggest that we have an international coordinated bombing of the White House or Washington, at least we should insist that all US bases be withdrawn from EEC countries.

*Sir Geoffrey Howe:* Notwithstanding the support of some other Honourable Members I am quite unable to accept that the question arises within the context of the question already under consideration.

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/061.

<sup>2</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/184.

### **86/201. Question No H-1017/85 by Mr Tzounis Concerning the Amnesty International Report on Torture in Turkey**

Date of Issue: 8 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Are the Foreign Ministers aware of the recent Amnesty International report on torture in Turkey and do they share the opinion that such an informative and important document should be given serious consideration in all future contacts with the Turkish Government?

*Sir Geoffrey Howe, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers:* The Twelve consider Amnesty International reports as a highly valuable source of information. Assuming that the document referred to in Mr Tzounis' question is the 1985 Amnesty International Report issued in January 1986, the Presidency would like to draw attention to the fact that a Turkish Special Parliamentary Commission issued a report late in 1985 containing a number of recommendations aimed at preventing the use of torture. This parliamentary commission has since been granted a new mandate and additional funds to pursue its work and monitor further developments.

In this context the Twelve would like to reiterate that they attach the greatest importance to the cause of human rights and to state that they are closely following the situation in Turkey in this respect.

*Mr Tzounis (PPE):* I would like to make it clear that the report by Amnesty International to which I referred, was dated February 1986.

I would also like to put the following supplementary question: does the Minister agree that at a time when the Community sets respect for human rights as a condition of its relations with countries of the Third World, such as those subscribing to the Lomé Treaty, more severe measures still should apply to countries associated with the Community, and which aspire to become full members?

*Sir Geoffrey Howe:* I think that matters of this kind obviously have to be considered in the context of the relationship in which they arise. This particular question has, of course, been considered in relation to Turkey in the context of a recent expert report from the Council of Europe and the European Commission of Human Rights. In both those cases it has been noted that considerable progress has been recognized and made.

I am sure that the whole House would wish to encourage Turkey to continue that substantial progress in the same direction.

*Mr Balfé (S):* As rapporteur on Turkey, I presented to this House, less than a year ago, a report which got a substantial majority. None of the detailed facts outlined there has ever been disputed by the Turkish Government. Bearing in mind the Amnesty Report has been followed by a number of other reports since then from distinguished organizations and individuals and that there is still widespread imprisonment without trial and torture going on in Turkey, does not the Minister accept that events in the Council and the Commission over the last few weeks have constituted a somewhat indecent haste to rehabilitate



Turkey? Could all this be remotely connected with the trade opportunities to be gained in that country, which the Turkish Government drew to everybody's attention very brutally in the days following the publication and adoption of my report?

*Sir Geoffrey Howe:* I think that the decisions to which the Honourable Member by implication refers are not of that quality. It was as long ago as February that the Foreign Affairs Council agreed that work should go ahead on the outstanding problems to prepare for an Association Council in the autumn. That has now been fixed to take place on the margin of the September Foreign Affairs Council.

I think the decision to begin normalization of relations reflected the progress that Turkey has made in restoring democracy and the wish of the Council to encourage further reform. I cite just one illustration of that. When I myself visited Turkey in February of last year, martial law was still in force in some two-thirds of the districts of Turkey; now about fifteen months later it has been almost entirely lifted, except in the south-east where terrorists are still active. That is the kind of manifestation of progress which has been taking place in parallel with the decisions to which I have referred.

*Mr Alavanos (COM):* I should like to ask the President of the Foreign Ministers, whether the fact that in Turkey five new death sentences were announced in July 1986, the fact that the suppression of human rights goes beyond the frontiers of Turkey and is particularly relevant to the situation in Cyprus, where there have been negative developments since the visit and related provocative statements by the Prime Minister Mr Ozal, the fact that direct information was presented to the European Council by the Greek Prime Minister concerning the situation relating to Turkey, the fact that the Greek Government see connections between the Turkish policy on Cyprus and the convening of the Conference of Association between the EEC and Turkey, whether all these developments will have any consequences for the convening of that conference, or whether the Foreign Ministers are disposed to proceed according to the timetable laid down previously, without taking into account any of the above important factors.

*Sir Geoffrey Howe:* Not all the particular matters raised by the Honourable Member can have been considered by the Council if his dates are accurate, as I have no reason to doubt.

There has been no proposal made for any change in the timetable that I have outlined. No doubt such a proposal could be made. If it were made, it would have to be considered and decided upon by the Council as a whole.

*Mr Avgerinos (S):* Mr President of the Foreign Ministers, I am sorry to see that you consider democracy to be a quantitative matter. You have told us that in 'quantitative terms', some form of democracy exists, which you consider sufficient. Are you aware that there are still 18 000 political prisoners, and 500 condemned to death? Does that represent progress in your view? We ourselves would like to see progress towards democracy more than anything else, but we do not consider that these figures permit Turkey to play a part in Europe today, as a democratic country.

*Sir Geoffrey Howe:* It would be difficult to exhaust this subject, which I know interests some Honourable Members very considerably, in the course of supplementary answers to one question. I do not begin to argue that there are not continuing reasons for keeping this question under close scrutiny. However, I come back to the point I made earlier on that independent bodies with expert qualifications have reported to the European Commission on Human Rights and to the Council of Europe, and those bodies have been satisfied that a degree of progress has been made and have taken action accordingly. It would not be right for me here to suggest any alternative conclusion.

## **86/202. Question No H-115/86 by Mr Martin Concerning the UN Council for Namibia Decree No 1<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 8 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

In order to protect the natural resources of Namibia, the UN Council for Namibia has decreed that:

1. No person or entity, whether a body corporate or unincorporated, may search for, prospect for, explore for, take, extract, mine, process, refine, use, sell, export, or distribute any natural resource, whether animal or mineral, situated or found to be situated within the territorial limits of Namibia without the consent and permission of the United Nations Council for Namibia or any person authorized to act on its behalf for the purpose of giving such permission or such consent.
  2. Any permission, concession or licence for all or any of the purposes specified in paragraph 1 above whensoever granted by any person or entity, including any body purporting to act under the authority of the Government of the Republic of South Africa or the 'Administration of South West Africa' or their predecessors, is null, void and of no force or effect.
  3. No animal resource, mineral, or other natural resource produced in or emanating from the Territory of Namibia may be taken from the said Territory by any means whatsoever to any place whatsoever outside the territorial limits of Namibia by any person or body, whether corporate or unincorporated, without the consent and permission of the United Nations Council for Namibia or of any person authorized to act on behalf of the said Council.
  4. Any animal, mineral or other natural resource produced in or emanating from the Territory of Namibia which shall be taken from the said Territory without the consent and written authority of the United Nations Council for Namibia or of any other person authorized to act on behalf of the said Council may be seized and shall be forfeited to the benefit of the said Council and held in trust by them for the benefit of the people of Namibia.
  5. Any vehicle, ship or container found to be carrying animal, mineral or other natural resources produced in or emanating from the Territory of Namibia shall also be subject to seizure and forfeiture by or on behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia or of any person authorized to act on behalf of the said Council and held in trust by them for the benefit of the people of Namibia.
  6. Any person, entity or corporation which contravenes the present Decree in respect of Namibia may be held liable in damages by the future Government of an independent Namibia.
- a) What steps do the Ministers take to ensure that the EEC and all individuals and companies within the Community observe the terms of the decree?
  - b) Does any respect of the *acquis communautaire* contravene the decree?
  - c) Do any articles or annexes of the Treaty of Accession of Spain and Portugal refer to activities liable to be in breach of this decree?

*Sir Geoffrey Howe, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers:* The question of the implementation of Decree No 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia has not been discussed in the framework of European political cooperation. That said, the Namibian question as such is regularly discussed by Ministers of the Twelve, who have repeatedly stressed their commitment to the early implementation of Security Council Resolution 435. In the eyes of the Twelve, all necessary preconditions for the implementation of Resolution 435 have been fulfilled and the Twelve have repeatedly called on all parties involved to implement the resolution as quickly as possible.

*Mr Martin (S):* The Commission, in a written answer to me recently, revealed that they treat imports into the Community from South Africa and Namibia as being from a single source. Does the Council accept that this makes it extremely difficult to ensure that UN Decree No 1 is actually being observed by the EEC? Will the Council instruct the Commission to disaggregate these import figures, or does the Council have something to hide in this respect?

*Sir Geoffrey Howe:* I am afraid that I am not familiar with the basis on which the import figures are treated, aggregated, or disaggregated. As the information the Honourable Member has come from the Commission, I suggest he might like to ask for additional information from the same source. It should, of course, be noted that the decree to which he refers is not regarded by most Member States as being valid or binding on members of the United Nations.

<sup>1</sup> Former Oral Question without debate (0-2/86), converted into a question for Question Time.

### **86/203. Question No H-143/86 by Sir James Scott-Hopkins on Combating International Terrorism**

Date of Issue: 9 July 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

When do the Ministers intend to endorse the declaration of the parties to the Tokyo Summit pledging themselves to make maximum efforts to fight international terrorism? What practical proposals has it designed to produce closer political cooperation between Member States in combating international terrorism? In particular, what initiative has it to propose to help to reduce the vulnerability of air travellers and airport staff to the risk of attack?

*Answer:*

There does not appear to be a need for the Twelve to endorse the Tokyo Declaration, since the Twelve have on a number of occasions manifested their determination and commitment to combat international terrorism in all its forms.

Indeed, almost all elements contained in the declaration had on earlier occasions already been published in statements on international terrorism by the Twelve. The texts of these statements, dating from 27 January 1986<sup>1</sup> and 24 April 1986<sup>2</sup>, are attached for the information of the Honourable Member, who will see from them what measures have been taken in European political cooperation to combat international terrorism.

As far as the risk of terrorist attack on air travellers and airport staff is concerned, the Twelve have taken measures to prevent them as far as possible. These measures include intensified cooperation among competent security and police services and, on a national basis, the increased surveillance of airport facilities, as well as the screening of passengers and their luggage.

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/061.

<sup>2</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/119.

### **86/204. Question No H-170/86 by Mr Ephremidis Concerning South African Air Strikes on Three Neighbouring Countries**

Date of Issue: 9 July 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

During the night of 18-19 May 1986, in blatant violation of international law and the UN Charter, South African air forces bombed and commandos attacked inhabited areas in Zambia, Zimbabwe and Botswana. These attacks represent an escalation of the threats and intimidation used by the racist regime of Botha's Government against neighbouring countries. This is the first time that attacks have been launched against Zambia and Zimbabwe and, in terms of scale and depth, they are the largest South African strikes against a neighbouring country. Whereas, through the Lomé Convention and other traditional and economic ties, the EEC has links with the countries attacked, whereas all the EEC Member States – and the international community in general – have condemned these belligerent acts by South Africa; and whereas, in accordance with the Twelve's decision of 10 September 1985<sup>1</sup>, the question of imposing sanctions remains on the agenda and the Twelve have reserved the right to reconsider their position, can the Foreign Ministers state whether they intend, in the light of the above developments, to impose immediate sanctions on the racist South African regime and, if not, whether they think that failure to take such sanctions might be interpreted as support for the regime in Pretoria?

*Answer:*

On 22 May the Twelve issued a declaration in which they strongly condemned South Africa's military actions against neighbouring States and deplored the loss of human life<sup>2</sup>. On 27 June the Heads of State or Government meeting in The Hague issued a considered statement on the Twelve's policy towards South Africa of which the Honourable Member will be well aware<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 85/172.

<sup>2</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/153.

<sup>3</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/185.

**86/205. Question No H-171/86 by Mr Adamou Concerning the Signing of the UN Convention Excluding South Africa from Sporting Events and Question No H-173/86 by Mr Wurtz on the International Convention Against Apartheid in Sport**

Date of Issue: 9 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

*Question No H-171/86:*

On 16 May 1986 in New York 43 member States of the UN met to isolate South Africa in the field of sport and signed a convention committing themselves not to allow sportsmen from their countries to carry on their activity in South Africa or take part in any meetings involving sportsmen from that country.

Can the Foreign Ministers say why none of the twelve EEC countries, or for that matter the USA, signed the convention, and what they propose to do about it in the near future?

*Question No H-173/86:*

On Friday 16 May 1986 the representatives of 43 countries in the UN signed an international convention against apartheid in sport. The signatory States have undertaken not to allow their sports federations or athletes to have any contact with countries practising apartheid. None of the Member States has as yet signed this convention. The Member States also abstained during the vote on the draft convention back in December 1985. Can the Foreign Ministers say what position the Twelve are intending to adopt on this question?

*Answer:*

On 10 December 1985 the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted Resolution 40/64G containing the International Convention Against Apartheid in Sports. The Twelve and other Western democracies abstained in the vote and the Twelve explained their position in a common declaration<sup>1</sup>. In this, the Twelve reaffirmed their total rejection of any form of racial discrimination in sport and confirmed their determination to discourage strongly any sporting contacts by their nationals involving racial discrimination. They also pointed out, however, that in the countries of the European Community sport is organized on a private basis and that individual governments are not therefore in a position to prevent sportsmen from having contacts with a specific country.

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 85/315.

**86/206. Question No H-192/86 by Mr Ulburghs Concerning the Imprisonment of a Belgian Oblate in South Africa**

Date of Issue: 9 July 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Louis Vandembroucke, a Flemish missionary who has been working in South Africa for fifteen years, was arrested by the police under Section 50 of the Security Act on 26 May 1986. It seems the Government took exception to his activities with a parents' committee that wanted to get black children back to school.

Are the Foreign Ministers aware of this new European victim of the South African apartheid regime and have they taken or are they planning to take measures to get Father Vandembroucke released?

*Answer:*

Father Vandembroucke was released on 4 June and no charges have been brought against him.

**86/207. Question No H-193/86 by Mr Alavanos Concerning the Production of Chemical Weapons**

Date of Issue: 9 July 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

At the NATO meeting that decided on and approved the production, after an interval of seventeen years, of chemical weapons of the binary type, most of the EEC Member States supported the decision and only a few expressed reservations without, however, exercising a veto on their production.

Would the Foreign Ministers state why they acted in contradiction to their earlier standpoints and declarations opposing chemical weapons – statement by the Ten at the UN General Assembly of 25 October 1985, declaration by the Ten against the holding or use of chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq war, and answer to Question H-221/84 by Mr Alavanos<sup>1</sup> – and supported the abovementioned proposal by the USA within NATO at the very time when, after the Chernobyl accident and the events in Bhopal, India, the need to protect the life and health of their peoples from the dangers of nuclear and chemical weapons had become even more obvious?

*Answer:*

The issue by the Honourable Member of Parliament relates to the military aspects of security and has therefore not been discussed in European political cooperation.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/105; *OJ* No 2-318 of 24 October 1984, pp. 126-127.

**86/208. Question No H-201/86 by Mr Pranchère Concerning the Fate of Twenty-Six Young Political Prisoners in Morocco**

Date of Issue: 9 July 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Have the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation made inquiries of the Moroccan authorities as to the fate of twenty–six young political prisoners currently staging protests and hunger strikes for the right to be treated as prisoners of conscience?

Various sources (including Amnesty International) agree that a number of prisoners have been tortured and some have died as a result of ill-treatment.

Could the Foreign Ministers obtain information from the Moroccan authorities on this matter and above all satisfy themselves that political prisoners in that country are treated decently?

*Answer:*

The Twelve have always followed the question of human rights closely, as we made clear in the recent memorandum presented to the European Parliament<sup>1</sup>. The specific cases raised by the Honourable Member have not, however, been discussed by the Foreign Ministers of the Twelve.

---

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/137.

### **86/209. Question No H-219/86 by Sir Peter Vanneck Concerning the Freedom of Navigation in International Waters Through the Gulf**

Date of Issue: 9 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

How do the Twelve intend to uphold one of the fundamental principles of international law, namely freedom of navigation in international waters through the Gulf (my Question No H-67/86 refers<sup>1</sup>), and if the Twelve do not know, will they place this point on their agenda?

*Answer:*

The Twelve believe that the best way to ensure freedom of navigation in the international waters of the Gulf is to bring an end to the six year old conflict between Iran and Iraq. They have therefore appealed on several occasions, most recently in a Joint Ministerial Declaration on 25 February, to the parties to the conflict to respect strictly the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring States and to refrain from any interference with the commercial shipping of third countries in international waters<sup>2</sup>.

The Twelve have, more specifically, fully supported the repeated efforts of the UN Secretary-General designed to lead to a just and peaceful resolution of the conflict. They have called on the two parties to cooperate with the Secretary-General and to respect the provisions of Security Council Resolution 582 of 24 February 1986. In the absence of other solutions, the Twelve remain ready to give their support to these efforts and to other constructive initiatives.

---

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/147.

<sup>2</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/087.

### **86/210. Question No H-226/86 by Lord Bethell Concerning the Reception of the Human Rights Subcommittee**

Date of Issue: 9 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Are the Twelve prepared to receive a delegation from the European Parliament's Human Rights Subcommittee at the forthcoming CSCE review conference in Vienna?

*Answer:*

The Twelve are aware that the presence of a delegation of the European Parliament's Human Rights Subcommittee in Vienna during the CSCE Follow-up Meeting would be important. The Presidency's delegation in Vienna is prepared to receive some members of the Subcommittee and – in coordination with the delegations of their countries of origin – to offer them every necessary assistance and to present them, on an individual basis, for a discussion with other delegations.

### **86/211. Question No H-258/86 by Mr Raftery Concerning Sanctions Against South Africa**

Date of Issue: 9 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Have the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation discussed the implications of economic sanctions against South Africa for the States neighbouring that country, and in particular for Lesotho, which is completely surrounded by it, and if so, will they give details of their conclusions?

*Answer:*

In considering their policy towards South Africa the Twelve take full account of its implications for South Africa's neighbours.

### **86/212. Question No 2939/85 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning the Unrepresentative and Unlawful 'Interim Government' of Namibia**

Date of Issue: 11 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 5 March 1986

The 'Transitional Government of National Unity', set up in Namibia on 17 June 1985 by Pretoria, an unelected coalition of members of six parties claiming to belong to the 'Multipartite Conference' has been condemned by the Security Council as 'null and void'. Today's transitional government is the successor to the equally unrepresentative 'interim government' of 1979 to 1983, which stood under the domination of the Turnhalle Democratic Alliance and hence of Pretoria.

The present executive council, or cabinet, which acts by consensus, consists of eight members and is chaired by them in rotation. It is in overall charge of ethnic executives and administrations which are strikingly similar to the South African homelands. A dissident wing of SWAPO, known as SWAPO Democrats, and an offshoot of SWANU, known as SWANU Moderates, hardly even afford the cabinet the minimum popular support desired by the South African Administrator-General.

Recently, Mr Moses Katjuonga, 'Minister of the Interim Government', accompanied by his colleagues Johann Van Rooyen and Hans Schrenan, was refused access to the premises of the International Labour Organization in Geneva, because, in the words of an ILO spokesman, these 'unannounced and uninvited visitors do not represent Namibia, but South Africa. The only organization which we recognize is the UN Council for Namibia'...

Under the terms of the Security Districts Proclamation, or AG 9, which is dated 9 November 1977 and was signed by Mr T. Steyn, the South African Administrator-General, the South African police and defence forces, as well as the railway police, may make arbitrary arrests and detain persons without trial. Article 4 (2) accordingly states that:

(2) Where an officer or non-commissioned officer of the security forces suspects any person falling within the jurisdiction of a security district of having committed an offence at any moment, or of having the intention or having had at any moment the intention to commit an offence, or of being in possession of information relating to the perpetration of an unlawful act by any person whatsoever or to the intention on the part of any person whatsoever to commit an offence, he may (...) arrest that person or have him arrested without a warrant, cross-examine him or have him cross-examined on the subject of the offence which has been committed or is premeditated, or detain him or have him interned in any place deemed suitable by the officer or non-commissioned officer provided that no person concerned by this paragraph is detained for a period exceeding 30 days.

The text also stipulates that, barring special authorization, the detainee has no right to consult a lawyer, while the Administrator-General may, on the other hand, extend the detention.

In addition, Law No 22 on the banning and prior notification of rallies, signed on 10 December 1981 by the South African Administrator-General, is the latest in a series of measures extending from AG 27 (1979) and AG 59 (1980) to AG 26 which confer arbitrary and unlimited powers on the security services. Fifty people are at present being held under the responsibility of the transitional government and in implementation of South Africa 'proclamations'. People have been imprisoned for up to six years, frequently in solitary confinement, while others have simply 'disappeared'<sup>1</sup>.

1. Do the Ministers not feel that these repressive acts, which could be repealed in a day by the transitional government if it was authorized to do so by the South African Administrator-General, make it completely impossible for that government to lay claim to even a first notion of credibility and for the country to move towards a national consensus? Do not the acts referred to in this question, which represent the reality of the order in Namibia, not only in the north, but throughout the country, make the actions of the transitional government in drawing up an entirely ineffectual Bill of Rights appear a somewhat sinister joke?

2. Under the terms of AG 8, the country is divided into eleven tribal 'ethnic groups' controlled by the security services. Could not the UN Council for Namibia, the only legal authority, be induced to declare that AG 8 and the other acts referred to in point have no legal force?

3. To what authority do companies such as Rossing, Tsumeb Corporation, Otjihase Mining, CDM, etc. pay their taxes? What degree of interpenetration exists between the South African Industrial Development Corporation and the semi-public Namibian First National Development Corporation (FNDC)?

4. Pending the implementation of United Nations Resolution 435 and given the presence of a sizeable Namibian diaspora in Africa, should not the EEC's 1986 budget aid to Namibia be reserved exclusively for organizations and initiatives that are independent of the present transitional government?

*Answer:*

The Twelve consider the Interim Government in Namibia to be null and void. They have made this clear on a number of occasions and have stressed the need for the early independence of Namibia on the basis of Security Council Resolution 435.

<sup>1</sup> In the spate of brutal assaults which were seen in the weeks from 7 to 20 January 1986, the following incidents stand out:

- the case of Justina Ampolo, 19, sever[ly] beaten on 7 January 1986 by the 'koevoets' (special security service) and admitted to hospital in Ovamboland;
- the case of the teacher Haikki Pasu, deliberately run over by a military lorry in Kavango on 15 January 1986;
- the case of Mr Linus, admitted to hospital after being severely assaulted. The four tires of his car had been punctured in advance by bullets, by a detachment of the South African Defence Forces. Mr Linus works for the CDM company. The incident occurred on 17 January 1986.



Attacks of this kind rarely lead to prosecutions largely because witnesses are intimidated, despite the generally recognized jurisdiction of the local Supreme Court, an appeal court which is itself under the authority of the South African Court in Bloemfontein.

**86/213. Question No 3081/85 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning the Complaint Lodged with the International Labour Organization Against Fernando Marcos's Government in the Philippines**

Date of Issue: 11 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 21 March 1986

Well before the recent electoral campaign with its obvious rigging, crowds of unarmed citizens were brutally provoked and repressed in the Philippines at the instigation of military and paramilitary forces, particularly on 20 September 1985 in western Negros where a demonstration by 5 000 stinking peasants suffered a veritable massacre (27 demonstrators were killed), of whom 17 were members of the National Sugar Workers Federation).

A complaint has been lodged with the International Labour Organization by a Filipino trade union. Have the Twelve taken the measures necessary to help that complaint to receive speedy and objective consideration and for the appropriate action to be taken on it even if a new government is installed in Manila?

*Answer:*

The Twelve have repeatedly voiced their concern at the violation of democratic principles, fundamental freedoms and human rights by the Government of Ferdinand Marcos. They were thus all the more relieved to learn of President Marcos's departure, which will make possible a return to respect for and the restoration of democracy in the Philippines, and national reconciliation with the new President, Ms Corazón Aquino.

The incident referred to by the Honourable Member and the complaint lodged with the International Labour Office have not been discussed in European political cooperation. At the 233rd session of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, which has just closed, the Committee on Freedom of Association investigated this complaint (case No 1353). The Committee decided to ask the Philippine Government for more detailed information than it had been given hitherto. The Committee will deal with this matter at its next meeting in November 1986. The Twelve are convinced of the need to contribute to the support for democratic forces in the Philippines and to encourage national reconciliation.

**86/214. Question No 3085/85 by Mr Collins (S-UK) Concerning Prisoners in Southern Turkey**

Date of Issue: 11 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 21 March 1986

Is the Council aware that some 200 prisoners in Adana Prison, southern Turkey began a hunger strike on 29 January 1986 in protest against torture and bad prison conditions? Is the Council aware that conditions have been so bad that three prisoners set themselves alight in order to draw attention to conditions there? What action does the Council intend to take on this so far as relations between the European Community and Turkey are concerned?

*Answer:*

Reports concerning a hunger strike in the Adana prison have indeed reached the Foreign Ministers of the Twelve.

The information available indicates that this was a hunger strike begun on 31 January 1986 by 148 prisoners. The number involved increased to 203 on 3 February. On 27 February 71 hunger strikers gave up their protest, followed on 21 February by the remaining 132. Reports about prisoners having tried to set themselves alight are as yet unconfirmed.

In this context the Twelve would like to reiterate their concern for human rights and to state that the situation in Turkish prisons is being closely monitored. It may be noted in this connection that the Turkish Parliament is also taking an active interest in the situation in Turkish prisons and detention centres, and that a special parliamentary commission issued a report at the end of 1985 containing a large number of recommendations aimed at preventing the use of torture. This parliamentary commission will continue to monitor further developments.

**86/215. Question No 41/86 by Ms Piermont and Ms Heinrich (ARC-D) Concerning the Expulsion from French Polynesia and New Caledonia of Ms Dorothee Piermont and the Ban on her from Entering the Territory**

Date of Issue: 11 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 10 April 1986

1. Are the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation aware that on 3 March 1986, on her departure from French Polynesia following a seven-day visit, Ms Piermont was served with an expulsion order and prohibited from entering the territory, although she was not prevented from travelling on to New Caledonia?
2. Are the Ministers aware that on 4 March 1986, on her arrival in New Caledonia, Ms Piermont was held for ten hours at the airport police station and was then refused entry to that territory as well?
3. Are the Ministers aware that while Ms Piermont, having been prohibited from entering the territory, wished to travel to New Zealand, she was put on a flight to Tokyo instead?
4. Are the Ministers aware of the reasons for her expulsion and the ban on her entering the territory?
5. If the Ministers were so informed, by whom were they informed?
6. Are the Ministers aware of any precedents in which Members of the European Parliament have been expelled from and prohibited from entering territories over which the European Community has jurisdiction, and, if so, what are those precedents?
7. Do the Ministers consider that Members of the European Parliament have the right to obtain on-the-spot information on the political, social and economic situation of any part of the European Community?
8. Do the Ministers consider that Members of the European Parliament are entitled to deliver statements solely on the policies of their own countries or on those of the other Member States as well?
9. In respect of points 7 and 8, do the Ministers consider that there are basic differences or differences in degree between citizens of the European Community and Members of the European Parliament, and, if so, what are they? If not, why not?
10. What view do the Ministers take of such measures, in view of the numerous occasions on which citizens or Members have participated in public rallies in other countries, levelling unmistakable criticism at the policies of the countries in question (e.g. demonstrations against the stationing of intermediate-range missiles in the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Italy and the United Kingdom, demonstrations held in the United Kingdom to support striking British miners, in France

against the *Super-Phénix* fast breeder reactor and in Spain against the NATO membership) and in view of the speech in favour of the siting of intermediate-range missiles delivered to the German *Bundestag* by the French President, François Mitterand, in a blatant attempt to sway the opinion of the public and of the German *Bundestag*?

11. Are the Ministers prepared to take measures to restore to a lady Member of the European Parliament the right to secure full information and complete freedom of speech, thereby ensuring that she may once more enjoy complete freedom of action, and, if so, what measures will they take?

12. Are the Ministers prepared to take measures to ensure that in future, Members of the European Parliament are not similarly hindered in their functions and, if so, what measures will they take?

*Answer:*

The problem raised in the questions put by the Honourable Members is outside the sphere of European political cooperation.

### **86/216. Question No 58/86 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning Overfishing in the South Atlantic, Especially in the Namibian Territorial Waters**

Date of Issue: 11 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 10 April 1986

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) produced a report in November 1984 according to which seven countries were overfishing off Namibia and in its territorial waters, in particular by making more and more use of factory ships and ultra-modern large-scale fishing methods. The renewal of stocks was said to be in serious jeopardy.

I should therefore like the Ministers to state, given the extremely limited or even non-existent circulation of the abovementioned FAO report, which are the seven countries accused of the overfishing in question, in descending order of scale, and what quantities are involved. How is such overfishing compatible with the obligations resulting from Decree No 1 of the UN Council on Namibia which aims to protect that country's natural resources?

*Answer:*

Since the FAO report referred to by Mr Glinne has not yet been approved, the Twelve are not in a position to give an answer to this question.

### **86/217. Question No 73/86 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning Over-Mining of Diamond Deposits in Namibia**

Date of Issue: 11 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 10 April 1986

De Beers Consolidated Mines, the South African diamond producer, has been accused by a judicial commission of deliberately over-mining deposits in Namibia in the late 1960s and 1970s in anticipation of the Territory receiving independence.

The report was produced by Judge P. W. Thirion, a South African who headed the investigation into over-all conditions in Namibia. It claimed [that] Consolidated Diamond Mines, a De Beers subsidiary,

acting on orders from its parent company, had breached a 1923 agreement with the territorial Administration that was meant to strike a balance between high-grade and low-grade deposits so that both would be mined, even if this resulted in reduced profits.

According to *The Guardian* of 11 March 1986, from which the above paragraphs are quoted, De Beers and CDM denied these accusations on 10 March 1986. De Beers said its innovative techniques had made profitable mining possible in areas that had been considered uneconomic. According to *The Guardian*, the Thirion report said that CDM began to 'cream off' the best deposit blocks of diamonds at their Oranjemuno mine in the early seventies. The effect was dramatically to shorten the life of the mine by trapping low-yield areas in the ground, but in the short term to produce record revenues out of Namibia's unique open-cast diamond mines. Output from the mine rose by 66 percent during the height of the over-mining period as four huge crushing plants came on line and CDM switched to a six-day, 24-hour operation in the seventies. The mine has been depleted at a frightening rate, and is now due to close in 1992.

Can the Ministers answer the following questions:

1. Has the Thirion report been studied in the context of political cooperation and with the attention that the situation in Namibia deserves?
2. Is the South-West Africa Diamond Board, which controls mining activity in Namibia, in fact 'a sham', as claimed in the report?
3. What is the responsibility of the Territory's General Administration, which has long been operated unlawfully by South Africa?
4. Surely this affair highlights the need to give legal force to Decree No 1 of the UN Council for Namibia, the country's only lawful authority at present, which seeks to protect the resources of a territory that has been subjugated by the occupying power and by interests in collusion with it?

*Answer:*

While the Namibian question is a major concern of the Twelve, the Thirion report has not been studied jointly by them.

On 17 June 1985 South Africa established a transitional government of national unity in Namibia intended to administer the territory's internal affairs.

The Twelve consider the transitional government as null and void and continue to press for Namibia's early independence on the basis of Security Council Resolution 435.

### **86/218. Question No 203/86 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning the Cessation of Exports of Petroleum Products to the Republic of South Africa and Occupied Namibia**

Date of Issue: 11 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 24 April 1986

On 28 January the Ministers considered their decision in principle of 10 September 1985<sup>1</sup> to cease petroleum exports to the Republic of South Africa in the light of the need for national legislation. I should like to have clarification of the following points:

1. Is this a matter for the national parliaments, with differing policy measures being adopted from one Member State to another?
2. Does the decision apply to crude oil only or to all petroleum products, including refined and blended products?
3. Does it also apply to petrochemical products?

4. Does the cessation of exports to the Republic of South Africa also apply to illegally occupied Namibia and is it restricted to crude oil produced in the Community as a whole? Does it cover crude oil which is technically not imported into the Community and which is held in bonded storage?
5. Is it the Ministers' intention that the involvement of Community companies in the export and maritime transit of petroleum products from third countries should also be covered?
6. Is petroleum and petroleum export technology and its financing also covered?

*Answer:*

Following the adoption of the Luxembourg package of 10 September 1985, it was decided that the restrictive measures would be implemented on a national basis. All Member States agreed that the measures relating to oil should include the termination of all exports of crude oil in free circulation in the Member States of the European Community to South Africa.

This was considered to be the most effective way to implement the measure, given that all oil-producing Member States had already adopted guidelines to prevent the export to South Africa of crude oil produced by them.

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 85/172.

### **86/219. Question No 204/86 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning the Involvement of Royal Dutch Shell in Supplying Oil to the Republic of South Africa**

Date of Issue: 11 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 24 April 1986

On 9 January 1986 the American trade union AFL-CIO, the Free South Africa Movement, the United Mine Workers, the National Education Association, the National Organization for Women, the United Auto Workers, the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers (representing the employees of Shell USA) and various Members of the US Congress publicly announced the start of a boycott of the multinational company Royal Dutch Shell in view of its support for the current regime in the Republic of South Africa and occupied Namibia.

Royal Dutch Shell in fact:

1. is a major supporter of apartheid in that it supplies South Africa with energy and petrochemical products for agricultural and industrial purposes;
2. manages a vital pipeline jointly with the South African Government and operates some 800 service stations in South Africa;
3. is a joint owner and/or manager of South Africa's most important oil refinery, of off-shore installations through which the vast majority of South Africa's oil imports transit and of the huge Richards Bay terminal via which South African exports of coal have been processed and thanks to which they have increased tenfold since 1975;
4. has rejected a proposal put forward by the shareholders of its US subsidiary in 1984 by saying that a refusal by the Company to supply the South African army and police would constitute interference in the internal affairs of the country;
5. has stated publicly its intention to ignore the oil embargo decreed by the UN General Assembly in 1963;
6. disregards the rules set out in the Sullivan Code and in the Community Code of Conduct as regards labour relations – in 1985 following incidents in the Rietspruit coal mine in South Africa, a pit

jointly owned by Royal Dutch Shell, 86 miners were sacked for attending the funeral of a militant trade unionist killed in an industrial accident; in this instance the Company displayed an arrogant anti-union attitude.

I should therefore like to know how the deliberations of the Foreign Ministers of the Community meeting on 10 September 1985 and 28 January 1986 apply in the case of Royal Dutch Shell.

*Answer:*

The restrictive measures *vis-à-vis* South Africa agreed by the Twelve on 10 September 1985<sup>1</sup> are being strictly enforced, without exceptions, by the relevant authorities of the Member States. This applies as much to Royal Dutch Shell as to any other company.

---

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 85/172.

### **86/220. Question No 220/86 by Mr Kuijpers (ARC-B) Concerning the Imprisonment of Vladimir Poresj**

Date of Issue: 11 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 24 April 1986

Vladimir Poresj, one of the founders of the religious and philosophical youth seminary in Leningrad, was sentenced in 1979 to five years prison camp with hard labour. He was also sentenced to three years internal banishment. Because of his uncompromising attitude and his openly expressed sympathy for fellow prisoners and other prisoners of conscience he was sentenced just before completing his term to a further three years in a hard-labour camp. The sentence imposed on Poresj was arbitrarily extended by the governor of Tsjistopol prison on the basis of rules introduced under Andropov.

He is now in Abagur camp near Novokusneck. This means that Poresj is almost totally isolated since his fellow prisoners are all classified as 'common law' criminals.

Can the Ministers indicate:

- whether they are aware of this situation?
- what representations they intend to make to the Soviet authorities?

*Answer:*

The case of Vladimir Poresj raised by the Honourable Member of Parliament has not been discussed as such in the framework of European political cooperation. However, the Twelve continue on many occasions to make representations to the Soviet authorities, individually and jointly, to recall the importance the Twelve attach to respect for the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and the Concluding Document of the Madrid meeting freely agreed to and signed by the Soviet Union, among which is the obligation to respect the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or conviction, as well as the right of the individual to know and act upon his rights and duties in this field.

### **86/221. Question No 247/86 by Mr Ephremidis, Mr Adamou and Mr Alavanos (COM-GR) Concerning the Bellicose US Provocations Against Libya in the Gulf of Sirte**

Date of Issue: 11 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 12 May 1986

With the latest American exercises in the Gulf of Sirte and the repeated provocations against the national independence and security of Libya by the United States armed forces, there is a threat of a wider flare-up in the unstable south-eastern Mediterranean region.

Will the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation say:

a) why they do not make approaches to the United States to put an immediate stop to its bellicose provocations against Libya and immediately halt its military 'exercises' being held, for the fourth time in three months, in the Gulf of Sirte, thousands of miles from the coasts of the United States, so that the conditions for a peaceful way out of the current crisis may be created;

b) why they ignore the calls of the Arab League, the Government of Malta and most Arab countries for international pressure to be put on the United States to make it desist from its bellicose activities;

c) why, in the case of the Malvinas (Falklands) war, the EEC governments sided with Great Britain when it declared a 200-mile zone round the islands to be British territorial waters, but, in the case of Libya, do not recognize its right to defend the waters of the Gulf of Sirte, which bound its coast, from being used for bellicose provocations against it;

d) whether, going beyond the general threat to peace in the region, the Foreign Ministers do not perceive the risk of EEC Member States such as Greece, Italy and Spain being drawn into these incidents of war by the American provocations, owing to the presence of American military bases on their territories?

*Answer:*

The Honourable Members probably share the opinion of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Twelve when they state that respect for the rules of international customary and treaty law by all the members of the international community is a fundamental condition for preserving peace.

However, the claim made by Libya on the Gulf of Sirte, which forms part of the high seas, cannot be justified historically or by the Conventions of 1958 and 1982 on the Law of the Sea.

The Twelve have put forward this standpoint, which is shared by the international community, on various occasions *inter alia* in September 1985, in the context of joint representations to the Libyan authorities. The Twelve are convinced of the fact that international disputes, including disputes over the limits of territorial waters, should not be resolved by the use of force, but by applying the relevant rules of international law.

As regards the case of the Falklands war, the United Kingdom introduced a 200-mile security zone after the start of hostilities and exclusively for the duration of hostilities. This case cannot therefore in any way be compared with Libya's unilateral claim in peacetime.

### **86/222. Question No 316/86 by Mr Pordea (DR-F) Concerning the Importance of Community Support for the Firm American Line Towards the Soviet Union**

Date of Issue: 11 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 13 May 1986

In the last 40 years, worldwide Soviet expansionism has inflicted a series of major defeats on the free world, while the subversive 'revolutionary' action of the network of communist parties in obedience to Moscow and their trade union subordinates, sustained by mendacious ideological propaganda, poses a permanent threat to all democratic countries.

The West's moral capitulation and the assistance it has always provided have so far helped Soviet communism to perpetrate its series of aggressions and its destructive work.

Does the Council not therefore believe that:

- the EEC should give its resolute support to the general strategy on which its ally the United States has rightly embarked with the aim of guaranteeing its own security by safeguarding freedom and the fundamental values of civilization and peace?
- were the Community to take up such a position officially, and thereby strengthen the defensive position of the West as a whole, this would further not only the work of the superpower summits but also the negotiations on an agreement between the EEC and COMECON, to the benefit of the peoples subjugated by the Soviet Union, as well as world peace?

*Answer:*

There can be no doubt that the Twelve share and support the values of civilization recognized in the West. The Twelve are determined to cooperate in promoting democracy on the basis of the fundamental rights recognized in the constitutions and laws of the Member States, in the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and in the European Social Charter, notably freedom, equality and social justice. They are fully aware of the responsibility of their countries to protect their common interests and independence, and in particular to respect the principles of democracy, compliance with the law and respect for human rights to which they are particularly attached. The Twelve are resolved to make an active contribution to the preservation of international peace and security in accordance with their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations.

The Twelve hope that the contacts that were resumed at the highest level between several Western countries and the Soviet Union will lead to an improvement in the international situation and a renewed dialogue in all fields, including arms control and disarmament, regional questions and those concerning human rights. The Twelve, for their own part, will continue their efforts to promote greater stability in East-West relations, as a basis for wide-ranging and far-reaching cooperation between all the countries of Europe and North America. Notably the CSCE process offers a suitable framework for such efforts.

There is therefore no need for the Twelve as such to embark on a course as suggested by the Honourable Member of Parliament.

**86/223. Question No 334/86 by Mr Schwalba-Hoth (ARC-D)  
Concerning the US Anti-Terrorism Task Force in Stuttgart**

Date of Issue: 11 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 13 May 1986

1. In view of the US's latest snubbing of the Community (with the raids on Libya), what is the Foreign Ministers' attitude towards the recent setting up of a permanent anti-terrorism crisis headquarters in Stuttgart?
2. For what reasons was this headquarters set up?
3. What form did prior consultation of the Community's Ministers take?
4. What powers and resources does the headquarters have?
5. In what way was it involved, directly or indirectly in the US attacks on Libya?

*Answer:*

As the Honourable Member of Parliament knows, the Twelve have supported a political solution to the question of international terrorism. The setting up of an anti-terrorism task force by the United States as referred to by the Honourable Member of Parliament has not been discussed in European political cooperation.



**86/224. Question No 350/86 by Mr Balfe (S-UK) Concerning the Raid on Libya**

Date of Issue: 11 July 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 28 May 1986

When the Foreign Ministers met on 14 April 1986 to discuss Libya did the British Foreign Secretary indicate that permission had already been given for US Air Force planes to use British facilities for their raid on Libya?

*Answer:*

In the days preceding the military operation of 15 April by US forces against targets in Libya, the general possibility of such a strike had become clear to many. While attending the Ministerial EPC meeting in The Hague on 14 April none of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Twelve were aware of a specific decision by the American President to actually launch the operation. Details of what was said during the meeting cannot be divulged.

**86/225. Question No 371/86 by Mr Schwalba-Hoth (ARC-D) Concerning Strip-Searching in Northern Ireland**

Date of Issue: 11 July 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 28 May 1986

In view of the declarations on human rights in non-Community countries and of the efforts to arrange for the Communities' accession to the Commission on Human Rights:

1. How do the Foreign Ministers view the strip-searching of women in Northern Ireland by the British authorities?
2. How do they view the cases of strip-searching described in the March edition of the British monthly '*Monochrome*' (two women were treated in this way on more than thirty occasions in one month)?
3. How do they view the statement condemning strip-searching signed by 91 British MPs?

*Answer:*

The subject raised by the Honourable Member is outside the scope of European political cooperation.

**86/226. Question No 430/86 by Ms Lizin (S-B) on Strengthening the Trevi Group**

Date of Issue: 11 July 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 28 May 1986

On 25 April 1986 in The Hague, the Ministers announced that they would strengthen cooperation within the Trevi Group. Could the President provide Parliament with more detailed information about this and which areas and departments will be concerned?

Has a secretariat or a permanent structure been envisaged?

*Answer:*

Meeting in The Hague on 24 April 1986, the Ministers of the Interior and Justice responsible for cooperation within Trevi decided to strengthen this cooperation<sup>1</sup>. For further details the Honourable Member is referred to the press release attached. The setting up of a permanent secretariat for Trevi was not decided on 24 April.

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 85/134.

**86/227. Question No 439/86 by Mr De Vries (LDR-NL) Concerning the State of Ratification of the Protocols to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms**

Date of Issue: 11 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 28 May 1986

Which of the Member States have not yet signed or ratified the Protocols to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms?

*Answer:*

According to information available the following Member States of the EC have not yet signed or only signed and not yet ratified the optional protocols to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms:

- Protocol No 1: Spain;
- Protocol No 4: Greece, United Kingdom, Spain;
- Protocol No 6: Belgium, Ireland, Portugal, United Kingdom, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy;
- Protocol No 7: Belgium, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom;
- Protocol No 8: Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain.

**86/228. Statement on Sri Lanka**

Date of Issue: 14 July 1986

Place of Issue: London

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: The Twelve

Status of Document: Declaration

The Twelve continue to follow closely developments within Sri Lanka and efforts to find a basis for direct talks between all the parties concerned. The Twelve believe that negotiations offer the only route to a solution of Sri Lanka's current problems and that only a political settlement, within the framework of a united Sri Lanka, recognizing the needs and interests of all the parties concerned, holds the prospect of a lasting peace in the country. The Twelve welcome President Jayewardene's recent proposals for an end to the conflict and hope that all parties concerned will now seize this opportunity to join in direct talks, to put to the violence and to achieve a peaceful and lasting settlement. The Twelve are aware of India's important role in this process.

## **86/229. Statement on the Execution of Six Opposition Leaders in Guinea Bissau**

Date of Issue: 21 July 1986  
 Place of Issue: Bissau, Guinea Bissau  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: The Twelve  
 Status of Document: Message

The Twelve deplore the fact that the authorities of Guinea Bissau did not show clemency towards the six people found guilty following an attempted *coup d'état* last November and regret that the humanitarian approaches of a number of governments and international organizations were ignored.

## **86/230. Declaration on Human Rights**

Date of Issue: 21 July 1986  
 Place of Issue: Brussels  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Foreign Ministers  
 Status of Document: Declaration

The Foreign Ministers of the European Community, meeting in the framework of European political cooperation and of the Council, have reviewed the principles of the human rights policy of the European Community and its Member States. They reaffirm that respect for human rights is one of the cornerstones of European cooperation. They further reaffirm their commitment to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms and emphasize the importance in this context of the principles of parliamentary democracy and the rule of law.

The Twelve seek universal observance of human rights. The protection of human rights is the legitimate and continuous duty of the world community and of nations individually. Expressions of concern at violations of such rights cannot be considered interference in the domestic affairs of a State. The major United Nations instruments in the field of human rights should be universally ratified as soon as possible. States should cooperate with intergovernmental organizations which monitor implementation of human rights and of which they are a member. Respect for human rights is an important element in relations between third countries and the Europe of the Twelve.

The worldwide human rights situation remains alarming, in particular persistent violations of individual liberties as well as tyranny, oppression and indiscriminate violence in many countries. Concern for violation of human rights forms an important focus of attention for the Twelve, a concern Ministers share with the European Parliament. In recent years the European partners have delivered various declarations on behalf of Foreign Ministers and made representations on numerous occasions with many governments, attempting to ameliorate the human rights situation in the countries concerned and to counter cases of specific human rights abuse. Joint statements in international fora on human rights issues have become standard practice for the Twelve, as have frequent discussions on all consultative levels existing among them. The Twelve will continue action within the framework of European political cooperation against violations in any part of the world.

Individuals and non-governmental organizations the world over have made valuable and courageous contributions to the protection and promotion of human rights. The Twelve appeal to all States to enhance public awareness concerning the cause of human rights through educational programmes and by allowing non-governmental organizations freely to disseminate human rights information.

The Twelve deplore the fact that countless people around the world suffer hunger, disease and lack of opportunity, thus being denied the enjoyment of the most basic economic and social rights. The promotion of economic, social and cultural rights as well as of civil and political rights is of paramount importance for the full realization of human dignity and for the attainment of legitimate aspirations of every individual. Neither lack of social and economic development, nor any persuasion or ideology may serve as a justification for the denial of civil and political rights. The Foreign Ministers affirm that in the

development of their relations with non-member States as well as in the administration of aid the European Community and its Member States will continue to promote fundamental rights so that individuals and peoples will actually enjoy to the full their economic, social and cultural rights and their civil and political rights.

Lasting peace and security are unattainable without universal enjoyment of human rights. In view of their special responsibility as Europeans, the Twelve emphasize that respect for human rights by all States participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe is an essential factor in achieving peace and security, justice and well-being in Europe.

### **86/231. Statement on Ethiopia and the Horn of Africa**

Date of Issue: 21 July 1986  
Place of Issue: Brussels  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Foreign Ministers  
Status of Document: Declaration

The Foreign Ministers of the Twelve have reviewed their policy towards the Horn of Africa, and agreed that the Twelve should continue to play a constructive role in the area, where they have long-standing ties and interests.

They recognize that the persistence of tensions in the region, and related refugee problems, pose a grave threat to economic development and stand in the way of normal relations between the countries of the region. They note statements by governments in the region favouring negotiated political settlements, and urge them to pursue this course. They note the role which increased support for regional projects could play in this context. In particular they welcome the opening of talks between Somalia and Ethiopia. They also welcome Sudanese efforts to achieve a political settlement of the problems of south Sudan, and urge all parties to work seriously towards this.

The Twelve urge the Governments concerned to take further steps to achieve the peaceful settlement of internal conflicts and to ensure respect for human rights in their countries. In this context they welcome recent releases of political prisoners in Ethiopia.

The Twelve remain seriously concerned at the extent of food shortages and attach particular importance to measures to help prevent further famine and to promote food security. There has been a massive response from the Community, the Twelve and the European public. As well as food and other emergency aid, the Community provides Ethiopia, Somalia, the Sudan and Djibouti with a considerable contribution in development assistance with priority to development of peasant farming and the prevention of further famine.

The Twelve will continue to pay careful attention to the human consequences of settlement and villagization programmes.

The Twelve affirm their wish to pursue an active dialogue with the countries of the region.

### **86/232. Question No 2610/85 by Mr Iversen (COM-DK) Concerning Afghanistan**

Date of Issue: 23 July 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 24 January 1986

In the light of the latest UN reports on the situation in Afghanistan and the fact that it is now more than six years since the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, will the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation say what peace moves the twelve Community countries contemplate making?

*Answer:*

Since the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan the situation in that country has features constantly on the agenda of European political cooperation.

A reminder of this continuing concern of the Twelve was contained in a joint declaration published on 24 December 1985 on the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the Soviet invasion<sup>1</sup>.

The Twelve regret the continuation of the fighting in Afghanistan and the worsening of repression there, which has resulted in the violation of the fundamental rights of the Afghan people and the continuing infringement of human rights in Afghanistan. This disturbing situation is confirmed by the report drawn up by the Special Rapporteur of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, Mr Felix Ermacora.

The Twelve have signed as co-authors the Resolution on Human Rights with regard to Afghanistan adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 13 December 1985.

The Twelve are convinced that an end to the Afghanistan question can only come about through a peaceful solution on the basis of the principles enshrined in the successive United Nations resolutions, i.e. a fair and lasting political settlement in accordance with the principles of non-intervention and self-determination.

An agreement on a timetable for the withdrawal of Soviet troops will form the crux of such a solution.

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 85/331.

### **86/233. Question No 2901/85 by Ms van den Heuvel (S-NL) Concerning International Military Observers on Nicaraguan Borders**

Date of Issue: 23 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 5 March 1986

In view of the fact that the 'reply' to Written Question No 1613/85<sup>1</sup> contains only facts that are common knowledge, could the Foreign Ministers answer the specific question of whether making peace-keeping forces available for Nicaragua's border is a possibility?

*Answer:*

The Twelve are willing to consider providing appropriate assistance, if asked, to those pursuing a peaceful solution to the problems of Central America. They have not, however, received any request for 'peace-keeping' forces.

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/050.

### **86/234. Question No 2937/85 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning the Conscription of Community Nationals into South African Armed Forces**

Date of Issue: 23 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 5 March 1986

Under the new Aliens Act passed in the Republic of South Africa, all male foreign nationals aged from 18 to 54 are eligible for conscription if they have been resident in South Africa for two years.

1. On what date did this act enter into force?

2. To what territory does it apply, given that conscriptions is becoming common practice in Namibia?
3. How many nationals of Member States are concerned by the Aliens Act and how many have served or are serving in the South African armed forces?
4. Given that at least one serviceman holding a UK passport is known to have been killed in a frontier engagement, his body having been repatriated to the United Kingdom (cf. 'Namibia 1985': a report by Robert Jones MP, Donald Anderson MP and Lord Kennet', published by the British Council of Churches, 2 Eaton Gate, London SW1), blacks in general and the Namibians in particular are inclined to believe that Europeans are enlisting voluntarily in the South African armed forces which are waging war on the liberation movements and carrying out incursions in neighbouring countries. That being so, what steps have been or are being undertaken in political cooperation and/or by the Governments of the Member States to save Community nationals living in South Africa from compulsory military service and to advise the ACP Council of Ministers and the United Nations Secretary-General of what is being done?

*Answer:*

The South African Aliens Act No 1 of 1937, amended in 1984 by the Aliens and Immigration Laws Amendment Act No 49, does not contain the provisions referred to in the question. These provisions are however included in the South African Citizenship Amendment Act of 11 April 1984. The specific question raised by the Honourable Member has not been discussed in the framework of European political cooperation.

### **86/235. Question No 3121/85 by Mr Kuijpers (ARC-B) Concerning the Rejection of the Contadora Agreement**

Date of Issue: 23 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 21 March 1986

During the meeting in Luxembourg between the European Community and the Contadora Group, Nicaragua's Foreign Minister signed three declarations (peace negotiations and cooperation between the Community and Central America). However, President Ortega rejects this Contadora Agreement until such time as the minimum conditions guaranteeing safety have been met.

Can the Council indicate, three months after these events, to what extent these three declarations have been complied with by the various parties?

*Answer:*

At the Luxembourg meeting of 11 and 12 November 1985, three documents were agreed: a political *communiqué*, an economic *communiqué*<sup>1</sup> and an agreement between the Central American countries (including Panama) and the EC.

The '*Contadora Acta*' is a draft treaty put forward by four Latin American countries and designed to resolve the differences between the Central American countries. The latter are at present considering whether they are in a position to sign the latest draft of the *Acta*. At the Central American Summit Conference held in Esquipulas on 25 May 1986, the Five of Central America declared their willingness to sign the *Contadora Acta*; they have not, however, met a deadline of 6 June 1986, proposed for that purpose by the Contadora Group.

The Twelve continue to support strongly efforts designed to bring a peaceful end to the conflicts of the region along the lines proposed by the Contadora Group and have urged the countries involved to sign the *Acta* and implement it fully as soon as possible.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 85/253.

**86/236. Question No 222/86 by Mr van der Waal (NI-NL)  
Concerning the Circulation of Bibles in Turkey**

Date of Issue: 23 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 24 April 1986

In previous years proceedings have on several occasions been instituted against the secretary-general of the Turkish Bible Society, Mr Emmanuel Bagdas, for printing and circulating bibles, despite the fact that this is allowed under Turkish law.

At the end of 1985 preliminary legal proceedings were instituted against Mr Bagdas, who was charged with importing bibles into Turkey which is forbidden under Turkish law.

1. Can the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers meeting in EPC make representations to the Turkish authorities with a view to securing official guarantees that bibles may be printed and circulated throughout the country without hindrance in conformity with Turkish law?

2. Does the provision of the Turkish Publications Act prohibiting the import of bibles not infringe Articles 18 and 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Articles 9, 10 and 14 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms?

3. Is the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers meeting in EPC prepared, in view of the above, to make representations to the Turkish Government with a view to ensuring that the Publications Act is amended so as not to discriminate against Christian minority groups in Turkey?

*Answer:*

The issue raised by the honourable parliamentarian have not been discussed within the framework of European political cooperation. However, the Presidency would like to point out the following. On March 20th of this year, the Turkish Government decided to revoke the decrees relating to this subject, thus eliminating restrictions on printing and/or distributing the bible in Turkey and importing the bible into that country.

**86/237. Question No 233/86 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning  
Economic Sanctions Against Apartheid**

Date of Issue: 23 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 24 April 1986

The effects of the executive order adopted, with the Breman amendment, on 9 September 1985 by the President of the United States against the regimes in the Republic of South Africa and occupied Namibia, are beginning to be felt. The independent weekly, *The Namibian*, of 21 March 1986 states that it is a severe blow to the police and the South African military system that 350 American companies operating in South Africa and Namibia are threatening to stop supplying even the most important parts, including tires, as the regulations governing American sanctions begin to bite. After a delay while complex technical clauses were being finalized, sanctions, however 'limited' they are or continue to be defined, are now affecting computers and IBM technology, in particular the equipment most needed by the police, the army and other authorities responsible for enforcing apartheid. Under special clauses, motor vehicles, boats and their spare parts and accessories are examined case by case to check whether the supplying of such equipment meets a significant police or army need, according to a spokesman for the US embassy in Pretoria. In a statement issued by its Port Elizabeth office, the Goodyear company has declared that it is

obliged to apply the presidential order against the authorities enforcing the apartheid system in South Africa and Namibia. In its abovementioned issue, *'The Namibian'*<sup>1</sup> gives a list of the 15 authorities concerned (including those in the Bantustans).

I should like to know how the measures agreed by the Ministers on 10 September 1985 compare, in terms of practical effect, with the President of the United States' executive order.

*Answer:*

The practical effects of the restrictive measures *vis-à-vis* South Africa taken by the Twelve on 10 September 1985 and by the United States on the basis of the Executive Order of 9 September 1985 are difficult to assess in detail at this stage. Amongst others, the activities of foreign-owned companies in South Africa in their respective industries, and international trade patterns are important factors. However, the restrictive measures agreed upon by the Twelve were carefully prepared with a view to, in particular, their expected effectiveness and the Twelve believe that the Luxembourg package represents an important element in the increasing international economic and political pressure on the South African Government.

<sup>1</sup> Address: PO Box 20783 – Windhoek 9000, Namibia.

### **86/238. Question No 297/86 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning Additional Contributions to SADCC**

Date of Issue: 23 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 13 May 1986

The Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference has recently produced a report on the destabilizing effects of the measures taken by the Republic of South Africa in Southern Africa as a whole. This document, which was drawn up before the economic blockage and the coup organized in Lesotho in January by Pretoria, estimates that the economies of Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe suffered damage amounting to 10.12 billion dollars between 1980 and 1985 not only as a result of acts of war and increased military expenditure but also as a result of the increased costs of energy and transport and major export losses. This does not take into account the incalculable cost of this policy of destabilization in human terms.

In addition to the contribution by Lomé III have additional national contributions for SADCC been announced since the Harare meeting? If so, by which countries, inside or outside the Community?

*Answer:*

The Twelve have frequently made clear their total condemnation of South Africa's destabilizing activities in Southern Africa. They do not, however, have the detailed information requested by the Honourable Member; this could most easily be acquired from the SADCC Secretariat in Gaborone.

### **86/239. Question No 349/86 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning the Contadora Process**

Date of Issue: 23 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 28 May 1986



During the budgetary debate in the Netherlands, the Prime Minister, Mr Lubbers, claimed that the Dutch Presidency would do its utmost to promote the Contadora process.

Can the President of the Council say what steps the Dutch Presidency has already taken to promote the Contadora process and what further steps, if any, it intends to take?

*Answer:*

During the last five months, the Twelve have taken the following steps to support the Contadora peace process<sup>1</sup>:

- i) on 12 January they sent a message of encouragement to the Contadora and Support Group countries in advance of their meeting in Caraballeda;
- ii) on 20 January they published a statement welcoming the new impetus given to the Contadora process by the Caraballeda meeting;
- iii) on 22 February the Twelve issued a statement on relations between Costa Rica and Nicaragua;
- iv) on 11 April they published a declaration on the Contadora Group meeting in Panama (5 to 7 April);
- v) on 23 May the Twelve issued a statement on the Central American summit in Esquipulas.

In addition to these public statements of support and encouragement, the Twelve have continued to play an active diplomatic role. In particular, the President-in-Office of European political cooperation attended the Panama meeting on 5 to 7 April as an observer and met many of those involved in attempts to resolve Central America's problems peacefully in the margins of the meeting. For the future, the Twelve will continue to support the Contadora process actively.

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Docs. 86/024, 86/043, 86/085, 86/117, 86/153.

### **86/240. Question No 379/86 by Mr Glinne (S-B) Concerning UNESCO and Afghanistan**

Date of Issue: 23 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 28 May 1986

I understand that UNESCO intends to pay for 3 000 teaching staff to be sent from the Soviet Union to Afghanistan.

I would like to know if this information is correct. What will be the cost of this project? How is it compatible with the Afghan people's right to self-determination and cultural identity? Does European political cooperation accept this curious triangular relationship of UNESCO – USSR – Kabul 'Government', and if not, what action has it taken or does it intend to take?

*Answer:*

The information acquired by the Member of the European Parliament cannot be confirmed. Within UNESCO's plan of action for 1986/87 which was approved by the 23rd General Conference at Sofia an UNDP project was extended concerning assistance to the Teacher Training Institute in Afghanistan (AFG/83/019). Under this project UNESCO continues to provide technical expertise (eight experts) and a chief technical adviser for the said institute. UNESCO is not involved in bilateral initiatives regarding the institute.

**86/241. Question No 440/86 by Mr De Vries (LDR-NL) Concerning the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms**

Date of Issue: 23 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 28 May 1986

What action have the Member States taken since June 1985 on each of the following recommendations of the Colombo Commission<sup>1</sup>?

- a) a review of the procedural aspects of the machinery for the protection of human rights instituted by the European Convention, over and above the provisions of Protocol 8, to enable the organs of the Convention to discharge their duties with maximum speed;
- b) recognition of the right of the individual to refer to the Court applications declared admissible;
- c) examination of the desirability of instituting within the Council of Europe side-by-side with the procedures laid down in the Convention, a non-judicial procedure to foster respect for human rights;
- d) the study of ways and means to prevent the emergence of two different bodies of case law (that of the European Court of Human Rights and that of the Court of Justice of the European Communities) on the interpretation of the same rights, one such means being accession by the Community to the Convention?

*Answer:*

The twelve partners in EPC are fully committed on a national basis to implementing the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and play an active part within the framework of the Council of Europe in improving the practice of the European organs instituted by the Convention to ensure better protection of the rights and freedoms laid down in this instrument.

As to the various sub-questions asked by the Honourable Member the following provides a picture of developments up to June 1986:

- a) in the relevant committee of experts of the Council of Europe, partners are preparing methods of bringing about early improvements in procedures, in particular so as to enable the European Court of Human Rights and the Commission for Human Rights to discharge their obligations with greater efficiency;
- b) within the framework of the abovementioned committee the question of a ninth draft Protocol is under consideration. This draft does recognize under certain conditions the right of the individual to refer to the Court applications declared admissible;
- c) further study is needed of the idea of instituting, within the Council of Europe and in parallel with the procedures laid down in the Convention, a non-judicial procedure to foster human rights;
- d) further study is equally needed of the relationships between different bodies of case law (European Court of Human Rights and the Court of Justice of the EC). The Council cannot at this stage take a decision in principle on accession to the Convention by the Community with the necessary consensus.

---

<sup>1</sup> Strasbourg, June 1985.

**86/242. Question No 515/86 by Mr Perinat Elio (ED-E) Concerning a Common European Defence Market**

Date of Issue: 23 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 5 June 1986

Various Community political associations concerned with the subject of European defence have focused in their discussions and deliberations on the possibility of institutionalizing a 'Common European defence market' with all the political and military implications such an aspiration involves.

However, such a proposal, both because of the historical memories which the idea evoked in its time and because of the position currently adopted by the respective international defence alliances, calls for plans which require a firm political will to clarify the ideas referred to and to avoid unnecessary failure on specific detail, giving these plans scope commensurate with the importance of the subject.

Could the Ministers define their position on the matter in question so as to clarify the political ideas referred to above?

*Answer:*

The issue referred to by the Honourable Member of Parliament has not been discussed within the framework of European political cooperation.

### **86/243. Question No 530/86 by Mr Antony (DR-F) Concerning the Treatment of Lebanese Christians by the Cypriot Authorities**

Date of Issue: 23 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 6 June 1986

1. Having regard to the already appalling situation of Lebanese Christians,
2. whereas the Christian enclave in Lebanon, i.e. the civilized, beleaguered part, can only be left by the sea route between the port of Jounieh and the Cypriot port of Larnaca,
3. having regard to the Cypriot customs authorities' inhuman treatment of passengers disembarking from ships, involving hours of searches, with no thought for the fatigue of families or the misery of the children,
4. whereas, however, it was in the Islamic zones in Lebanon that Cypriot citizens were abducted,
5. whereas, furthermore, Cyprus receives considerable financial aid from the Community,

What steps do the Foreign Ministers intend to take to ensure that the Cypriot Government treats Lebanese Christians with due respect for human rights?

*Answer:*

The issue raised by the Honourable Member of Parliament has not been discussed by the Foreign Ministers meeting within the framework of political cooperation.

### **86/244. Question No 575/86 by Mr Cottrell (ED-UK) Concerning the Reaction of Greece to the Accord on Terrorism**

Date of Issue: 23 July 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question of 9 June 1986

The Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation agreed to diplomatic sanctions against the regime in Libya. Why did the Greek Government agree to that accord and then subsequently subtract themselves from it?

Have the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation sought an explanation from the Greek Government for this action? Since the Greek tourist economy is in tatters because of terrorism in that country, does the attitude of the Greek Government seem rational to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation?

*Answer:*

The measures regarding Libya adopted at ministerial meetings on 14 and 17 April were agreed to by all Twelve. Ministers continue to attach importance to the implementation of measures taken and discuss regularly the best way of furthering cooperation both within the Twelve and with like-minded countries. The issues raised by the Honourable Member of Parliament have not been discussed within European political cooperation.

### **86/245. Declaration Concerning Chile**

Date of Issue: 1 August 1986  
Place of Issue: London  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Declaration

The European Community again urge the Chilean Government to take early steps towards the orderly restoration of democracy and to initiate a dialogue with the democratic opposition. The EC deeply regret the deaths and injuries associated with the 2 and 3 July demonstrations in Chile and condemn recent violence from whatever source. They trust that the Chilean authorities will establish and publish the full facts about the cases of Sr Rojas and Srta Quintana.

### **86/246. Statement on the War Between Iran and Iraq**

Date of Issue: 6 August 1986  
Place of Issue: London  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: The Twelve  
Status of Document: Declaration

The twelve Member States of the European Community are very concerned at the recent increase in the number and seriousness of attacks by Iran and Iraq on targets in civilian areas, and at the threats by each side to escalate such attacks further. The Twelve urge each Government to exercise maximum restraint and to honour the undertakings given to the United Nations Secretary-General in June 1984 to cease deliberate attacks on civilian targets, as requested most recently in the Secretary-General's statement of 3 July.

The Twelve take this occasion to renew their appeal to both sides to respect Security Council Resolution 582, in particular by a general cessation of hostilities as soon as possible, and urge both sides to cooperate with the efforts of the Secretary-General in the search for a comprehensive and durable settlement which is acceptable to both sides.

### **86/247. Circular Concerning the Namibia Day**

Date of Issue: 19 August 1986  
Place of Issue: New York  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Unclassified

To: All EC Missions and  
the Delegation of the Commission of the European Communities  
From: UK Mission to the UN

1. For the sake of good order the Presidency circulates below the text of the message to mark Namibia Day agreed by Africa Experts this morning *ad referendum* to capitals. The Presidency would be grateful to know by 1700 hours New York time tomorrow (20 August) if partners have any further comments: the *Final Text of the message* will need to be sent to the acting President of the Council for Namibia by 22 August<sup>1</sup>.
2. Following is the text of the message:

Namibia Day draws to our attention a problem which has been before the United Nations virtually since its inception. Since the termination of South Africa's mandate over the territory the issue has become of the gravest international concern. 1986 sees the 20th anniversary of the adoption of GA Resolution 2145 (XXI). It is now nearly eight years since the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 435 (1978) endorsing a settlement plan for the territory. The twelve Member States of the European Community understand the bitterness and share the frustration felt by the African States and other members of the international community at this long lasting impasse over Namibia's future.

The Twelve have consistently reiterated their view that the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa must be brought to an end without further delay. They remain committed to a peaceful solution to the Namibia problem in keeping with the provisions of the Settlement Plan endorsed by Security Council Resolution 435 (1978) and confirmed by subsequent resolutions of the Council. This plan embodies the only agreed framework for a peaceful transition to internationally recognized independence, in a manner which is guaranteed by the UN to be free and fair and which will allow the people of Namibia freely to exercise their right to self-determination. Both the Government of South Africa and the South West African People's Organization (SWAPO) have formally accepted the plan, yet the Government of South Africa still delays its implementation. The Twelve call upon South Africa to cease its illegal occupation of Namibia immediately in order to allow Namibians their independence under the UN plan. The Twelve do not accept that the Settlement Plan should be delayed or set aside for extraneous reasons or for arrangements inconsistent with Resolution 435 (1978).

The Twelve consider as null and void the establishment by the South African authorities of a so-called transitional government in Namibia in violation of the explicit provisions of Security Council Resolution 435 (1978). The Twelve categorically reject any unilateral moves by the South African Government to transfer power in Namibia. Such moves can have no effect on the United Nations' plan.

The Twelve particularly deplore the continuing policy of intimidation and repression pursued by South Africa against the inhabitants of Namibia including the practice of detention without trial for indefinite periods and the resort to enforced conscription. South Africa has also, in defiance of international law, continued its armed incursions into Namibia's neighbours, particularly the People's Republic of Angola, thus imperilling their sovereignty and seriously undermining peace and stability in the region.

The Twelve forcibly condemn the use of violence by South Africa either against neighbouring States or in the maintenance of its illegal presence in Namibia.

The European Community and its Member States remain of the view that the United Nations has a primary duty to promote peaceful solutions in conformity with the Charter. They remain firmly committed to the independence of Namibia. They will continue their aid to the Namibian people, particularly through their support for the United Nations Institute for Namibia. They reaffirm their readiness to assist in the development of a free and independent Namibia. They will continue to press South Africa to abide by the clearly expressed decisions of the entire international community.

The Twelve give particular support to the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative to secure the urgent implementation of the Settlement Plan and will continue to work for and support this objective.

<sup>1</sup> Date: 21 August.

## **86/248. Message to the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement**

Date of Issue: 28 August 1986  
 Place of Issue: London  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Message

I have the honour on behalf of the Member States of the European Community to send you congratulations on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The Twelve acknowledge the contribution which a truly non-aligned movement can make to world stability, peace and development.

The continuing partnership between the Community and many Member States of the Non-Aligned Movement under the Lomé III Convention and other cooperation agreements is a notable example of our shared concerns<sup>1</sup>.

We look forward to continuing cooperation between the Twelve and members of the Non-Aligned Movement.

---

<sup>1</sup> This phrase was suggested by the Commission of the EC and refers to, for example, Mediterranean countries, ASEAN, Latin America, as well as the Lomé III countries. (The Editors)

### **86/249. Declaration Concerning Chile**

Date of Issue: 29 August 1986

Place of Issue: London

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: The Twelve

Status of Document: Declaration

The twelve Member States of the European Community, recalling the first anniversary of the '*Acuerdo nacional para la transición a la plena democracia*', reaffirm their belief as expressed in their Foreign Ministers' statement of 10 September 1985<sup>1</sup>, that the '*Acuerdo nacional*' provides a basis on which a dialogue between the Government and the democratic opposition on the restoration of democracy in Chile can shortly be started.

---

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 85/173.

### **86/250. Statement at the Biological Weapons Convention Review Conference (BWCRC)**

Date of Issue: 9 September 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

Mr President, I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community. I will then add a few words in my capacity as the representative of the United Kingdom. The Convention which we are to review is unique. It is the only arms control agreement in force which requires the eradication of an entire category of weapons from the arsenals of States. As such the Convention represents a significant milestone in the long and often difficult history of arms control and disarmament. The Twelve draw considerable encouragement from the fact that 103 States to date have become parties to the Convention. By so doing all States parties have committed themselves to play a full and active role in working to ensure that these appalling weapons are not used: and that the temptation to develop them is avoided. This is an issue of which East and West, and developing and industrialized countries alike share a common interest. The widest possible circle of membership for the Convention is a very important factor in creating confidence that this common objective will be realized.

Mr President, I should like to say a few words about the general principles underlying the attitudes of the Twelve at this Conference. The use of biological weapons is prohibited under the Geneva Protocol of 1925. The Biological Weapons Convention prohibits their development, production, stockpiling, acquisition or retention by other means. Taken together these two international agreements are intended to rid mankind of the fear of what Sir Winston Churchill correctly described as an unspeakable method

of warfare. The Twelve reaffirm their support for the objective of outlawing biological weapons from the face of the earth. They reaffirm their support for the Convention as an international norm against biological and toxic weapons, and one which provides a political and indeed moral standard by which the conduct of States in this area should be judged. The Twelve believe the Convention requires and deserves the support of the entire international community. For this reason the Twelve have actively sought during recent months to encourage non parties to adhere to the Convention. Wider adherence would increase international confidence in, and enhance the authority of the Convention as the international norm against biological weapons.

Mr President, the Twelve believe this Review Conference has an important task to fulfill in strengthening the general consensus in favour of the Convention's underlying aims, and indeed the general consensus that arms control and disarmament measures must be complemented by measures to encourage confidence and trust between the parties to them. The Twelve attach importance to the examination of additional measures to increase such confidence and cooperation.

Mr President, I should like to turn now to one crucial element in generating confidence among States parties to the Convention. As with any arms control and disarmament measure, they must have adequate assurance that its provisions are being complied with by all States parties. Without provisions for the verification of compliance those States parties that adhere scrupulously to the terms of the Convention can never be entirely confident that all other States parties will do the same. Secondly, those whose compliance with the Convention might be called into question are denied the means and opportunity within the treaty regime of conclusively proving their compliance.

Mr President, at the last Review Conference six years ago a number of delegations expressed reservations about the compliance mechanisms of the Convention. Regrettably such doubts have not been stilled with the passage of time. If doubts raised about the effectiveness of the Convention go unanswered, the authority of the Convention will be weakened. In the view of the Twelve, such a state of affairs would not be acceptable. Simply to say that such doubts are unwarranted, in effect to pretend that they do not exist would be an entirely inadequate response.

The Twelve believe therefore that the question of assurance of compliance is a crucial element for creating confidence in the Convention and strengthening authority. It is one which must play a major part in our work.

The Twelve also believe that there are two lessons to be drawn from this situation. The first is that, if an incident occurs which could give rise to doubts about compliance, it is incumbent on the party concerned to take all steps necessary, in conjunction with other States parties, to clarify the incident and, by doing so, promote confidence in the authority of the Convention.

The Twelve believe that the second lesson is that it is necessary to reduce the grounds for any lack of confidence and trust in the efficacy of the Convention. But there is no single predetermined system of verification which can be taken off the shelf, dusted down and applied to any arms control or disarmament situation. The appropriate mechanisms may also change with time. The pace of scientific and technological development over the last six years has been rapid. Techniques quite legitimately developed for civil purposes which are now widely available could, if abused, have repercussions for the Biological Weapons Convention. We need to draw the appropriate conclusions from these developments and examine what new arrangements might be required for there to be greater confidence that, were a State party to try evasion, it could not succeed without being rapidly detected.

The Twelve recognize that were amendment of the Convention thought necessary, this would not be within the competence of a Review Conference. The first Review Conference recognized that Article XII of the Convention did not provide it with a mandate for doing so. Decisions on appropriate new measures could not be taken at a Review Conference, nor in the short space of three weeks at our disposal. On the other hand, this underlines how important it is that the Conference consider the question of strengthening confidence in the Convention. The Twelve are also convinced that the Review Conference should record clearly the determination of all States to cooperate in doing so. We must begin to generate the momentum in favour of strengthening these procedures.

My final comment, Mr President, relates to compliance with Article X of the Convention, that which provides for the exchange of information on the peaceful development of microbiology. The Twelve

attach much importance to this aspect of the Convention, and have made considerable efforts to facilitate the flow of information. The spread of disease is not constrained by the existence of national boundaries. We must ensure that the same can be said of information about causes and cures.

Mr President, I have resisted the temptation to refer specifically to every one of the articles of the Biological Weapons Convention. I trust that this will not be taken as reflecting a lack of interest in them on the part of the Twelve. On the contrary, it is vitally important that we should focus on the issues confronting the Convention in present circumstances, as a constructive and realistic manner. The Twelve stand ready to collaborate in this process.

**86/251. Question No H-71/86 by Mr McMahon, Question No H-236/86 by Mr Cryer and Question No H-213/86 by Ms Dury Concerning the USA and the Political Situation in Nicaragua**

Date of Issue: 9 September 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Questions

*Question No H-71/86:*

What steps have the Ministers meeting in political cooperation taken following on the most recent decision of President Reagan to send increased military aid to the Contra regime in Nicaragua? Will the Ministers make representations to the US to cease destabilizing a democratically elected regime and will the Ministers utilize the historic links between the new Member State of Spain and Nicaragua in an attempt to bring peace and stability, free from outside interference, to this country?

*Question No H-213/86:*

Could the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation explain in detail their attitude to the United States's repeated attempts to destabilize the Nicaraguan regime and their reaction to the work of the Contadora Group?

*Question No H-236/86:*

What representations have been made, following Ministers meeting in political cooperation, to the USA asking the Government under President Reagan to cease from their efforts to destabilize Nicaragua by promoting acts of terrorism through the Contras especially in view of the increase in military aid which President Reagan is sending to this discredited band of cut-throat brigands?

*Ms Chalker, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers:* The Twelve have repeatedly made clear their view that the problems of Central America cannot be solved by armed force, but only by a political solution coming from the region itself. The Twelve have therefore consistently supported the efforts of the Contadora Group to achieve a comprehensive and very viable settlement on the basis of the objectives agreed by the Central American States in September 1983 and have urged countries with links and interests in the region to contribute to the creation of conditions favourable to the peaceful resolution of its problems. The Twelve have ensured that all concerned, including the United States, are fully aware of their views.

*Mr McMahon (S):* Bearing in mind that two-thirds of the Community assistance to the whole of Central America goes to Nicaragua, and having regard to the recent shocking decision of the United States Administration blocking an Oxfam shipment of pipes, agricultural seed, implements and so on, what representations will the Council make to the Government of the United States about this action, and will the President-in-Office guarantee to protect Community citizens who are employed in



humanitarian schemes in Nicaragua, particularly people working in the Belem health centre funded by the European Community and Scottish Medical Aid for Nicaragua? When will the Council tell the President of the United States to respect international law regarding his policies in Nicaragua?

*Ms Chalker:* Could I say that I believe that the Twelve are absolutely right in supporting the Contadora process through political dialogue and economic cooperation. That is why we remain in close touch with the Contadora Group. The role of the Twelve is to provide support for their efforts. As I think the Honourable Member may know, an economic cooperation agreement was signed at Luxembourg in November to offer practical support.

The Community declared its willingness to increase substantially the volume of aid in all forms to the region. Additional aid to be given is designed to support the Contadora aim of encouraging regional cooperation in Central America. I understand there is a provision already made for a significant increase in aid to Central America and I am sure that the Commission will be happy to provide the latest figures.

Could I say to the honourable gentleman that I believe it is very important that we remember that those who go to these countries to work freely do know what kind of situation they are going into. But if he has specific questions about Community citizens in that part of the world, no doubt he will write either to the Commission or to the Presidency-in-Office.

With regard to his comments about the United States, let me just say that the Twelve have made it absolutely clear that we support a comprehensive, verifiable and simultaneous agreement based on the Contadora document of objectives, and we do not consider that the problems of the region can be resolved by armed force. We have made the United States fully aware of the views of the Twelve.

*Ms Cryer (S):* Would the Minister explain why the views of the Twelve supporting the Contadora Group's solution to the problems of Nicaragua do not seem to have had much effect on the United States? When she casually dismisses visits by people such as the delegation from Sheffield who went to plan the provision of an ordinary basic water supply, when she says that they know the situation they are going to, does she mean that she accepts the brutality of the Contras, the murdering of men, women and children in a situation which is commonly known as terrorism and which the Conservative Government continually condemns – those terrorists being financed and supported with military supplies by the United States? Can she not put the same sort of zest and determination into expressing the views to the Reagan Government that she expresses about the development of the internal market, and is she convinced that Ms Thatcher is not undermining the views of the Twelve by acting as Reagan's poodle on every aspect of United States foreign policy?

*Ms Chalker:* In answering questions on political cooperation, I will not be answering the last point raised by the honourable gentleman. We have made it absolutely clear to the United States Administration, as has the President-in-Office of the Council, that the Twelve stand together and believe firmly that the problems in that area cannot be solved by armed force. We have urged restraint on all sides and we shall continue to do so.

As regards those persons who go from his area to do very worthwhile and much needed work in the region, I believe that they must go with their eyes open to the situation existing there, but that is not to say that we will not continue to do all we can to get terrorism in the area to cease, however it occurs. Might I remind him that it is not only the Twelve who support the Contadora process. In May of this year the US Government reaffirmed their support for a comprehensive, verifiable and simultaneous settlement which would answer the 21 Contadora objectives. It is that which we must continue working for and this is not a situation which is going to be solved by political jingoism which is I am afraid all too often what is heard from the left.

*Mr Hughes (S):* The President-in-Office has said very little but said it very carefully as she usually does on these occasions. I wonder if she could come out and say quite categorically that the United States is flagrantly using this money to train terrorists in Costa Rica, Puerto Rico and Honduras and yet condemns Colonel Ghadafi for supposedly sponsoring terrorists; secondly, that they are actually standing in the way of the Contadora process, despite their mealy-mouthed pronouncements on this subject earlier this year; thirdly, that they have made determined efforts to stand in the way of all peace processes in that area and to stop self-determination in Nicaragua; fourthly, that a new round of slaughter

has been commenced by the Contras in Nicaragua. In view of all these things would the President-in-Office not say that it is high time that the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation condemned the United States Administration policy on Nicaragua and gave all possible support to the Sandanistas in Nicaragua in the face of this pressure?

*Ms Chalker:* I have to tell the honourable gentleman that none of the discussions in political cooperation would enable me as President-in-Office to answer any of the points he has made. I understand his concern. I also understand very well that there is anxiety to see that more is done to support the Contadora process, but that is exactly the policy of the Twelve. It is the policy which will continue as far as I am aware amongst the Twelve, and the comments in this particular question will of course form part of my consideration at a meeting of the Twelve in political cooperation to take place very shortly.

*Mr Boesmans (S):* Notwithstanding that last answer by the President-in-Office, I continue to regard it as a highly curious situation that we on the one hand should have made Nicaragua one of our major partners in development cooperation, while on the other development aid is being systematically cut off by our alliance partner the United States. There is more to this than just an attack directed against a third country: rather it concerns a country that we in Europe carefully selected as a major aid recipient.

What we have given is being cut off, and a great deal more is being destroyed than we have ever given. It is also the case that tens of thousands of people, including some Europeans, have already been killed as a result of aggression by the United States. Surely that is worth something better than an answer along the lines of, 'Yes, but we have informed our American alliance partner that we continue to support the Contadora initiative.'

I would therefore ask the Minister what concrete steps have been taken in the past half-year to register a protest with the United States at the deaths of five European development workers in addition to the tens of thousands who have already been killed in recent years in Nicaragua, and what consultation has taken place among the Twelve to ensure our support for the future, now that the United States has approved an extra 100 million dollars in aid to the Contras? Have we adopted any measures in that connection for the aid granted hitherto to be maintained and strengthened to enable a stand to be made against the United States backed Contras?

*Ms Chalker:* Might I remind the Honourable Member that the destruction is not only going on in Nicaragua. There is destruction going on in many of the other countries in the area and that is why the Contadora process is important. It is not only important for Nicaragua, it is important for every single country in that area where there is no democracy and where terrorism has been going on for some considerable time. The matter has not been on the agenda of political cooperation in recent months but the concern being expressed will obviously be noted by the Council.

*Mr Hutton (ED):* Could the President-in-Office tell us whether or not the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation have discussed the grave issues raised in the deeply moving letter issued by the Nicaraguan bishops in July which detailed the very considerable difficulties under which the church is trying to work in Nicaragua including the refusal to allow the Sisters of Mother Theresa of Calcutta to set up two missions in that country? If they have not done so would they discuss them soon and would she tell us if the Foreign Ministers will urge the Nicaraguan Government to restore human rights, allow free speech and set a date for properly free elections in that country?

*Ms Chalker:* May I say that we are deeply concerned at the contents of that letter – the denial of human rights and the lack of democracy. That is why we have in the Central America working group been giving attention to the needs of that area. As President-in-Office, I can certainly give an undertaking to the Honourable Member to raise that matter further.

## **86/252. Question No H-80/86 by Mr Balfe Concerning the US Air Raid on Tripoli**

Date of Issue: 9 September 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

How many citizens of Member States were either killed or injured in the USA raid on Tripoli on the night of 14-15 April 1986, how many Member States' diplomatic premises were damaged and will the Member States be seeking compensation from the US Government?

*Ms Chalker, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers:* Two Greek citizens were slightly injured in the United States' air-raid on installations in Tripoli. The French Embassy was damaged and evacuated. Some windows were broken in Danish and Spanish diplomatic premises. The question of compensation for damage suffered has been discussed in European political cooperation.

*Mr Balfe:* Does the President-in-Office not sometimes reflect on the hypocrisy of its attitude to countries like the United States with regard to its sponsorship of terrorism in Nicaragua and its attitude to the United States when it bombs Community embassies? I wonder whether the matter should not be discussed. Can the Minister also tell us, in view of concern expressed in recent days, whether any European bases, and in particular British bases will again be used for terrorist raids on Libya? People in Britain are getting increasingly concerned not only at the way in which troops can apparently fly in and out, uncontrolled by British citizens or the Government, but also at the reprisals which are taken against British citizens because of the irresponsibility of this Government.

The Minister will know that only this afternoon I handed in a letter from a constituent concerned about two Britons who have been kidnapped in the Lebanon and the plight which might befall them if there is yet further British support for raids against Tripoli. I hope the President-in-Office can give us some assurances that we shall not be used as a staging post and a poodle for Mr Reagan.

*Ms Chalker:* I think I have to say that that question is more properly addressed to me in my role as a Foreign Minister in the British Parliament rather than as President-in-Office answering questions on European political cooperation. However, I will do my best to help the Honourable Member because I do understand his anxiety.

Let me say to him that in Libya Colonel Ghadafi committed the Libyan Government to organizing and directing a worldwide campaign of terrorist violence against innocent people. That is something that no one in the free world can allow to go uncontrolled one way or another. This European Community, through political cooperation, is taking all possible steps to ensure that such a campaign of terrorism cannot resume or continue in the world again. However, I must say the Honourable Member, when he refers to the letter handed in this afternoon, that whilst I understand his anxiety about the use of bases, the use of British or any other bases is not a matter for the Presidency. I would remind him of what the British Foreign Secretary said in April of this year, namely, that what had happened at that time was no blank cheque and that we would be bound to consider any issue on its merits if the matter arose again. The matter has not arisen again and I sincerely hope that it will not.

*Mr Marshall (ED):* Would the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers not agree that the evidence is irrefutable that Colonel Ghadafi is the very godfather of international terrorism? In view of the recent incidents in Turkey and Paris would she not agree that all Community countries should close Libyan People's bureaux in their countries as they become the centre of international terrorism and would she also not agree that flights between the Community and Tripoli would be better stopped?

*Ms Chalker:* In the United Kingdom we have indeed taken a number of steps. But let me remind Honourable Members what the Twelve have done to cooperate in the fight against terrorism. There is absolutely no doubt that they have enhanced security at airports, ports, and railway stations. They have introduced more effective frontier controls. They have improved coordination of their visa policies and they have taken action against the abuse of diplomatic immunity. However, more still probably needs to be done. That I can accept.

May I say that we have made it clear as the Twelve that no State which supports terrorism can expect to have normal relations with us. Libya ignored that warning. In April, the Twelve acted together. We have reduced the size of the Libyan People's bureaux and agreed other measures. In addition we set up special machinery in political cooperation and in the Trevi framework, to improve the operational aspects of the fight against terrorism. However, whether or not we shall succeed depends not only on the determination of the Twelve but also of many nations outside the Community as well. At the meeting of Interior Ministers which the UK Presidency has arranged in London, when all these measures will be

reviewed, and we shall consider what further action is necessary, I am quite sure that the Twelve will want to send out messages to other nations which can play an equal role. We, of course, condemn the loss of life in any incidents which occur, but we do not have the specific evidence that I think the honourable gentleman was referring to at the start of his question.

*Mr Cryer (S):* Since the President-in-Office has accepted that there was loss of life in Tripoli, I wonder if she could produce some evidence of the alleged plots organized by Colonel Ghadafi which were used to justify the loss of life, rather than depend simply on right-wing sloganizing? Could she also assure this Assembly that in future discussions of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation she will be full and frank — unlike the Foreign Secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe, who agreed with the other eleven Ministers that there should be a political solution to the problem arising out of Libya and at the same time knew that F-111s were prepared to go out on their mission to destroy life and limb and property from United Kingdom bases, therefore placing every United Kingdom citizen in jeopardy particularly those in the Middle East. Could she give us that assurance?

*President of the European Parliament:* Before I ask the Minister to reply, I really must ask Members when they put questions not to make any personal allegations against individuals, including the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom. I hope that Mr Cryer will comply with the normal procedure of Parliament and not speak the way he has just spoken.

*Ms Chalker:* I will not be drawn by the Honourable Member for Sheffield. I have known him too long. I will say to Parliament that, of course, intelligence information would not be valid intelligence information if it were distributed, least of all, to the Honourable Member for Sheffield. May I say that whatever the problems of April, sadly we cannot change the past. We can work to defeat terrorism in the future. If the energies of certain Honourable Members in this Parliament and elsewhere were as committed to defeating terrorism in the future as they are to making the sort of statements we have heard this afternoon, then perhaps we might succeed a little easier.

*Mr Heinrich (ARC):* Have the Foreign Ministers meanwhile obtained any proof that Libya was involved in the attack on the *La Belle* discothèque in Berlin, which was supposedly the justification for bombing Libya?

My second question is this: apparently rumours originating in intelligence circles have claimed in recent weeks that Libya is planning new attacks in Europe and the USA. Do the Foreign Ministers have any proof of the truth of these rumours? Libya has distanced itself from them and called on the USA to name names and give concrete information. Libya would than be prepared, it says, to arrest those responsible to keep them from committing acts of terror. What do the Foreign Ministers know about this?

My third question: what do the Foreign Ministers propose doing to prevent further bombings or other attacks against Libyan territory? As you know, the American President's special envoy General Vernon Walters was again visiting Europe some days ago, as he did before the first bombing. What is known exactly about this mission of his?

*Ms Chalker:* Could I say first of all that, of course, there was intelligence information about Berlin, but that is not a matter for public disclosure. I base my understanding of what goes on in Libya, as do the Twelve and the President-in-Office of the Council, on the public statements by Colonel Ghadafi, the leader of Libya. I base them not on intelligence reports, but on his avowed intent to perpetrate terrorism at large. May I say to the Parliament that it is not just a question of working, as the honourable lady said, on rumour. Our secret services do not work on rumour; they work on fact. Nobody would be more glad than the President-in-Office if Libya would change its policies and work for a different sort of world from that which it has been busy promoting for so long. As far as the visits of General Walters are concerned, I understand that there has been an exchange of views on how best to combat international terrorism wherever it may occur and however it may be caused. The emphasis was on the continued importance of firm, sustained and collective international action in which cooperation between countries of the European Community and the United States play a crucial role. There was no further discussion than that.

*Mr Habsburg (PPE):* My question has already been answered by the Minister as I wanted to ask whether the previous questioner was not aware of what Colonel Ghadafi had said in Harare in his speech in which he admitted that he was the head of international terrorism.

*Ms Chalker:* I would simply say that it has not only been the most recent statement, of which the Honourable Member reminds us, but, of course, repeated statements over a long period of time on which we base our comments.

**86/253. Question No H-101/86 by Mr Schwalba-Hoth Concerning the Expulsion of Fourteen Thousand American Indians from their Reservation in Arizona and their Compulsory Resettlement<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 9 September 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

What is the Foreign Ministers' view of the expulsion of fourteen thousand American Indians from the reservation in Arizona where they have been living since 1982? Are the Foreign Ministers prepared to endorse the protests to the US Administration against this compulsory resettlement – the possible use of troops has been announced – since the sole reason for this action is reported to be to facilitate the extraction of mineral resources?

*Ms Chalker, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers:* This subject has not been discussed within the framework of European political cooperation.

*Mr Schwalba-Hoth (ARC):* What contacts have taken place between the European Community and the USA to ascertain that the Community has no competence in this matter?

*Ms Chalker:* We certainly are very much aware of what has been going on but I do not believe it is for the Twelve in political cooperation to make representations to the United States on this matter. It is an internal United States' matter. It is an historical dispute, I understand, between the Navajo and the Hopi over land-ownership and those involved have democratic channels open to them to make their views known within the United States. I really do not think it is a matter for political cooperation in the Twelve.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *OJ* No 2-342 of 9 September 1986, pp. 92-93.

**86/254. Question No H-231/86 by Mr Habsburg Concerning the Implementation of the Yalta Agreement**

Date of Issue: 10 September 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Given the expressed desire of the new Soviet leadership for transparency in respecting international agreements and the right of any one signatory State to call for a review of its implementation, will the Foreign Ministers under the British Presidency invite the Governments of the Soviet Union and the United States of America to review the implementation of the Yalta Agreement?

*Answer:*

The issue raised by the Honourable Member has not been discussed within European political cooperation.

**86/255. Question No H-202/86 by Mr Wurtz Concerning the Wrongful Imprisonment of Mr Serfati, the Former Director of Moroccan Phosphates**

Date of Issue: 10 September 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Despite repeated assurances by the Moroccan authorities, Mr Serfati, an engineer and the former director of Moroccan Phosphates, who has been wrongfully held in prison for ten years, has still not been released. Mr Serfati's health has deteriorated – he is almost blind – and it is becoming increasingly urgent that his unconditional release be demanded. What steps have the Foreign Ministers taken to obtain Mr Serfati's release and what has been the response of the Moroccan authorities?

*Answer:*

The case of Mr Abraham Serfati raised by the Honourable Member has not been discussed within the framework of European political cooperation. However, the question of Mr Serfati's condition has been raised by individual partners with the Moroccan authorities on several occasions.

**86/256. Question No H-358/86 by Mr Kolokotronis Concerning the Turkish Policy on the Islands of Imvros and Tenedos<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 10 September 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

The islands of Imvros and Tenedos in the Aegean Sea were ceded to Turkey under the Treaty of Lausanne (1922-23) despite the fact that their populations were entirely Greek.

Ever since then Turkey, in violation of its international obligations, has pursued – with success – a policy of altering the demographic composition of the population of the two islands. The number of Greeks living on Tenedos has been reduced from 2 500 to 100 and on Imvros from 9 207 to 650.

In view of the fact that this policy constitutes a direct violation of:

1. the Treaty of Lausanne (Articles 38-44 and Article 14, and paragraph 5 of the 15th annexed protocol);
2. the Advisory Opinion of 6 April 1935 of the International Court in The Hague;
3. the Convention on Human Rights;

will the Ministers please state what view they take of Turkish policy on the matter in question and what steps they propose to take, and with what aim in view?

*Answer:*

The issue raised by the Honourable Member has not been discussed within European political cooperation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Former Oral Question without debate (0-60/86) converted into a question for Question Time.

**86/257. Question No H-227/86 by Mr Iversen Concerning the Wages Policy of UK Companies in South Africa**

Date of Issue: 10 September 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

A report drawn up by the Ethical Investment Research and Information Service ('UK Companies' South African Pay and Conditions', EIRIS, 9 Poland Street, London W1V 3 DG) shows that UK companies in South Africa in very many cases pay much lower wages to the black workers employed by them in South Africa than the minimum wage stipulated in the Community's Code of Conduct for South Africa. For example, British Petroleum pays its black workers only 198 rand a month whereas the minimum wage under the Community Code is 525 rand per month.

What comments do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation have to make about these figures and what measures are the Foreign Ministers thinking of taking *vis-à-vis* the UK Government to have these figures put right?

*Answer:*

The Twelve believe that the Code of Conduct has played an important part in improving the pay, conditions and prospects of black workers in South Africa. Member States do not comment on the performance of individual companies, but reports under the Code indicate that the large majority of European countries with interests in South Africa do meet the Code's requirements. Member States will continue to urge all companies to comply fully with the provisions of the Code, the revised and strengthened text of which was agreed by Foreign Ministers in November 1985<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 85/292.

**86/258. Question No H-278/86 by Mr Griffiths Concerning Exit Visas for Israel to Jews by the Soviet Union**

Date of Issue: 10 September 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

What steps have been taken by the Foreign Ministers to persuade the Soviet Union to grant exit visas for Israel to Jews who have made such applications and especially for those who have been waiting for more than ten years?

*Answer:*

The Twelve attach great importance to the respect of the provision in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights (1948) that every person has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country. The provisions in the Helsinki Final Act as well as those contained in the Madrid Closing Document also pertain to the right to emigrate. This issue was in particular raised at the Ottawa Experts' Meeting on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, as well as at the Berne Experts' Meeting on Human Contacts.

**86/259. Question No H-280/86 by Mr Papoutsis Concerning the Reduction of Conventional Forces and Arms on European Territory**

Date of Issue: 10 September 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

At the most recent Warsaw Pact summit the General Secretary of the CPSU, Mikhail Gorbachev, put forward certain specific proposals for the reduction of conventional forces in Europe. Does the President of the Council, within the context of political cooperation among the Twelve, intend to explore the possibilities with both camps (USA and USSR) of a reduction in conventional forces and arms in Europe?

*Answer:*

The question raised by the Honourable Member does not fall within the scope of European political cooperation.

**86/260. Question No H-288/86 by Mr Saridakis Concerning the Action to Be Taken Following Mr A. Papandreou's Briefing of the European Council (The Hague, 26-27 June)**

Date of Issue: 10 September 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

The Greek Prime Minister, Mr A. Papandreou, briefed the European Council in The Hague on certain new aspects of relations between Greece and Turkey, at least according to statements made to the press by some of the leaders of the Community Member States. Mr Papandreou himself told Greek journalists of his satisfaction at the understanding his briefing had met with from his colleagues.

Would the President of the Council of Ministers inform the European Parliament whether these new aspects will induce the Council of Ministers meeting in political cooperation to call on Turkey to end its acts of provocation and its expansionist designs against Greece, a Member State of the Community, and to make this a condition of an improvement in relations between Turkey and the Community?

*Answer:*

Relations between the Community and Turkey are dealt with in the Community and the political cooperation framework. The Twelve continue to monitor political and other developments touching upon these relations. The Prime Minister of Greece expressed his views and concerns on the matter at the European Council of The Hague on 26 June, while this has also been discussed by the Council of Ministers.

**86/261. Question No H-292/86 by Mr Gerontopoulos Concerning the Meeting of the States of Central America in Esquipulas**

Date of Issue: 10 September 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question



At their meeting in Esquipulas the Presidents of the States of Central America decided to institutionalize their meetings and to set up a permanent body to be known as the Conference of Vice-Presidents. They also decided to organize elections to a Central American Parliament by direct universal suffrage.

Have the Foreign Ministers considered the joint declaration issued after the Presidents' meeting and what are their comments on this initiative as a possible means of reviving the Contadora Group's peace initiative?

*Answer:*

The Twelve remain committed to a peaceful resolution of the problems of Central America on the basis of the objectives agreed by the Contadora Group. They welcomed the Esquipulas summit in a statement on 21 May<sup>1</sup> and have made clear their support for any moves, such as the decision to establish a directly elected Central American Parliament, which may help to strengthen democracy in the region. The Twelve have taken particular note of the proposals designed to increase economic and political cooperation amongst the five countries and reiterate their conviction that peace and stability throughout this region have a critical role to play in the development of such cooperation.

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/154.

### **86/262. Question No H-300/86 by Mr Filinis Concerning the Summit Meeting in The Hague and Statements on South Africa**

Date of Issue: 10 September 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Once again, at the summit meeting in The Hague, instead of deciding on practical action in support of anti-apartheid groups and restrictive economic measures, the European Community preferred simply to express its regret at the regime in South Africa and reiterate a few toothless pronouncements which had already been made at the political cooperation meeting on 10 September 1985.

Do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation not think that the Community's inability to agree on a common foreign policy weakens its credibility and that its failure to impose sanctions represents in practice direct and tacit support for a regime which is underpinned by trade and investment from the Member States of the Community?

*Answer:*

The Heads of State or Government issued a full statement on the Twelve's policy towards South Africa at the meeting of the European Council in The Hague on 26-27 June<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/185.

### **86/263. Question No H-303/86 by Sir Peter Vanneck Concerning the Possible Implications of Sanctions Against the Republic of South Africa**

Date of Issue: 10 September 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

In the event of sanctions by the Community against the Republic of South Africa, how do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation intend to apportion the burden of supporting the economies of the 'front-line' States?

*Answer:*

The Twelve have developed no specific plans in the framework of European political cooperation to deal with the situation described by the Honourable Member. The situation in Southern Africa is, however, regularly discussed in EPC – for example, at the meeting with the front-line States in Lusaka in February 1986.

Individual partners as well as the Community as a whole are actively involved in supporting SADCC in an effort to diminish the dependence of the front-line States on South Africa. Recent developments in Southern Africa show the need for continuing support for SADCC.

**86/264. Question No H-317/86 by Ms Lienemann Concerning the Situation in South Africa**

Date of Issue: 10 September 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

The situation in South Africa is giving increasing cause for concern. Can the Ministers say what political and economic measures they propose to take to induce the South African Government to abandon its policy of repression and apartheid?

*Answer:*

The European Council issued a full statement on the Twelve's policy towards South Africa on 27 June<sup>1</sup>. Since then the Presidency's Foreign Minister has undertaken a mission to Southern Africa on behalf of the Twelve in a further effort to establish the necessary conditions for dialogue. The Presidency has also contacted other industrialized countries to discuss possible restrictive measures which might be taken against South Africa.

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/185.

**86/265. Question No H-318/86 by Ms Daly Concerning the Soviet Persecution of Christian Activist Irina Ratushinskaya**

Date of Issue: 10 September 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Will the Foreign Ministers intervene with the Soviet authorities to obtain the release from labour camp of Irina Ratushinskaja, a Christian serving a 12-year sentence and suffering persecution for writing religious poetry, participation in human rights demonstrations and a refusal to discriminate against Jewish examination candidates when as a physicist she was a staff member of the Odessa Teaching Training College?

*Answer:*

The case of Irina Ratushinskaja mentioned by the Honourable Member has not been discussed as such in the framework of European political cooperation. However, the respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief without distinction of race, sex, language or religion is stipulated in the Helsinki Final Act. The Twelve, individually and collectively, use every occasion that presents itself to remind the Soviet Union of the obligations it accepted by signing the Final Act and by adhering to the UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

**86/266. Question No H-319/86 by Ms Crawley Concerning the Meeting of European Women with Lord Carrington**

Date of Issue: 10 September 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Earlier this year, a group of women representing all NATO countries approached the Secretary-General of NATO, Lord Carrington, with the view to securing a meeting with him. The visit, to be coordinated by Women for Peace Brussels, was to coincide with International Women's Day of Disarmament, and the women wished to discuss with Lord Carrington their views and feelings about today's nuclear world, and possible steps towards disarmament. It was felt that this meeting would be particularly appropriate in this United Nations Year of Peace.

Lord Carrington replied, and has subsequently repeated, that he is unable to meet the women, and has suggested that instead they see a NATO official. However, the women feel that it is important for them to speak directly to Lord Carrington even if only for a short time.

Do the Foreign Ministers not feel that the Secretary-General should make time in his admittedly very busy timetable to meet this group?

Would the Foreign Ministers undertake to use the influence they have to persuade Lord Carrington to meet the women?

*Answer:*

The question of whether or not Lord Carrington should meet a group of European women falls outside the scope of European political cooperation.

**86/267. Question No H-331/86 by Mr Newens Concerning the Views of the British Prime Minister on the PLO**

Date of Issue: 10 September 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Do the Ministers share the views of the British Prime Minister on the PLO, as expressed during her visit to Israel in May 1986?

*Answer:*

The Twelve believe that a just and lasting solution to the Arab-Israel dispute must be based on the two universally accepted principles: the right to existence and security of all the States in the region, including

Israel, and justice for all peoples, which implies the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination with all that that implies.

The Twelve believe that these principles are binding on all the parties concerned – i.e. on Israel, on the Palestinian people, and on the PLO which will have to be associated with the peace negotiations.

**86/268. Question No H-360/86 by Mr Seligman Concerning Human Rights for the Baha'i in Iran**

Date of Issue: 10 September 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Since probably 200 Baha'i have been executed in recent years in Iran and over 800 members of the faith are currently imprisoned in Iran, what measures are the Council adopting to use the full weight of the Community's political and commercial influence to re-establish human rights for the Baha'i in Iran?

*Answer:*

The Twelve have on several occasions made clear to the Iranian authorities their serious concern at the treatment of the Baha'i community in Iran. The Twelve have also called upon the Iranian Government to respect its obligations under the UN Charter and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

**86/269. Question No H-371/86 by Mr Hutton Concerning Chemical Weapon Disarmament**

Date of Issue: 10 September 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Have the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation had the opportunity to discuss and endorse the United Kingdom initiative on chemical weapon challenge inspection tabled at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva in July?

*Answer:*

Foreign Ministers of the Twelve regularly discuss East-West relations and disarmament matters, including those pertaining to chemical weapons. In this context, the UK initiative on a challenge inspection tabled at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva has been briefly touched upon and has been welcomed.

**86/270. Statement Concerning the Release of Political Prisoners in Poland**

Date of Issue: 15 September 1986  
Place of Issue: Brussels  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: The Twelve  
Status of Document: Declaration

The Twelve welcome the decision of the Polish Government announced on 11 September on the release of political prisoners. Recalling their statement on the occasion of the amnesty announced in July 1984, they

hope that the Polish Government's action on this occasion will prove to be an important step towards national reconciliation and that it will be followed by further measures to promote dialogue and democratic reform.

## 86/271. Statement on South Africa

Date of Issue: 16 September 1986  
 Place of Issue: Brussels  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Foreign Ministers  
 Status of Document: Declaration

1. The Foreign Ministers of the Twelve reviewed their policy towards South Africa in the light of decisions adopted at the Hague European Council on 26/27 June<sup>1</sup>. They heard a report from Sir Geoffrey Howe on the mission to the region which he undertook at the request of the Heads of State or Government.

2. Ministers expressed their grave concern that the situation in South Africa appeared to have entered a new phase of increased tension under the state of emergency. They shared the widespread anxiety within the Member States over reports of the conditions in which some detainees are being held. They once again condemned the practice of detention without trial. They called for the release of all people so detained under the state of emergency, which they wished to see brought to an end.

3. Ministers underlined the importance they attached to the strengthening and more effective coordination of the positive measures being taken to assist the victims of apartheid both by Member States and by the Community itself. They noted that the draft Community budget for 1987 forwarded to the European Parliament by the Council on 10 September contained an increased provision for the Community programme, with particular emphasis on training.

4. Ministers reaffirmed the urgent need for a genuine national dialogue, across lines of colour, politics and religion. They deplored the fact that the South African Government was not yet prepared to take the steps necessary to make this possible. Two steps in particular were identified at The Hague:

- i) the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners;
- ii) the lifting of the ban on the African National Congress, the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania and other political parties.

They undertook to work towards a programme of political action designed to promote the achievement of these objectives.

5. In view of the South African Government's failure to respond and after consultation with other industrialized countries Ministers decided that the Twelve should now proceed to adopt a package of restrictive measures on the lines envisaged at The Hague. This consists of bans on new investment and on the import of iron, steel and gold coins from South Africa. On implementation, they took an immediate decision to suspend imports of iron and steel in the framework of the ECSC Council with effect from 27 September.

Ministers also decided to ban the import of gold coins originating in South Africa and new investments in that country, without prejudice to the means of implementation of these measures which will be the subject of further examination by the Committee of Permanent Representatives and the Political Committee.

6. Most partners were also willing to implement a ban on the import of coal from South Africa if a consensus on this could be achieved. On this question, the Presidency will continue to seek consensus on the basis of the statement made by the Hague European Council.

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/185; *Bull. EC* 6-1986, point 1.1.18.

### **86/272. Statement on Chile**

Date of Issue: 16 September 1986  
Place of Issue: Brussels  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: The Twelve  
Status of Document: Declaration

The Twelve are deeply concerned about the reimposition of the state of siege and the repressive measures that have followed the attempted assassination of General Pinochet. They deplore all acts of violence from whatever quarter. The Twelve express the strongest concern about the loss of life which has taken place and call for the immediate lifting of the state of siege.

The Twelve call on the Chilean Government to resume without delay and accelerate the process of restoring democracy, without which no lasting solution to the country's problems is possible. They appeal for the immediate release of imprisoned opposition leaders, trade unionists, journalists and others summarily detained, for the lifting of restrictions on the media and an end to the activities of armed bands in Chile. And they reiterate their hope that an early dialogue can be started between the Government and the democratic opposition.

The Twelve protest in the strongest possible terms about the deplorable incident in Santiago on 8 September involving the Dutch chargé d'affaires. This was a serious breach of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations and the Twelve call for the immediate release of the students arrested on that occasion.

### **86/273. Statement at the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Namibia, Held on 17-20 October 1986**

Date of Issue: 18 September 1986  
Place of Issue: New York  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: British Delegation  
Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Sir John Thomson:* Mr President, this is the fourth time the General Assembly has been called into Special Session to discuss the question of Namibia. During the Eighth Emergency Special Session in September 1981 my distinguished predecessor, Sir Anthony Parsons, had the honour to speak on behalf of the Member States of the European Community. I do so again today.

Namibia has been an acknowledged international responsibility for over sixty years and an issue which has been before the United Nations virtually since its inception. Since the termination of South Africa's mandate over the Territory the matter has become one of grave international concern. 1986 sees the 20th anniversary of the adoption of GA Resolution 2145 (XXI). It is now nearly eight years since the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 435 (1978) endorsing a Settlement Plan for the Territory. Five years ago my predecessor expressed the grave concern of the Member States of the EC about the consequences for Southern Africa that would result from delay in reaching agreement on the implementation of that plan. Time has shown how right that warning was. We share the bitterness and frustration felt by African States and other members of the international community at this long lasting impasse over Namibia's future.

The position of the Twelve on the question of Namibia is clear and unambiguous. The illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa must be brought to an end. The only acceptable basis for a peaceful and lasting solution to the problem is the implementation, without preconditions or pretext, of Security Council Resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). The Settlement Plan endorsed by the second of these Resolutions, has been accepted both by the Government of South Africa and by the South West African People's Organization. It embodies the only universally accepted framework for a peaceful transition to independence in a manner which is guaranteed by this Organization to be free and fair. We firmly believe that the people of Namibia must be permitted to exercise their right to self-determination

through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations in accordance with the Settlement Plan. It is essential that South Africa should not subordinate the implementation of the Settlement Plan to the fulfilment of conditions which are extraneous to the independence of the Territory. We do not accept that it should be delayed or put aside for such reasons or for arrangements inconsistent with Security Council Resolution 435 (1978). We wish to see the plan implemented in its entirety without further delay so that the people of Namibia can move forward to the internationally recognized independence which is their due.

Unfortunately the South African Government has not yet seen fit to move forward in this way. On the contrary that Government has so far chosen to maintain its illegal occupation of Namibia in defiance of international opinion. In this context the Twelve particularly deplore the decision of the South African authorities to establish a so-called 'transitional Government' in Namibia in violation of the explicit provisions of Security Council Resolution 435 (1978). This resolution does not authorize the South African Government to delegate its responsibilities in the implementation of the United Nations Settlement Plan. The purely unilateral South African initiative establishing a so-called 'transitional Government' in Namibia represents a mere manoeuvre, aimed at further delaying Namibia's peaceful achievement of independence, as well as circumventing the United Nations and excluding it from the settlement process. The Twelve consider as null and void this measure taken by Pretoria and categorically reject any unilateral moves by the South African Government to transfer power in Namibia. Such moves can have no effect on the United Nations plan except to set back the cause of peace and independence in the Territory and to increase tension in the region, as indeed the establishment of the so-called 'transitional Government' has already done.

The Twelve also deplore the policies of intimidation and repression pursued by South Africa within Namibia itself. These have been the subject of repeated condemnation by the international community. The catalogue of arbitrary arrests and detentions makes depressing reading; and South Africa has continued to pursue a policy of forced conscription of Namibian adults into the occupation army. Apartheid is still enshrined in the legislation in force in the Territory and evident in provisions at the second tier administrative level for separate schooling, hospitals and other facilities.

Since the General Assembly last debated the subject of Namibia South Africa has continued its armed incursions into Namibia's neighbours, particularly Angola. These acts have taken place in defiance of international law and have created a grave danger to peace and security in the region. At the meeting between the Foreign Ministers of the Twelve and of the front-line States in Lusaka last February, Ministers condemned South Africa's policy of destabilization in all its manifestations, including the use of any direct or indirect armed actions in neighbouring States. We once again strongly urge South Africa to desist from such activities.

The Twelve forcibly condemn the use of violence by South Africa either against neighbouring States or in the maintenance of its illegal presence in Namibia. These developments make even more necessary the maintenance of the general and primary duty of the United Nations to promote peaceful solutions in conformity with the Charter, thus avoiding any encouragement of the use of force.

Over the years strenuous efforts have been made by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, the front-line States, the South West African People's Organization, the Organization of African Unity and the Contact Group aimed at bringing about a just and peaceful solution to the Namibian question in accordance with Security Council Resolution 435 (1978). We strongly support these efforts and hope that the Secretary-General's current round of consultations will bear fruit. Meanwhile, the European Community and its Member States will continue their aid to the Namibian people, particularly through their support for the United Nations Institute for Namibia. They reaffirm their readiness to assist in the development of a free and independent Namibia.

The fact of this Emergency Special Session testifies to the importance attached by the international community to the question of Namibia. It is to be hoped that our deliberations will help to open the way for the early implementation of the Settlement Plan. For our part the Twelve will continue to press South Africa to abide by the clearly expressed decisions of the international community by withdrawing the constitutional arrangements put into effect in 1985 and by terminating her illegal occupation of Namibia thus allowing Namibians to exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

## **86/274. Explanation of Vote on the Resolution Presented to the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Namibia**

Date of Issue: 18 September 1986  
Place of Issue: New York  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: British Delegation  
Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Sir John Thomson:* I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Twelve Member States of the European Community to the draft resolution which has been presented to this Special Session of the General Assembly.

We regret that once again it has not been possible to reach consensus on the draft resolution before us because of certain elements that make unanimous approval by the General Assembly impossible.

The Twelve consider that, under the provisions of the Settlement Plan, the Constitution of an independent Namibia must be worked out by a constituent Assembly appointed as the result of elections in which all political groups in the Territory are able to participate. None of these groups should therefore be designated in advance as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

The Twelve cannot endorse the call in the draft resolution for Member States to render increased military assistance to SWAPO, a means of bringing Namibia to independence. Similarly they cannot agree to lend their support to armed struggle as a means to this end, in spite of the impatience and frustration felt by the Namibian people owing to South Africa's continuing and illegal occupation of the Territory. In the view of the Twelve the general and primary duty of the United Nations is to promote peaceful solutions in conformity with the Charter, thus avoiding any encouragement of the use of force.

The Twelve also reject any arbitrary and selective attack against Member States of the United Nations or groups of countries.

Our respect for the division of competence among the main bodies of the Organization remains unchanged. The Security Council alone is authorized to take decisions binding upon Member States.

This Special Session testifies to the importance accorded by the international community to the question of Namibia. It is thus all the more regrettable that these and other controversial elements have been introduced to the draft resolution. This practice risks dividing the membership of the United Nations at a time when there is a need more than ever to mobilize the international community in pursuit of the common goal of internationally recognized independence for Namibia.

Earlier in the debate I set out once again the position of the Twelve on the question of Namibia. The illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa must be brought to an end. The only acceptable basis for a peaceful and lasting solution to the problem is the implementation without preconditions or pretext of Security Council Resolution 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). The Settlement Plan endorsed by the second of these resolutions – which has been accepted by the Government of South Africa and by the South West African People's Organization – embodies the only universally accepted framework for a peaceful transition to independence in a manner which is guaranteed by this Organization to be free and fair. We wish to see the plan implemented in its entirety so that the people of Namibia can move forward to the internationally recognized independence which is their due. We cannot accept any further delay in this process or that the implementation of the Settlement Plan should be held up because of extraneous considerations.

## **86/275. Speech Made by Sir Geoffrey Howe to the United Nations General Assembly<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 23 September 1986  
Place of Issue: New York  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Statement in International Forum



*Sir Geoffrey Howe:* Last year my predecessor Jacques Poos, the Foreign Minister of Luxembourg, spoke here as representative of ten Member States in the EC. It is my privilege to address you on behalf of twelve Member States, since the Community has welcomed two new members – Spain and Portugal. Their accession weaves two more strands of European culture and history into one ever-thickening cable. Meanwhile the construction of Europe goes on. We are ratifying new treaty provisions on foreign policy cooperation. And by the end of 1992, we mean to have broken down the barriers which still divide the Community; so that, from Aberdeen to Athens, from Copenhagen to Cadiz, goods, services and capital, and by no means least, people, can move freely between us.

Our Community has learnt to work together in domestic affairs. It is now the world's single greatest trading bloc. Individually we have made powerful contributions to world affairs: our contribution must and will grow – now that we act together. The principles of the Charter of the United Nations have always been basic to our Community. We believe that our history imposes on us a particular responsibility to work for these principles and to promote in the world the ideal of dialogue and peaceful cooperation which has served the twelve Member States so well.

But Europe, the wider Europe, remains divided. Twenty-five years ago the Berlin wall cast its shadow between *East and West*. Barbed wire and concrete set neighbours and families apart from each other. These man-made divisions oblige us, as Europeans, to search for reconciliation and the rebuilding of trust between nations. Our common history and culture encourage us to believe we can succeed.

The accident at Chernobyl has added a new dimension to exchanges between East and West. Let us hope that the lessons of this accident will be well learned. As Martin Luther King Jr said: 'we must learn to live together as brothers, or perish together as fools'.

For us in Europe, as for the rest in the world, better *relations between the two superpowers* are of the greatest importance. We warmly welcomed the Geneva Summit Meeting last November between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev. We share the widespread hope that there will be another summit this year. This prospect has already produced major proposals by both sides. We therefore much regret that the arrest of a respected American journalist in Moscow had cast a cloud over these hopes. We look for its early removal.

The Geneva negotiations have as one priority the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The other urgent priority is deep cuts in the strategic and intermediate forces of the United States and the Soviet Union. We believe that the United States, the Soviet Union, and Europe can make significant progress towards disarmament without compromising their security. And an early agreement on the world-wide elimination of chemical weapons should and must be obtained.

Even if the objective of general and complete *disarmament* can only be gradually achieved, it remains none the less our ultimate goal. But agreements will have lasting value only if they are fair, balanced and verifiable. And, if confidence is to grow, existing arms control agreements must be respected by all parties. We are approaching a critical period: there is an opportunity for major decisions. Future generations will not forgive failure.

Arms control and disarmament negotiations are only part of East-West relations. Practical steps are needed to overcome the tension and divisions which lie behind the high level of armaments.

This is why the *Helsinki Final Act* is so important. It is fundamental for the health of East-West relations that all the Helsinki commitments should be honoured. We look to all the participants in the CSCE process to do so. At the CSCE Follow-up Meeting in Vienna we will press for the sort of steps which ordinary people in our countries can see and understand. The Twelve warmly welcome the successful conclusions of the *Stockholm Conference* last weekend. The agreement that has been reached there is a significant contribution towards reducing the risk of war in Europe and towards establishing greater confidence between East and West. The Twelve, who made a substantial contribution to that result, will seek to build on it both in the field of arms control and more widely in the CSCE process.

Although *Afghanistan* and *Cambodia* are two countries far distant from our own, the outside interventions there symbolize many of the problems we face in East-West relations and in working for greater stability in the world at large. In Afghanistan in particular, some small detachments of Soviet troops may be withdrawn; but over 110 000 Soviet troops will still remain. Tens of thousands of Afghan

citizens have been killed as a result of the Soviet occupation. They will not return to life. Four million remain outside their country, living as refugees. Many of them have been taken in by Pakistan, which has been rewarded by numerous attacks launched across her borders from Afghanistan.

The principles which must underlie a solution have been massively endorsed by this Assembly on many occasions. The Soviet Union should implement these principles, withdraw all its troops from Afghanistan and agree an acceptable timetable without delay. We support the UN Secretary-General's efforts to resolve the conflict. Only their success – and soon – can prevent further suffering.

Few parts of the world have suffered more than the *Middle East* from the ancient feuds and modern factions of Churchill's phrase. Our approach is the same: to counsel dialogue and cooperation. There are no military answers to the conflicts in the Middle East – or in North Africa.

A just, lasting and comprehensive settlement of the *Arab/Israel dispute* can be achieved only through negotiation. We take encouragement from the agreement between Egypt and Israel over Taba. We have made known our views on many occasions. We stand by them. An international conference could make a major contribution, if the gap between the parties can be narrowed and if they can agree on the principle and nature of such a conference. All parties should clearly and unambiguously accept two principles: the right to existence and security of all States in the area, including Israel; and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, with all that that implies. We appeal to the parties concerned, the Arab States, Israel and the Palestinian people, to open the door to peace by recognizing each other's rights.

The Twelve are working individually and collectively to help development in the *occupied territories*. We call on Israel, pending its withdrawal in accordance with Security Council Resolution 242, to fulfil scrupulously its obligations as the occupying power and to ease restrictions on political activity and economic development. But such measures must be a prelude to, not a substitute for, true peace negotiations.

Six years ago this month the conflict between *Iran and Iraq* broke out. It has claimed well over half a million casualties, and gravely damaged both countries. It is a source of great concern to their neighbours in the Gulf, with whom we sympathize. We have unreservedly condemned the use of chemical weapons and the escalating attacks by both sides on shipping in the Gulf. The two countries should ask themselves – what possible good is served by continuing this conflict. We would deeply deplore any further escalation.

It should be accepted equally by both parties that this conflict can only be brought to an end by negotiation. Security Council Resolution 582 forms the best basis for such a negotiated settlement. We urge Iran and Iraq to agree an immediate cease-fire and to seek a peaceful, honourable solution to their differences, cooperating fully with the Secretary-General in the exercise of his good offices.

In the *Western Sahara*, too, we appeal to the parties to respond positively to the Secretary-General's efforts to find a peaceful solution.

The UN is doing vital work in the effort to preserve *Lebanon's* sovereignty, unity, independence and territorial integrity. We deplore recent incidents which have put new obstacles in the way of UNIFIL's mission. We extend our sympathies to the victims. We wish to underline the urgency and importance of taking measures to enable the Force to carry out its mission safely and effectively. The latest events have demonstrated how intolerable the present situation has become.

I turn now to the problems of *Cyprus* which, after too many years remains an important matter of international concern. The island remains tragically divided. The Twelve reaffirm their strong backing for the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity of Cyprus in accordance with the relevant UN resolutions. We stand fully by our previous statements. In particular we reject any action which purports to establish an independent State within Cyprus. And, as we have made clear on many occasions, we support the Secretary-General in his mission of good offices for a just and viable solution of the problem. We ask all concerned to cooperate with him and not to take any action which might make his task more difficult.

In *South Africa* the Twelve have worked to promote the genuine national dialogue which is so obviously and urgently needed if there is to be a peaceful solution to the country's problems. South Africa's policies affect her neighbours too. We have forcefully condemned her armed incursions against neighbouring countries. There must be no recurrence of these armed raids.

The Twelve have repeatedly made clear their revulsion at apartheid. We have demanded that it should be abolished. We utterly reject a philosophy which denies opportunity or liberty to one child, yet gives ordinary rights and privileges to another, solely on the basis of his or her colour. Such a system breeds hatred and violence. There have been reforms in South Africa – but too few and too slow to stem the surging bitterness and bloodshed in the country. The present state of emergency has brought desolation to the homes of many thousands of people imprisoned without trial. This has worsened, not improved, the prospects for peaceful change.

Violence will not end apartheid. Instead conditions must be created in which dialogue can begin. But dialogue is impossible while black leaders remain imprisoned or detained and black organizations proscribed. That is why the Twelve have repeatedly called on the South African Government to release unconditionally Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners and to lift the ban on the African National Congress, the Pan African Congress of Azania and other political parties.

In September 1985 the European Community countries agreed on a series of measures – some restrictive, some positive – designed to impress on the South African Government the inescapable need for fundamental reform. In June this year at The Hague the European Council decided to take additional action. As part of this, Heads of State or Government of the Twelve asked me to undertake a mission to Southern Africa. In the course of two visits to the area in July I sought to explain the policies of the Twelve to South Africa's neighbours and to impress upon the South African Government our deep concern and the need for steps to encourage a peaceful negotiated solution.

In the absence of any progress in that direction, and having consulted the major western industrialized countries, the Twelve agreed at Brussels last week to impose a ban on new investments in South Africa, and on the import of iron, steel and gold coins from South Africa. These measures represent a further step, reinforcing the measures we took last year which include bans on all exports to and imports from South Africa of arms and paramilitary equipment, a ban on oil exports, and a ban on all new cooperation in the nuclear field.

In addition we are implementing a concerted European programme to help the victims of apartheid, both individually and collectively. We are helping those arrested under the state of emergency, and we are putting heavy emphasis on programmes of training and education for black South Africans. We are also helping South Africa's neighbours, for example over the improvement of transport facilities in the region.

We will keep up our effort in all these areas and do everything we can to promote urgent and peaceful change.

Time is short. We appeal to the South African Government to look to the future, to accept that fundamental change is inevitable. They clearly understand the demographic and economic challenge. South Africa's white leaders are sowing the wind. Unless sincere negotiations begins now, their own children will reap the whirlwind.

The South African Government also bears a heavy responsibility in *Namibia*. Last year they set up a so-called 'Transitional Government of National Unity'. This has no status whatsoever under the UN plan. We cannot accept unilateral moves by South Africa to transfer power in Namibia. We call upon the South African Government to implement the United Nations plan without further delay.

*Central America* is another area where armed force will solve nothing. Dialogue and peaceful negotiation are the only way forward; a political solution is of the highest importance. It must emerge from the region itself. We support the Contadora peace process which is a major step in the right direction. But further effort is needed by all concerned to reduce regional tensions. At Luxembourg last November, we established a political dialogue with Central America to underline our active support for that process in the interests of stability and pluralist democracy. We also signed a cooperation agreement. We reiterate our intention to increase our aid to the region substantially, in order to encourage regional cooperation and economic development.

Mr President, on behalf of the United Kingdom I shall be circulating a separate national communication on the Falklands.

More widely in Latin America, we have been encouraged by the continuing consolidation of democracy in most countries of *South America*. We hope that this process will continue throughout the region. But problems certainly remain in some countries. We have made plain our particular concern

about human rights abuses and the continuation of violence in *Chile*. The Chilean Government has reimposed a state of siege following the attempted assassination of General Pinochet. We view this development with deep concern. We reiterate our hope that the Government will immediately release political prisoners and initiate without delay a dialogue with the democratic opposition about a peaceful restoration of democracy.

The *human rights* abuses in Chile and South Africa are by no means unique. This Assembly cannot remain indifferent in the face of the systematic violations of individual liberties, of the tyranny, oppression and indiscriminate violence which persist in many countries. And of the fact that hunger, disease and lack of opportunity deny the most basic economic and social rights to countless people.

On 21 July 1986 we issued a statement setting out our principles in this field. This was a signal of the high priority we attach to human rights in our international relationships. This Assembly has established clear standards – in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international instruments. We seek the universal observance of those instruments. That is what our people expect, not just fine words. We therefore attach particular importance to maintaining and strengthening the mechanisms established by the United Nations for the protection of human rights.

The scourge of *international terrorism* has brought a new precariousness to modern life. It has killed innocent people in airports, shopping arcades, and crowded streets. We utterly condemn cowardly attacks like the Karachi hijack and the recent atrocities in Istanbul and Paris. They can do nothing to help the political causes which their perpetrators profess to believe in. Our horror is greater when sovereign States lend their support – moral or material – to the terrorists. This year we have taken certain steps to deter State-supported terrorism, particularly in the case of Libya. No country which supports terrorism can expect to enjoy normal relations with the Twelve. We are determined to do more and a Ministerial meeting of the Twelve will be taking place the day after tomorrow to consider future action: we shall not tolerate such behaviour by supposedly responsible governments.

The problem of *drugs*, too, demands an urgent collective effort. International drug trafficking is now on a scale which threatens to undermine whole societies. Close international cooperation is required to defeat this evil trade. We shall play our part at the World Conference in Vienna next June – a valuable initiative by the Secretary-General.

*Economic issues* have been central to the development of the European Community. It is now the world's largest trade grouping, accounting for 20% of world trade. We are the world's largest importer, in particular of products from developing countries, amounting to US \$ 105 billion in 1985. Our 320 million citizens are linked to some 400 million people in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific through our trade and aid agreements with their countries. We are collectively the largest donors of aid in the world. This economic weight gives us certain responsibilities towards the world's trading systems – and we take these responsibilities seriously.

Since World War II growth in world *trade* has been stimulated by the progressive dismantling of the tariff barriers that existed between the two World Wars. Nevertheless, there are strains in the world trading system. Old traditional industries in the Western world have faced massive contraction as comparative advantage has passed to the newly industrialized countries – with traumatic social changes for those involved. Pressures for import controls have grown. They look like easy solutions. But they are not.

*Protectionism* above all penalizes developing countries by reducing access to prime markets in developed countries. In the developed countries themselves protectionism penalizes consumers by increasing prices and restricting choice, and exporters by increasing their production costs.

Protectionism is self-defeating. A spiral of retaliatory protectionist measures would have disastrous effects on world trade, particularly for the third world. Let us always remember that trade fosters growth.

The contracting parties of the GATT have just concluded their ministerial meeting at Punta del Este at which an important agreement has been reached to launch a new round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations. The Community has worked hard for a successful outcome. Multilateral trade negotiations serve two purposes: to renew the GATT system, bringing it up-to-date with the realities of world trade,

and to pursue trade liberalization by allowing countries to make concessions multilaterally that they may find difficult to make bilaterally. If we all share the burden of adjustment, we spread the pain. We are fully committed to this process.

You may ask what the Community is doing to give effect to these admirable principles. Two brief examples. First, in the *textiles* sector, the Community has achieved a remarkable degree of restructuring. The Community is glad that the new Multi-Fibre Arrangement agreed in July foresees the application of GATT rules to trade in textiles as a final objective and calls for all participants to cooperate in the progressive liberalization of the textile trade. The Community also argued strongly for the particularly favourable treatment that the new Multi-Fibre Arrangement gives to the least-developed countries.

Second, *agriculture*. This is major political issue. And one that must be tackled urgently. There has been a revolution in food production in the last ten years. New technology has meant new fertilizers, fatter cattle, new types of grain and rice, more efficient storage. India is now exporting food. China is virtually self-sufficient. These are great success stories which serve as an inspiration to those struggling to overcome food shortages.

But more plus more can equal less. Too much food in some countries can aggravate food shortages in others. Expensive producers growing more can cause poorer producers to grow less. The result is a tragic paradox: that even in an age of plenty, famine persists. Meanwhile trade disputes become political conflicts, as countries compete to subsidize their food exports, and dispose of their growing surpluses.

We must address these problems now. While recognizing the importance of agriculture for the well-being of rural communities, the Tokyo Summit agreed on the need 'to redirect policies and adjust the structure of agricultural production in the light of world demand.' The Community is committed to this. Heads of Government agreed at the European Council in The Hague in June that 'a better control of total production must be ensured so that it is better adjusted to the market situation.' This is not the responsibility of one country or group of countries. The problem is world-wide, and we can only deal with it – in the words of the Tokyo declaration – in cooperation with each other. Last week, GATT Ministers agreed to launch a new GATT round, including negotiations on agriculture. We have no more important task than to make this a success.

The Tokyo Summit was also an important opportunity to review progress on the *debt* problem. The annual meetings of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank are less than a week away, so I shall be brief.

The last year has seen important changes. International recovery may be in its fourth year but the international economic environment remains unfavourable. Growth is still unevenly distributed throughout the world and growth rates are still lower than we want. Lower interest rates help us all, even if in real terms they are still high by historical standards. Oil price falls help many but severely affect others, and commodity prices generally remain weak. Many debtors have undertaken courageous adjustment programmes. And most of the industrialized countries have reduced the imbalances of the early 1980s which aggravated the difficulties facing debtors.

The debt burden remains heavy for a number of countries. The Community fully support the US initiative for sustained growth, which aims to meet the legitimate aspirations of debtor countries for growth through structural adjustment and economic liberalization with the necessary external financing. Or, in plain language, it recognizes that we sink or swim together. Those who expected instant results misunderstand the initiative and the problem's complexity. But much has been achieved. The World Bank has stepped up its policy-based loans. The IMF and World Bank are working more closely together. And, in recent weeks, they have shown a flexible and imaginative approach to the very difficult problems faced by the oil-producing countries.

There has been much criticism that *resource flows* have declined. This may be so for the banks in the short term: it partly reflects falling short-term demand for loans. But the banks have a crucial role to play in support of the US initiative. We are confident that they will rise to the challenge. For their part the creditor countries are responding to the need to ensure adequate finance for adjustment through rescheduling at the Paris Club; new export credits; aid programmes; and support for the international

monetary bodies. The Twelve will support a General Capital increase for the IBRD at the appropriate time, and they welcome progress towards a US \$ 12 billion replenishment of IDA 8 to help the poorer countries.

One way or another, be it bilaterally, multilaterally or through the institutions of the European Community, we provide one-third of the world's *official development assistance*. We shall maintain and, where appropriate, expand these flows to meet the commitments we have made individually to the targets established by the UN.

The problems of *Africa* are particularly acute. As the Special Session recognized in May, many countries face grave economic problems. But natural disasters such as droughts and man-made disasters such as civil war have made them far worse. We extend particular sympathy to the people of Cameroon who have suffered the appalling natural calamity of Lake Nyos.

At the *Special Session*, African countries acknowledged the role they themselves must play. The industrialized countries, including the Twelve, agreed on the importance of increasing official development assistance to Africa, its improved quality and effectiveness. We maintain substantial bilateral aid programmes and contribute to international and regional development agencies; in addition, we are making a substantial collective contribution through the Lomé III Convention and other association and cooperation agreements.

Finally, this Organization itself faces a very serious problem: how to confront its financial crisis. A number of countries, over the years, have either delayed payments or withheld contributions. The Twelve collectively provide just under 30% of the United Nations budget. We believe that every State should meet its legal obligations. The Secretary-General has shown courage in proposing certain measures, endorsed by the General Assembly at its resumed session in the spring, to deal with the short-term problem. But further measures are required. There is a clear need for changes in the system which will produce broader consensus on financial issues and help overcome the reluctance of some members to meet their financial obligations.

We are grateful for the work done by the Group of 18 high-level experts. We shall make a positive and constructive contribution to the discussion of their report. We support the creation of a new mechanism to consider the programme and budget, structured so as to ensure effective decision-making and to contribute to greater rationalization and efficiency within the system. We are firm in our support for the Charter and for a strong and effective UN. Greater budgetary discipline, improved coordination, and rigorous adherence to priorities can only strengthen the organization and ensure its future stability and vigour.

As this session will once again demonstrate, the world faces many grave problems. Too many to cover in one speech — and I have not attempted to do so. So I am also circulating today a memorandum as a companion piece to this speech, describing our position on a number of other issues to which we also attach the highest importance.

Voltaire once observed that in India and China they believe that a prophet will come out of the West whereas people in Europe expect their sages to come from the East. The lesson of this, perhaps, is that we all have something to learn from one another. The UN is a place to listen as much as to speak. And if we do so, perhaps we shall find to our surprise that we can learn from each others' experiences and profit from each others' goodwill.

I have tried to show how our experience of cooperating together in the Community has shaped our positions on a number of key issues facing this Assembly. I believe those positions, though ambitious in aim, are fair and realistic in practice. It is an approach which we believe fulfils the ideals to which this Organization is committed. In our search and support for freedom, peace, justice, democracy and prosperity for mankind, in offering our friendship to all who wish us well, we shall continue to pursue our duty to other nations, notably to those less fortunate than ourselves; at the same time we shall uphold and defend what we have built together.

## Memorandum

1. This Memorandum is circulated concurrently with the speech delivered to the General Assembly today by the Rt Hon Sir Geoffrey Howe QC MP on behalf of the European Community and its twelve Member States. It forms an integral part of that speech.

2. The Memorandum is intended to allow a fuller treatment of a number of issues than would be possible in the compass of one speech. The Twelve have no wish to monopolize the floor, but they do wish to do justice to certain other issues which they regard as highly important. These include one further African problem, three Asian issues, the problem of nuclear safety and a number of economic issues.

### *Horn of Africa*

3. Over the last year the Twelve have reviewed their policy towards the Horn of Africa. Persisting tensions and related refugee problems are gravely threatening economic development and obstructing normal relations between the countries of the region. Governments in the region have made statements in favour of negotiated political settlements: we urge them to pursue this course and have therefore welcomed the start of talks between Somalia and Ethiopia.

4. We have also urged the Governments of the Horn of Africa to settle internal conflicts peacefully and to ensure respect for human rights in their countries. We remain concerned at widespread food shortages in the area and attach particular importance to measures to prevent further famine and promote food security. Food shortages in the Horn have prompted a massive response from the Community and the European public. As well as giving food and other emergency aid the Community is helping Ethiopia, Somalia, the Sudan, Djibouti and other drought-affected countries to develop peasant farming and prevent renewed famine.

5. We are paying carefully attention to the human consequences of resettlement and villagization programmes.

### *Sri Lanka*

6. The Twelve have followed closely the unfolding of events in Sri Lanka where there have been some important and positive developments. These can only give heart to all those innocent people who have suffered from the violence there. We must all hope that the opportunity which now exists to put an end to the violence in Sri Lanka will not be allowed to slip away. We believe that negotiations offer the only sure route to a solution of the country's current problems and that only a negotiated settlement, within the framework of a united Sri Lanka, recognizing the needs and interests of all the parties concerned, holds the prospect of a lasting peace. In June, President Jayewardena put forward terms for an end to the conflict. The Twelve have welcomed that and have acknowledged India's important role in this process.

### *Cambodia*

7. We are much concerned by the intractable conflict in Cambodia. Vietnamese forces are still illegally occupying Cambodia in clear breach of the UN Charter, violating its territorial integrity, its culture and national identity. Apart from the suffering which Vietnam's policies have inflicted on Cambodia itself, they have also caused ASEAN and other countries serious difficulties, particularly because of refugees and the security threat. The suffering of refugees from Cambodia, Laos and from Vietnam itself is a matter for serious concern. These refugees are a living reproach to the Vietnamese Government.

8. Vietnam has rejected proposals to resolve Cambodia's problems. The Twelve urge the leadership in Vietnam to reconsider. Cambodia must be free both of foreign troops and of any prospect of a return to the appalling activities of the *Khmer rouge*. The Twelve will continue to advocate a solution in

accordance with the resolutions adopted by the United Nations and, in this spirit they reaffirm their support for UN and ASEAN efforts to end this long-running and disastrous episode in Cambodia's history.

#### *Korea*

9. We hope that a peaceful solution can be found by means of direct dialogue between South and North to the problem posed by the continuing division of the Korean peninsula. We hope also that, to this end, the contacts between the two sides broken off earlier this year can be resumed soon and that the people of Korea may shortly be represented at this forum. We wish the Republic of Korea well for the success of the 1988 olympic games.

#### *Nuclear safety*

10. Nuclear safety is an issue of particular topical concern to our citizens this year. The Chernobyl nuclear disaster demonstrated vividly the scope for greater East-West cooperation. This tragic accident, which spread radioactivity throughout Eastern and Western Europe, demonstrated that in such case international public opinion, governments and the relevant experts must have all the facts, promptly and accurately.

11. We urge the Soviet Union to give the International Atomic Energy Agency and other competent international bodies all necessary information on this disaster. We welcome the successful negotiation of international conventions on early notification and mutual assistance in the event of further nuclear accidents. We look for their early entry into force.

#### *World economic prospects*

12. The international recovery is now in its fourth year. A major factor for this sustained growth has been the unremitting fight against inflation, which is now showing increasingly positive results in all major industrialized countries. As a result, interest rates are substantially lower now than four years ago if still high in real terms by historical standards. The fall in oil prices has improved the prospects for growth for oil-importing countries, both industrialized and developing. But more remains to be done. Low commodity prices, difficulties of market access and indebtedness remain problems for many developing countries. Oil-exporting countries have been adversely affected by lower oil prices. Unemployment in developed countries remains unacceptably high. Uncertainties remain about large and unsustainable imbalances and persistent protectionist pressures.

13. As affirmed in Tokyo, we are committed to a cooperative strategy of promoting structural adjustment by eliminating rigidities, in particular in labour markets, and by continuing with low budget deficits and sound monetary policies. Policies such as these should lead to a continued lowering of inflation and interest rates, faster underlying growth rates and better employment prospects.

14. Many developing countries too have experienced considerable progress in the last four years, although we recognize that in many countries this has been achieved at the cost of painful adjustment measures. Overall output growth has recovered to over 3% and should be helped further by lower energy prices and an improvement of trading opportunities.

#### *Commodities*

15. We are concerned about the position of the many developing countries whose economies are dependent on the production and sale of a few primary commodities. The narrow base of these economies is a brake on development and can be a source of economic instability. But the brake could be released and the problems overcome most effectively through growth-oriented structural adjustment, diversification



and expansion of trade-flows, linked with measures by these countries themselves to mobilize domestic savings and investment and to stop capital flight, coupled with adequate financial flows. The Community will work to create an economic environment in which commodity-dependent countries can both develop and tackle structural problems. In formulating our own trade and domestic policies we will take account of their export needs and, where there is a clear economic advantage for the countries concerned in so doing we will continue to support their efforts to develop or expand processing, marketing and distribution facilities.

16. In the case of some commodities and markets, agreements and arrangements of varying types may be useful. But changes in patterns of demand, the effects of government policies, the entry of new producers to markets and improvement in production techniques are among the factors giving rise to reassessment of the value of such agreements and a review of the commodities problems in a wider context.

17. In the framework of the Lomé Convention, the Community assists commodity-dependent countries by providing financial help to compensate them for falls in export earnings. The Community will extend comparable arrangements to other least-developed countries. The details and conditions under which this scheme will operate are currently being drawn up. We hope that other countries will follow this example.

#### *Debt: Structural adjustment and the Baker initiative*

18. We welcome and confirm our support for the US initiative for sustained growth announced by Treasury Secretary Baker at the IMF meetings in Seoul last autumn. We hope that it will be fully implemented as soon as possible. The IMF, the World Bank and the Regional Development Banks will continue to have an important role to play in tackling debt problems. Closer cooperation between them is therefore welcome. It is vital that they have adequate resources.

19. In this context, we would welcome agreement at the IBRD annual meeting to a substantially higher IDA 8 than IDA 7, and look forward to reviewing then the need for a General Capital increase for the IBRD. We also hope that the commercial banks will resume lending, and will be willing to reschedule debt flexibly. But the debtor countries themselves must take effective measures to mobilize domestic savings, to improve the environment for foreign investment and to encourage the repatriation of capital. We are also keen to seek new ways of promoting financial flows which do not add to debt. We welcome in particular progress towards the establishment of the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency which will facilitate the direct investment climate. Several EC member countries have signed the Convention.

20. Sustained economic growth can be achieved only in economies that are flexible and dynamic, which adapt to change yet remain bound together through an open, multilateral trading system. Such a performance is not easy. It requires active policies to promote the better functioning of labour markets. It requires control of budget deficits, plus improvements in the structure of taxation. It requires effective transfer of technology and a suitable environment for risk taking.

#### *Coordination of economic policy*

21. Lasting improvements in the functioning of the world monetary and trading system require increased international compatibility of national policies. The Community and its twelve Member States therefore subscribe to the agreement at the Tokyo Summit on close and continuous coordination of economic policies to promote non-inflationary economic growth; to strengthen market oriented incentives for employment and productive investment; and to open the international trading and investment system and foster greater stability of exchange rates. This agreement will help the stability of the international monetary system in the interests of industrialized and developing countries alike.

*UNCTAD VII*

22. The Seventh Session of UNCTAD will take place in 1987. The European Community believes that the best way of ensuring success will be to have an agenda with a unifying theme, so that debate can focus on subjects within the UNCTAD's competence. A suitable structure for the conference is equally important; without this UNCTAD VII will not be able to work efficiently. The Community will play a full part in helping the Secretariat prepare for the Conference, and looks forward to a constructive and fruitful session.

*African situation*

23. In the wake of the UN Special Session on Africa, the Community and its Member States would like to re-emphasize their commitment to supporting and supplementing the efforts of the African States. The Community with its Member States is the largest donor of development aid to Sub-Saharan Africa (providing 55% of official development assistance). The Community is also Africa's leading trading partner taking half of African exports. It is thus deeply committed to the future of the continent. Through its ongoing dialogue with its African partners the Community is adapting its development instruments (such as the Lomé Convention, its food aid programme, the relief and rehabilitation programme for the most seriously affected African States and the programme of action to combat desertification in Africa) to ensure that they can respond flexibly and speedily to African development priorities.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/41/PV.6.

**86/276. Statement on Libyan Arab Airlines**

Date of Issue: 4 October 1986  
Place of Issue: London  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: The Twelve  
Status of Document: Declaration

The Twelve have noted with serious concern the clear evidence of involvement in terrorist activity by Libyan Arab Airlines which was revealed in the trial and conviction in the UK on 26 September of Mr Rasmi Awad on charges of conspiracy to cause an explosion.

The Twelve recall their decisions of 21 April on the problem of State-supported terrorism, and Libyan involvement in particular<sup>1</sup>. The decision of the UK authorities to suspend flights to London by Libyan Arab Airlines is fully consistent with those decisions.

The Twelve are in close touch on the security implications of this case. They support the initiatives which have been taken to enhance security at airports and will be examining what further action may be necessary in accordance with international law.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Bull. EC* 4-1986, point 2.4.4.

**86/277. Statement in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly on Racism and Racial Discrimination<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 6 October 1986  
Place of Issue: New York  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN  
Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Birch:* Mr Chairman, I have the honour, on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community, to address the Committee on a number of items on our agenda today concerning racism and racial discrimination.

But first of all I would like to extend the warm congratulations of my delegation to you, Mr Chairman, as well as to the other members of the Bureau, on your election.

I should also like to thank the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr Jonah, and the Deputy Director of the Centre for Human Rights, Mr Nyamekye, for their thoughtful introductions, which I think will make a valuable contribution to our debate.

I should like to start by addressing item 83 – ‘Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination’.

The Twelve reject all forms of racial discrimination. Any form of discrimination based on race, colour, descent or ethnic origin is an affront to human dignity. Racism and racial discrimination are irreconcilable with the ideals of free and democratic societies, based as they are on the principles of equality, justice and liberty.

It is within the framework of those ideals that we contribute to the efforts of the international community to eradicate racial discrimination. Racial discrimination exists to varying degrees in all our societies, fostered by ignorance, fear and mistrust. We in the Twelve have taken firm legislative, administrative and, where appropriate, educational measures to combat it. And in June this year the Community and its Member States signed a Joint Declaration confirming their firm commitment to an open society and vigorously condemning all forms of discrimination within the Community. The only hope of eliminating racism worldwide is for all governments to recognize its existence at home as well as abroad, and then act to combat it. Recognition of a problem is the first, necessary step towards a solution; denial of the existence of the problem only makes the problem worse.

The struggle against racism and racial discrimination is one of the central preoccupations of this Organization. It derives from the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The United Nations has played an essential part in increasing public awareness of the evil of racism, and has been instrumental in establishing international standards and mechanisms to combat it. The Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, proclaimed by the Assembly, and the plan of activities for the first half of the Decade are evidence of the will of the international community to make determined and coordinated efforts to eliminate this evil throughout the world. So the Twelve welcome the fact that the consensus with which the Second Decade was proclaimed has since been reinforced. We are ready to work at this session to maintain that consensus.

The Twelve commend the Secretariat for its thorough response to the request made in ECOSOC resolution 2/86. The report of the Secretary-General before us today on the implementation of the programme of action contains a comprehensive account of the activities of UN bodies, specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations to achieve the objectives of the Second Decade. This report, together with the other documents submitted under this item, makes clear the wide range of activities which take place within the framework of the Second Decade. I will not try your patience by examining all these activities. But given the complex nature of the problems of racism and racial discrimination, the Twelve welcome particularly the emphasis which has been placed on education and training in addition to legislative and administrative measures in the eradication of racial discrimination. We read with interest the recommendation of the Seminar on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which said that

legislation and education had a very important role to play in the elimination of racial discrimination and prejudice. The law could be used to eliminate manifestations of racial discrimination, and education, from the very earliest stages, would implant a sense of human dignity.

The manual prepared by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to assist teachers and professors to combat racism will be very useful in this.

Mr Chairman, in seeking to eliminate racial discrimination from our own societies, the Twelve have had to cope with new problems, such as the need for our education systems to reflect the ethnic and

cultural diversity which we now enjoy in our countries. We have reached similar conclusions about the importance of both education and legislation in this area. We have therefore taken a particularly close interest in activities within the framework of the Second Decade which address those issues. For example, six Member States of the European Community made financial contributions to the Media Round Table on international legal issues relating to apartheid, racism and racial discrimination held in [The Hague] in September 1985. Several Members played an active part in the International Seminar on Community Relations Commissions and their Functions held in Geneva, also in September 1985.

As I said earlier, racial discrimination is a universal phenomenon. However in most countries it exists not because of the law, but in spite of the law. Any society which is organized on the basis of systematic, institutionalized racism is particularly abhorrent. This is the case in South Africa, whose policy of apartheid runs counter to all the principles on which our organization is based. As my Foreign Secretary said in his speech in the general debate on 23 September, delivered on behalf of the European Community and its Member States:

The Twelve have repeatedly made clear their revulsion at apartheid. We have demanded that it should be abolished. We utterly reject a philosophy which denies opportunity or liberty to one child, yet gives ordinary rights and privileges to another, solely on the basis of his or her colour. Such a system breeds hatred and violence. There have been reforms in South Africa — but too few and too slow to quieten the surging bitterness and bloodshed in the country. The present state of emergency has brought desolation to the homes of many thousands of people imprisoned without trial. This has worsened, not improved, the prospects for peaceful change.

Violence will not end apartheid. Instead conditions must be created in which dialogue can begin. But dialogue is impossible while black leaders remain imprisoned or detained and black organizations proscribed. That is why the Twelve have repeatedly called on the South African Government to release unconditionally Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners and to lift the ban on the African National Congress, the Pan African Congress of Azania and other political parties.

The Committee will recall that on 10 September 1985 the European Community, together with Spain and Portugal, agreed on a series of measures designed to impress on the South African Government the inescapable need for fundamental reform<sup>2</sup>. In June this year, the European Council, gravely concerned by increased violence in South Africa, by the reimposition of the state of emergency and the indiscriminate arrest of thousands of South Africans, decided to take additional action. An increase was agreed in financial and material assistance to the victims of apartheid, in particular those affected by the disturbances in Crossroads, and to political prisoners.

In the absence of any progress towards a peaceful negotiated solution, the Twelve agreed in Brussels on 16 September to take further steps to reinforce the 1985 measures. A ban was imposed on new investments in South Africa, and on the import of iron, steel and gold coins from South Africa. In addition, the Twelve are implementing a concerted European programme to help the victims of apartheid. The Community is providing some \$ 10 million in 1986 and in 1987 is likely to provide at least \$ 15 million. We are helping those arrested under the state of emergency, both with their legal costs and with financial support for their families, and we are putting heavy emphasis on programmes of training and education for black South Africans. We are also providing assistance to South Africa's neighbours, both bilaterally and through the Southern African Development Coordination Conference [SADCC]. For SADCC alone the Community has allocated some \$ 110 million under the third Lomé Convention for programmes in the areas of transport, infrastructure, agriculture and food security.

We shall keep up our efforts in all these areas and do all we can to promote rapid and peaceful change. The Twelve want South Africa to be a fully democratic, peaceful and prosperous country in which citizens of all races can exercise their fundamental rights.

It might be appropriate at this stage to say a few words about item 84. The Twelve regret that the report submitted under this item, like previous reports on this subject, does not represent a useful basis for our debate. The report consists of little more than lists of companies which maintain open

commercial links with South Africa. Furthermore the lists are inaccurate, selective and – apparently for political reasons – exclude many State and other corporations which are well known to conduct regular trade with South Africa.

Mr Chairman, I now turn to item 89, 'Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination'.

The most important international instrument in the continuing struggle against racial discrimination is the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. With 124 States parties, this Convention has come the closest of any international human rights instrument to universal recognition. We hope that other States who wish to demonstrate their opposition to racial discrimination will ratify the Convention and implement its provisions.

The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, established under the Convention, has a worldwide role to play. But this essential mechanism for implementing the Convention is now seriously at risk, as we have already heard from Mr Nyamekye at the beginning of this debate. Nearly two-thirds of all States parties have failed to honour their financial obligations under the Convention for 1985 and previous years. Because of the financial crisis of the United Nations, the Organization can no longer make advances to cover the Committee's expenses. As a result the 34th session of the Committee, which should have taken place this summer, had to be deferred. In consequence the Committee has not been able to submit a report to the Assembly, as required under Article 9(2) of the Convention. This is a matter of grave concern to the Twelve. The Committee's annual reports to the Assembly play an important part in developing broader international understanding of the Convention.

States parties take on a number of obligations when they ratify or accede to the Convention. Given the central role of the Committee, the financial obligations are particularly significant. Under Article 8(6) of the Convention, States parties are responsible for the expenses of members of the Committee while they are in performance of Committee duties. The arrears, as we have heard, now total over \$ 200 000. The Twelve call upon those who are in arrears to pay up without delay to enable the Committee to continue to fulfil its important functions.

The Twelve look forward to an improvement in the situation. We also look forward to the re-establishment of consensus on the traditional resolution submitted under this item. We regret that in recent years this consensus has gradually been undermined by the inclusion of divisive and extraneous issues. In our view this important resolution should reflect the views of all States parties. To that end, we are ready, as we said in this Committee last year, to work actively with other interested delegations on the preparation of the draft resolution in order to re-establish consensus on this important question. That will be the best signal of the priority this Assembly attaches to the elimination of racial discrimination.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.3/41/SR.4, items 83, 84 and 89.

<sup>2</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 85/172.

## **86/278. Question No H-110/86 by Mr Marshall Concerning the Interference with Mail in Russia**

Date of Issue: 7 October 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Are the Foreign Ministers aware of the widespread interference with mail in Russia and are they aware that even when the so-called 'Pink Forms' are used letters (and even Chanukah cards) are intercepted? What action do they intend to take?

*Ms Chalker, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers:* The Twelve are aware that mail is subject to widespread interference in the Soviet Union. This subject was discussed in the CSCE context at the

Experts Meeting on Human Contacts which was held in Berne from 15 April until 26 May this year. Certain Western delegations tabled a proposal on this subject. In the negotiations on that proposal the Soviet delegation was prepared to accept the following text:

To guarantee in accordance with the Universal Postal Convention and the International Telecommunications Convention the freedom of transit of postal communications, to ensure the rapid delivery of correspondence including personal mail and to ensure the conditions necessary for rapid telephone calls including the use and development of direct dialling systems wherever it is possible and to respect the privacy of all such communications.

As agreement on a concluding document was not reached at the Berne meeting, the Twelve will continue to pursue this subject at the Vienna CSCE Follow-up Meeting.

*Mr Marshall (ED):* Can we have an assurance that it will be pursued with vigour? Unfortunately postal authorities in the West have adopted a pusillanimous approach to this international scandal and this breach of international obligations. While the Russians may now say that they are willing to honour the privacy of all such communications, would the Minister not agree that up till now they have adopted a rule of *quisque decimus*, i.e. every 10th letter gets through to many *refuseniks*? This causes a great deal of offence, not only to the non-recipients of the letters but to those who have paid good money in postage for those letters.

*Ms Chalker:* The aim of Vienna is going to be to maintain the momentum of the CSCE process. I understand the problems only too well. We, I believe, need to work particularly hard to ensure that pressure is maintained on the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe by each of us individually and the Twelve collectively if we are going to improve their performance on human rights, humanitarian issues and indeed the transmission of postal and telegraphic communications.

I believe that there is always another very important aspect, and that is the experience of Members of this Parliament in putting to others the experiences of their constituents. Whilst Vienna will be a government-to-government negotiation, I believe that Members of this Parliament can play a valuable role in creating a channel and a focus for public opinion on this very important issue.

*Mr Habsburg (PPE):* The President-in-Office has appealed to us to be active in this field and we are very grateful for that appeal. However, what are the particular issues where she wants us to be active? What are the particular issues to be raised in Vienna in the implementation?

*Ms Chalker:* If we are to have a productive meeting in Vienna, then we need to pursue all the issues of CSCE — security, economic and humanitarian. But the Honourable Member's original question was, of course, on particular communications to *refuseniks* and others in the Soviet Union who have not been receiving what has been freely sent by individuals in the Twelve. We have to look not only at the question that was originally raised but at the whole question of freedom of movement and at the fact that we need to take up all those issues on human rights and humanitarian issues that come our way as Members of the European Parliament or indeed of national parliaments. That is certainly something which all Members can be involved in.

*Mr Ford (S):* Can I welcome the statement by Ms Chalker and the comments made by Mr Habsburg and Mr Marshall about what is a grave problem and ask whether there is any proposal by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation to apply the same standards internally within the Community, and ask her view about the cowardly refusal by judicial authorities in the United Kingdom, for example, to take action about the telephone tapping that was going on for the committee members of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament instituted by her own Government?

If it is true that in Russia we should protest about these issues, isn't it more important if we are going to claim to have human rights in the Western democracies to take action ourselves in areas where clearly we have the power to do something, and do something urgently?

*Ms Chalker:* The latter part of the honourable gentleman's question is neither one for European political cooperation nor indeed for the President-in-Office of the Community. But the question that he was seeking to put to me revolved precisely around a UK situation and he should know that phone tapping is only authorized by the Home Secretary on the basis of evidence that it might be necessary to do so. He must be satisfied with that answer.

**86/279. Question No H-363/86<sup>1</sup> by Mr Ford Concerning the European Community Political Map Published the 4th Quarter 1985**

Date of Issue: 7 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Are the Foreign Ministers aware that the European Commission has published a political map which does not show Gibraltar as a separate territory and a British colony within the European Community? Do they disassociate themselves from this action, which has gravely offended Community citizens in Gibraltar?

*Ms Chalker, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers:* The issue raised by the Honourable Member falls outside the scope of European political cooperation.

*Mr Ford (S):* Can I say in reply to the previous question, that is exactly of course what the Russians say.

On this matter I cannot understand how it can possibly fall outside the concern of the Foreign Ministers. Clearly Parliament services have directed the question there and I really wonder whether by refusing to answer this question, the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation are indicating that they would welcome a change in the constitutional relationship between Gibraltar and the United Kingdom? If that is the case what view do the Foreign Ministers take of the commitment by the UK Government to consult with and seek the agreement of the people of Gibraltar before changing that constitutional arrangement?

Do the Foreign Ministers endorse the right of colonial peoples to self-determination and not to become pawns in the hands of large or even medium-sized powers in the world?

*Ms Chalker:* I have to say to the honourable gentleman, as he well knows already, that bilateral issues of this nature are not for European political cooperation. I would say to him that having had a very good look at the map to which his original question refers, Gibraltar is a part of the Community as a result of British membership and it is shown as such. That is by virtue of paragraph 4 of Article 227 of the Treaty of Rome. But he will know that it is a *territoire outre-mer*, a European territory for whose external relations a Member State is responsible. That is what is provided by that article and the United Kingdom is therefore responsible for Gibraltar.

<sup>1</sup> Former Oral Question without debate (0-38/86), converted into a question for Question Time.

**86/280. Question No H-238/86 by Ms Castle Concerning Cyprus**

Date of Issue: 7 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Since the President-in-Office of the Council has stated he is anxious to improve relations with the Mediterranean countries during the UK Presidency, can he state what steps he is taking to end Turkey's illegal occupation of Northern Cyprus and to restore basic freedoms to the people of Cyprus, such as freedom of movement and the ownership of property throughout the island, as demanded by the legal Government of Cyprus?

*Ms Chalker, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers:* The specific question raised by the Honourable Member has not been discussed within European political cooperation, but Ministers discussed recent developments in Cyprus at their meeting on 21 July 1986 in Brussels. The Twelve have repeatedly

affirmed their unconditional support for the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity of Cyprus. They underline the importance of support for the Secretary-General of the United Nations in his mission of good offices which they consider represents the best hope of making progress towards a just and lasting solution to the problems of Cyprus.

The Twelve would favour dialogue that reduces tension. They continue to stress the need for all parties to avoid action that might make progress in that direction difficult. They regard the Government of President Kyprianou as the sole legitimate government of Cyprus.

*Ms Castle (S)*: Is the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers aware that the United Nations negotiations are getting nowhere, for the simple reason that the Turks will not consider for a moment the three essentials of any settlement, namely the withdrawal of the troops from Cyprus and the restoration of freedom of movement and of property rights throughout the whole island? Will not therefore the Council of Ministers shoulder some responsibility in this matter, which has been allowed to drag on, and make it absolutely clear that there can be no settlement and no recognition of Turkey's claim to be considered as a civilized member of the international society as long as she continues her illegal occupation of Cyprus and refuses to accept the three basic rights without which there can be no unity or freedom in Cyprus?

*Ms Chalker*: I think that the honourable lady is very well aware that there is no question of recognition of the so-called 'Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus'. I agree with her that it is naturally most disappointing that the Secretary-General has not had positive replies on all sides. I agree with her that hard thinking is needed by all parties on the way forward. But we also need to urge restraint on all parties. We, as the Twelve, are doing all that we can to support the Secretary-General of the United Nations in this work and we shall continue to do so. I understand that the Secretary-General met President Kyprianou and Mr Denktash in New York last month. I hope the progress will now be made, and we shall give it our best endeavours to help that along.

*Mr Marshall (ED)*: Would the Foreign Minister agree that Ms Castle was a member of a government which in 1974 refused to carry out its role as a guarantor power of the treaty in Cyprus? Would the Foreign Minister please tell the House of the practical steps that the Community is taking to give assistance to Cyprus and can she assure us of a positive response by the Council of Ministers to Cyprus' desire for full and free trading links with the Community?

*Ms Chalker*: I have to agree with the honourable gentleman's first comment. As far as practical assistance is concerned in the Community framework 44 m ECU were made available to fund projects in Cyprus under the current financial protocol. I think he will know that these must benefit the island as a whole. Cyprus is a relatively small island and it would hardly make economic sense for major infrastructure projects to be restricted to one side or the other.

One good example of such a project is the sewage system for the whole of Nicosia, north and south. It is worth some 14.8 ECU and it obviously benefits both communities who I am glad to say have cooperated well on this project. I hope that they will cooperate well on similar projects in the future.

*Mr Hindley (S)*: The Foreign Ministers will be aware that Turkey is extremely keen on improving its relations with the Common Market and indeed keen on eventually joining the Common Market. Will we have an assurance that this eagerness will be used to lever the Turkish authorities into finding a solution in Cyprus and indeed to give way on the following Question No [H-238/86], the question of violations on human rights in Turkey?

Can we have an assurance that Turkish approaches to joining the EEC will be met with resistance as long as the situation in Cyprus remains unresolved and as long as there continue to be human rights violations in Turkey?

*President of the European Parliament*: Perhaps I should draw to the attention of the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers the fact that of course it is the next question that deals with Turkey so she may prefer to deal with that as a separate question. The question will, of course, be answered, but it is up to the Foreign Minister to decide whether she would like to answer that now or to take it later.

*Ms Chalker*: I shall take it later, Madam President.

*Mr Wedekind (PPE)*: Is the President of the Council really unaware that if a peaceful situation is to be secured in Cyprus it will be necessary to negotiate with both sides? That there are two population groups



and that it is necessary to speak to both of them? That both have different, but democratically elected governments? If we want to come up with a solution we shall have to talk to the democratically elected representatives of both sections of the population.

Does the President of the Council not also share the view that this is not a conflict between the Greeks and the Turks, but rather a conflict between the Greek and Turkish populations in Cyprus, who are going to have to talk to each other? Is the President of the Council really not aware that none of the proposals made by the United Nations hitherto has been rejected by the Turkish side – and when I say ‘Turkish side’ I mean the Turkish side in Cyprus? But that they have all been rejected by the Greek side? Does the President of the Council not also take the view that there is only one way, namely the way of cooperation, on Cyprus, with both communities being granted the same rights? Is the President of the Council not also of the opinion that there can be no peace as long as the Greek-Cypriot side continues to insist on a majority decision? Does the President of the Council not also take the view that it must not be forgotten that it was the Greek-Cypriot side that violated the constitution, unleashed the 1974 crisis and committed murders of Turkish people? It is not understandable that Turks want to live peacefully on Cyprus, and to do so without going in fear of the Greek murder gangs that still existed only recently?

*Ms Chalker:* I think I must say to the honourable gentleman that we are only too well aware that there are two communities in Cyprus who must communicate with one another as well as through the United Nations. What I said in answer to a previous question is that we were disappointed indeed that only the Turkish Cypriots had felt able to give a positive reply to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Now, there is no other way forward than by bringing both parties together. Therefore the efforts that the Secretary-General has been making – I described the bringing together of President Kyprianou and Mr Denktash in New York last month – are moves in that direction.

I am very much aware of what is going on there but I am also very much aware of the reluctance of individuals both in Cyprus itself and in the two countries with a direct interest to actually listen to the aspirations of one another. Quite frankly, without the two communities in Cyprus listening, it will take a lot longer to get a satisfactory solution. Perhaps the best thing would be to allow those two communities in Cyprus to work together with the Secretary-General of the United Nations and everybody else stand back.

*Mr Mavros (S):* Council's President-in-Office has told us about the role of the UNO. I have heard nothing about the role of the EEC in the matter of Cyprus, even though the Republic of Cyprus is linked to the EEC by an agreement of association, while Turkey, which is suppressing the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of that country, also has an agreement of association with the Community. What practical measures, then, will the EEC adopt to play its part in this matter of principle?

*Ms Chalker:* Certainly the Presidency has made absolutely clear the position of the Twelve on Cyprus. Yes indeed, we do have an association agreement with the country, but it is a matter of deep concern that so far we have been unable to bring about any resolution of this problem when there has been limited discussion on the issue in recent times.

The Twelve unconditionally support the independence, the sovereignty and the territorial integrity and the unity of Cyprus in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions. We do not differ from them, and that is why I sought to explain our position in that context. But the Twelve continue not to recognize the ‘Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus’ nor any ‘constitutional’ developments which have taken place in Northern Cyprus.

We will go on supporting the Secretary-General's efforts because they seem to us to be the best way of finding a peaceful, just and lasting settlement. I do not believe that the Twelve can do any differently since they are in total agreement with the United Nations on this issue. Perhaps the more countries that are involved in trying to resolve this problem the better.

We have taken note of all the comments made to Foreign Affairs Councils on the issue of Cyprus, but I believe that there is no better way ahead than through the efforts of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and the Twelve remain committed to that.

*Mr Ephremidis (COM):* I would like to ask a question related to the first question by Ms Castle, who asked what Council was doing to stop the illegal occupation of Northern Cyprus by Turkish troops, and

not by Denktash's troops. The transgressor is Turkey. What has Council done, or what does it propose to do against Turkey? Is it reacting, is it helping to put an end to this illegal occupation by thawing relations with Turkey, and re-establishing the Council of Association? Will the President-in-Office tell us clearly what is to be done about this illegal situation of occupation? Does Council have the means or not, does it want to do something or not? Everything else, so far as Denktash, Kyprianou, UNO, etc. are concerned, will fall into place as soon as the illegitimate situation of occupation is ended. I would like a clear answer about this.

*Ms Chalker:* I have to repeat to the Parliament that the Twelve are backing very fully the United Nations proposals because we believe that the Secretary-General initiative offers the best hope of resolving this very unsatisfactory state of affairs. There is no question but that the Twelve wish to see it resolved and resolved quickly. As far as the United Kingdom is concerned, when those restrictions – the closure of crossing points – were imposed on 4 July, the United Kingdom Government immediately made clear our concern to the Turkish Government and asked them to use their influence to secure reversal. I am glad that the restrictions indeed were lifted on 12 July. But it is important now for the Twelve individually and collectively to work with the United Nations initiative and to give every help to it. We know from your resolution in this Parliament on 10 July that that has your support and we shall continue as the Twelve to do it<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Resolution on the escalation of tension in Cyprus, *OJ* No C 227 of 8 September 1986, p. 125-126.

### **86/281. Question No H-328/86 by Mr Adamou Concerning the Continued Violation of Human Rights in Turkey**

Date of Issue: 7 October 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

The day before Mr Cheysson's visit to Turkey for talks with the regime on boosting EEC-Turkey trade, by virtue of a decision taken by the military tribunal in Adana, 19 Turks engaged in the struggle for democracy were sentenced to death, 13 were given life sentences and a further 156 were given prison sentences ranging from 2 to 24 years. This comes on top of other evidence on the continued violation of human rights in Turkey (Amnesty International, visit of MEPs etc.).

What practical measures have the Foreign Ministers taken or what measures do they intend to take to bring an immediate and definite end to the violation of human rights in Turkey?

*Ms Chalker, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers:* Could I say to Mr Adamou that the Twelve continue to monitor the human rights situation in Turkey. The Member countries raise their concerns as appropriate.

In respect of the question posed by Mr Hindley<sup>1</sup>, I should say to him that there has been no application from Turkey to join the Community. There are discussions from time to time obviously through the medium of the EEC-Turkey Association Council but the questions he was posing earlier do not in fact arise at present.

*Mr Adamou (COM):* The Community declares that one of the basic aims of its existence and activity is the protection of human rights. But when these rights are suppressed as blatantly as in Turkey, how can we justify the action of the Twelve in reconvening the Council of Association with Turkey and thawing our relations with that country?

*Ms Chalker:* Can I say to the honourable gentleman that as the Presidency we have generally accepted that the process of restoring democracy in Turkey is not yet complete. I am not surprised that it is a great matter of interest for Parliament, it is equally a matter of great interest to the Twelve that the process of restoring democracy in Turkey should be completed. We recognize the need for many further reforms, but we do have to acknowledge that steps have been taken along the road to democracy.

Turkey's progress has been recognized by the Council of Europe and the friendly settlement of a five-nations case at the European Commission on Human Rights last December and that indeed we welcomed at an Association Council.

Could I say to the Honourable Member that the Association Council last month marked the resumption of contacts at ministerial level between the Community and Turkey and it is only through contacts that we can increasingly bring pressure upon the Turkish Government to get on with their policy of restoring democracy and improving their human rights issues. I am quite certain that at all future meetings and discussions on the issue, the need to restore democracy and to restore human rights will be on every Member of the Twelve's lips as they speak about our future relationship with Turkey.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the Supplementary to Question No H-238/86, *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/280.

### **86/282. Question No H-208/86 by Mr Maher Concerning European Defence Expenditure**

Date of Issue: 8 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Would the Ministers state the level of security and defence expenditure in the Community on a country-by-country basis for 1985? If forward projections exist for 1986 and 1987, could the Ministers give an approximate figure for security and defence expenditure in Member States during these years also?

*Answer:*

The issue raised by the Honourable Member is outside the scope of European political cooperation.

### **86/283. Question No H-438/86 by Ms Lizin Concerning WEU**

Date of Issue: 8 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Can the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation give an appraisal of the progress so far made towards reactivating the WEU and of the relations between this body and the political cooperation agencies of the Twelve?

*Answer:*

The matters referred to pertain exclusively to the competence of the WEU and are not discussed within European political cooperation. Seven of the Twelve are members of WEU but there are no formal relations between the two groupings. The new treaty provisions on European political cooperation do not impede close cooperation in the field of security among certain partners within the framework of WEU.

### **86/284. Question No H-359/86 by Ms Boot Concerning the Case of Ms Guadeloupe Ccallocunta Olano De Quiste Under Arrest in Ayacucho, Peru**

Date of Issue: 8 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Status of Document: Presidency  
 Source of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

During its debate on topical and urgent subjects of 10 July 1986 the European Parliament adopted a resolution<sup>1</sup> calling for the immediate release of Ms Guadeloupe Ccallocunta Olano De Quiste (Doc. B 2-586/86). Can the EPC President-in-Office state what action the Foreign Ministers have taken on the case of Ms Guadeloupe Ccallocunta Olano De Quiste and what information he has received?

*Answer:*

The Presidency has been told by the Peruvian authorities that Sra Ccallocunta was re-arrested in Lima on 24 May. She was placed in the custody of the Counter-Terrorist Division of the Peruvian Investigation Police (PIP) and made a court appearance, accused of terrorism. After a brief spell in the Santa Monica Women's Prison she was transferred – along with all other terrorist suspects – to the Canto Grande Security Prison near Lima, where she remains. The Presidency understands that an application for Sra Ccallocunta's provisional release has been made and that this is now being considered by the Peruvian authorities. The Presidency also understands that the Peruvian Ambassador in Brussels has already sent a report – Sra Ccallocunta to the European Parliament.

---

<sup>1</sup> Resolution on the re-arrest of Ms Guadeloupe Ccallocunto Olano de Quiste, *OJ* No C 227 of 8 September 1986, p. 123.

### **86/285. Question No H-467/86 by Mr Arbeloa Muru Concerning Efforts to Abolish the Death Penalty in the World<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 8 October 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

According to information provided by Amnesty International, the number of executions carried out in 1985 was 1 125 and the number of persons sentenced to death 1 489. These figures include only those cases in which a trial of some sort was held or believed to be held and do not include summary executions, of which there were many.

Iran, South Africa, the People's Republic of China, Saudi Arabia, Nigeria and Pakistan were among the countries in which most executions were carried out. In the United States of America, 18 persons were executed, while 1 600 prisoners remain on 'death row'. Executions took place in 44 countries and death sentences were passed in 61.

According to Amnesty International, 35 persons in eleven countries were sentenced to death in March of this year and 29 were executed in a further ten countries.

What efforts are the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation making at present to end this atrocious and inhuman practice?

*Answer:*

The Twelve have not made a joint effort to achieve the worldwide abolition of the death penalty. They have, however, made appeals for clemency on humanitarian grounds to various governments about individuals sentenced to death. They have also regularly made clear their abhorrence of all summary or arbitrary executions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Former Oral Question without debate (0-77/86), converted into question for Question Time.

**86/286. Question No H-340/86 by Sir Peter Vanneck Concerning the Resolution on the Political Situation in the Middle East**

Date of Issue: 8 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

What action have the Foreign Ministers taken to implement the resolution on the political situation in the Middle East, adopted by Parliament on 20 February 1986<sup>1</sup>, and in particular the request that the Foreign Ministers should support the proposal to create a group to liaise between the parties involved in order to reconcile their viewpoints?

*Answer:*

The Foreign Ministers of the Twelve have resolved to keep in the closest touch with Middle Eastern leaders. During the Netherlands Presidency Mr Van den Broek visited a number of regional capitals. Since 1 July the British Presidency has received King Hussein, President Mubarak, the Secretary-General to the Arab League and a number of other leading figures in London. Sir Geoffrey Howe met Mr Shamir on 26 September in New York. The Twelve will continue to monitor developments with care and keep under constant review the scope for further action to promote new steps towards a just and lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute.

<sup>1</sup> Resolution based on the Charzat report, *OJ* No C 68 of 24 March 1986, p. 128.

**86/287. Question No H-390/86 by Mr Ephremidis Concerning the Extension of the Moratorium on Nuclear Tests**

Date of Issue: 8 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Since the implementation of the unilateral moratorium by the Soviet Union, the USA has carried out 18 nuclear tests, of which three were not in fact announced. The Soviet leadership, once again displaying a spirit of good will where reductions in nuclear armaments are concerned, has announced that the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests is to be extended, for the third time, to 1 January 1987.

What is the attitude of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation to this latest action by the Soviet Union, and what steps will they take to ensure that there is a positive response to it on the part of the American leadership?

*Answer:*

Within European political cooperation no position has been adopted as regards the issue raised by the Honourable Member of Parliament.

**86/288. Question No H-391/86 by Ms Crawley Concerning Irina Ratushinskaya**

Date of Issue: 8 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Will the Foreign Ministers of the EEC meeting in political cooperation take up with utmost urgency with the Soviet Government the case of Irina Ratushinskaya, a political prisoner, who is suffering from a chronic kidney complaint and is undergoing the maximum sentence for anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda – which is seven years' strict regime labour camp and five years' exile – in Mordavia, southeast of Moscow?

I call upon the Foreign Ministers of the EEC to make immediate representations to the Soviet Government for the release of Irina Ratushinskaya on humanitarian grounds.

*Answer:*

Respect for human rights and fundamental freedom, including freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, is stipulated in the Helsinki Final Act. The Twelve, individually and collectively, use every occasion that presents itself to remind the Soviet Union of the commitment it accepted by acceding to the UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and by signing the Helsinki Final Act.

The Twelve are concerned about the fact and the conditions of Ms Ratushinskaya's detention and are convinced of the urgent need for action by the Soviet authorities to lift the harsh measures to which she is subject. The forthcoming CSCE Follow-up Meeting in Vienna will be an appropriate opportunity to raise this matter.

**86/289. Question No H-408/86 by Mr Newton Dunn Concerning the Gabcikovo Nagymaros Hydroelectric Project and the Duna Kor Environmentalists**

Date of Issue: 8 October 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

What steps have the Foreign Ministers taken to follow up Parliament's resolution B 2-1703/85 of 13 March 1986<sup>1</sup> on opposition to the proposed Gabcikovo-Nagymaros hydroelectric project on the Danube, with its possible consequences for the Rhine-Danube link with the Federal Republic of Germany?

*Answer:*

The question raised by the Honourable Member has not been discussed within the framework of European political cooperation.

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 88 of 14 April 1986, pp. 77-78.

**86/290. Question No H-413/86 by Mr Ulburghs Concerning the Arrest of Ms Bhutto in Pakistan**

Date of Issue: 8 October 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

At the end of August 1986 Ms Benazir Bhutto, the daughter of the former democratically elected Prime Minister, Ali Bhutto, and currently one of the leaders of the opposition to the Government of Zia Ul-Haq, was arrested. Last year Ms Bhutto visited the European Parliament, where she requested support

for the struggle of the Pakistani people against the military regime. Are the Foreign Ministers prepared to take steps to secure the release of Ms Bhutto and to support moves to achieve democratization in Pakistan?

*Answer:*

According to information available to the Twelve, Ms Bhutto was released from detention on 9 September, following the decision by the Government of the State of Sind in Pakistan to release all those political prisoners who had been held under detention orders since 12 August.

**86/291. Question No H-413/86 by Mr Boesmans Concerning the Fate of the Flemish Priest, Father Vandesompele**

Date of Issue: 8 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

On 12 July 1986 Father Vandesompele, who had been working in South Africa for many years, was arrested by the South African police in his parish of Jouberton and imprisoned. Since then he has been detained in deplorable conditions. What representations have already been made to the South African authorities by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation with a view to ensuring the immediate release of Father Vandesompele and what specific results have been obtained?

*Answer:*

The Foreign Ministers of the Twelve have not discussed the specific case raised by the Honourable Member. They have, however, expressed their grave concern at the reimposition of the state of emergency in South Africa and have condemned the practice of detention without trial. They have called on the South African Government to take the steps necessary to allow a genuine dialogue to commence without delay.

**86/292. Question No H-429/86 by Mr Iversen Concerning Refugees in Europe**

Date of Issue: 8 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Have the Foreign Ministers examined the situation of refugees in Europe and the problems which arise from the fact that some countries are able to escape their responsibilities by closing their borders? Are the Ministers considering any joint initiatives on this matter in Europe in order to bring the present unhappy situation to an end?

*Answer:*

The Twelve remain committed to the principle of offering political asylum to *bona fide* applications, and the possession or otherwise of a visa does not affect the duty of a State party to the 1951 Convention to consider an asylum request and to protect a refugee from *refoulement*. At the same time, the Twelve are seriously concerned at the continuing arrival of large numbers of foreign nationals in the European

Community without the proper documentation. In this context they continue to attach importance to the internationally accepted practice of not issuing transit visas to those without valid documentation for their country of final destination.

**86/293. Question No H-430/86 by Mr Habsburg Concerning the Yalta Agreement**

Date of Issue: 8 October 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Since the answer given by the Ministers to my question H-231/86<sup>1</sup> was totally unsatisfactory, can they now indicate whether, in view of the international situation, they do not consider it high time to press for more active monitoring of implementation of the Yalta Agreement, since this has had the most decisive political influence in the post-war era?

*Answer:*

As the Honourable Member is well aware, the Twelve have on many occasions expressed their preoccupation with the consequences of the division of Europe as this came about after the end of the Second World War. They have sought peacefully and in a long-term perspective to build on the common traditions and history which are shared by the countries of eastern and western Europe. In the framework of the CSCE they have worked to overcome the unfortunate consequences of the division of Europe, and they will continue to do so.

---

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/254.

**86/294. Question No H-446/86 by Mr Alavanos Concerning Measures Against the Chilean Regime**

Date of Issue: 8 October 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

A wave of arrests and murders has been unleashed by the Chilean regime which, using the recent attempted assassination of the dictator Pinochet as a pretext, has declared martial law in the country. According to reports from the democratic opposition, the scale and ferocity of the violence is reminiscent of the days following the 1973 coup and the junta has reinforced its regime of terror to the point of placing a ban on news being reported from Chile (Reuter, ANSA).

Do the Ministers intend to take effective measures to assist the people of Chile to free themselves from General Pinochet's regime of violence and repression, which celebrated its 13th anniversary on 11 September? What will such measures consist of?

*Answer:*

On 16 September the Foreign Ministers of the Twelve meeting in Brussels issued a statement in which they expressed their deep concern at the reimposition of the state of siege in Chile and called for it to be lifted immediately and for the Government to begin a dialogue with the democratic opposition without delay as a first step to restoring democracy. The Twelve will continue to monitor the situation in Chile closely and will ensure that the Chilean Government is aware of their views.



---

## 86/295. Statement in the Fifth Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Report of the Committee on Conferences and on the Pattern of Conferences<sup>1</sup>

Date of Issue: 8 October 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Murray:* Mr Chairman, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community.

I should first express the appreciation of the Twelve for the report of the Committee on Conferences, and offer our encouragement to the Committee in its efforts to bring about optimum use of conference resources. The Twelve also appreciate the introductory statements made by Mr Mudho, Chairman of the Committee on Conferences, and by Mr Wyzner. In commending the labours of Under-Secretary-General Wyzner and of the Department of Conference Services, the Twelve acknowledge that present financial circumstances make their task more than usually difficult. The evolution of the financial environment will inevitably have a bearing on the Conference areas, as will the decisions taken on the report of the Group of Eighteen, which makes a number of related recommendations.

In considering the report of the Committee on Conferences, we might usefully reflect on the factors which together determine the shape and content of the calendar of conferences, and which affect the use of conference-servicing resources. In one respect, the immediate responsibility for these matters belongs to the Committee on Conferences. It is essential to examine carefully the recommendations of the Committee, and in particular the performance of the Department of Conference Services in implementing the conferences programme — a major line of expenditure in the UN budget. But in another respect, the Committee on Conferences and the Department of Conferences Services are constrained: all they can do is respond to the decisions of the General Assembly. It is inevitable that the more conferences are approved, the poorer will be the level of service, given the limited resources available. Member States cannot simultaneously expect an ever-increasing number of meetings, a static or declining level of funding on conference-servicing, and a continuous high quality of service. While we of course expect the Committee on Conferences and the Department of Conference Services to exercise their responsibilities, Member States equally should limit their requirements to the minimum.

Mr Chairman, in the last year or two, the Committee on Conferences has been making commendable efforts to try to reconcile the continuing high level of demand for meetings with the limited resources available, without reducing the quality of service. The statistics on the use made by various bodies of conference resources are revealing. Despite the Committee's appeals there seems still to be widespread reluctance on the part of the bodies concerned (and that means member States) to rationalize their use of their conference time. In our view the quality of a conference is not necessarily a function of its length. Mr Chairman, the Twelve welcome the modest improvement reported. We understand we have reached the position where half of UN bodies now use at least 75% of their conference resources. But we believe that there is much room for more improvement — the corollary is that fully half of the UN bodies still do *not* make good use of the resources allocated. The Twelve believe that the Committee of Conferences is well placed to draw some telling conclusions about resource wastage. Bodies which do not adhere to guidelines should in future have fewer resources to waste. The authority of the Committee, the renewal of whose mandate the Twelve fully support, should be strengthened if that is necessary to produce results.

Turning now to the specific issue of the control and limitation of documentation, Mr Wyzner's letter of 12 September to all Permanent Representatives reminded us of this perennial problem. Bearing in mind that every printed page, in six languages, costs several hundred dollars to produce, we should ensure that each document is at the very least concise, timely and makes a contribution to the item under discussion. This applies particularly to the Secretariat. But member States again have a duty here: Mr Wyzner's polite request that member States minimize their practice of asking for certain material to be

circulated as official documents is amply justified. The Committee should continue to monitor closely the whole documentation problem with a view to rationalizing and reducing the number, volume and cost of UN documents without prejudice to the rules on distribution in the official languages.

On the Committee's recommendation that the experimental period during which no subsidiary organ (with certain exceptions) should receive summary records continue for a further three years, the Twelve do not disagree with the thrust of this recommendation. But in view of the prevailing financial situation, we believe that the Committee on Conferences might have gone further and encouraged bodies in receipt of written records to examine carefully and candidly what they really need and what can be dispensed with. An honest assessment would reduce the number of exceptions.

Mr Chairman, the Twelve welcome the study made by the Committee on Conferences of the Secretariat's practice of despatching planning missions for conferences. That practice was clearly overdue for such examination, and did not meet even minimum standards of cost-effectiveness. The Twelve are glad to note from the report of the Committee on Conferences that guidelines for planning missions have now been drafted. We expect these to reduce significantly the frequency and size of planning missions. The Twelve recommend that the Committee maintain its monitoring of this practice.

On the draft calendar, Mr Chairman, the Twelve note the Committee's view that certain subsidiary bodies have a requirement to meet at headquarters during this General Assembly. We note that the reason offered by these bodies was that the meetings were necessary to enable them to finish their work. The Twelve endorse the Committee's suggestion (paragraph 64) that a fuller justification of these requests be a requirement.

The Twelve recall the decision of the General Assembly (40/243) which limits to 5 the number of special conferences which normally can be convened in any year. It is therefore incongruous that more than five special conferences are being planned for 1987 (page 29 of the English text), a year which is likely to be very difficult for the UN. Mr Chairman, we regret that the Committee on Conferences apparently found itself unable to do more than note this contradiction. The Twelve would like to see a mechanism whereby the Committee on Conferences, with the Secretariat, can monitor the requests for such conferences, and ensure that the General Assembly's limits are observed.

The Twelve's readiness to support the recommendations of the Committee on Conferences is therefore by no means unqualified: while that report urges upon the Administration the need for maximum cost-effectiveness in the use of resources, it stops short of reminding member States of their responsibilities in this direction. None the less, Mr Chairman, we believe that the Committee is moving in the right direction. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.5/41/SR.8, item 115.

## **86/296. Statement in the Special Committee Against Apartheid, to Mark the Day of Solidarity with South African Political Prisoners**

Date of Issue: 10 October 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Birch:* I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Members of the European Community.

For years the Twelve have repeatedly and unequivocally condemned apartheid, both here at the United Nations and in many other forums. We have demanded that it should be abolished. Apartheid is an insult to the dignity of those it affects and a flagrant violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms set out in the United Nations Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to which the Member States of the EC attach the highest importance. It prevents meaningful participation by the majority of the people of South Africa in the political life of their country. It is an institutionalized system of State racism, which deprives them of their civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights.

Apartheid has bred hatred and violence. The South African authorities have reacted ruthlessly to the efforts of the large majority of the population to secure the abolition of the system. The last twelve months have seen a deepening of the cycle of violence and repression. The South African Government have, it is true, introduced some reforms. But these have been too few and too slow to stem the surging tide of bitterness and bloodshed in the country.

The state of emergency, which was reimposed this year over the whole of South Africa has worsened, not improved, the prospects for peaceful change. It has led to the imprisonment of many thousands of people without trial and brought much anguish and suffering to their families and loved ones.

The Twelve are gravely concerned that the situation appears to have entered a new phase of increased tension. We fully support the spirit and objectives of this Day of Solidarity, and are implementing a concerted programme of assistance to the victims of apartheid. We reaffirm our solidarity with all those imprisoned because of their opposition to the apartheid system. We share the widespread anxiety felt by the international community over reports of the conditions in which some detainees are being held. We make yet another urgent appeal that all those imprisoned or deprived of freedom without trial because of their opposition to the regime be freed immediately and unconditionally. We call once again for an end to the state of emergency and to other repressive measures being taken by the South African authorities, in particular forced resettlement.

The goal of the Twelve is, quite simply, the elimination of apartheid. The international community should rise to this challenge. There is an urgent need for an end to violence and for a genuine national dialogue, across lines of colour, politics and religion. That is the only way the necessary changes can be brought about by peaceful means. Dialogue, however, is impossible while black leaders remain imprisoned or detained and anti-apartheid organizations proscribed. At their meeting in Brussels on 15-16 September the Foreign Ministers of the Twelve deplored the fact that the South African Government was not yet prepared to take the steps to make a genuine dialogue possible. As a first step on the road to dialogue the Twelve have repeatedly called on the South African Government to release unconditionally Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners and to lift the ban on the African National Congress, the Pan-African Congress of Azania and other political parties.

On this Day of Solidarity with South African political prisoners the Twelve renew once gain their demand for the speedy and complete dismantling of the system of racial segregation and of all forms of repression in South Africa. For our part, we will continue to do everything we can to promote urgent and peaceful change in that troubled country.

**86/297. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Review of the Efficiency of the Administration and Financial Functioning of the United Nations: Report of the Group of High Level Intergovernmental Experts, etc.<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 14 October 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Residency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Sir John Thomson:* Mr President, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community.

The Twelve wish at the outset to reaffirm their support for the Charter and for the Organization. A world like ours, whose nations are increasingly interdependent, has a correspondingly greater need for strong and vital multilateral institutions. The United Nations itself is the cornerstone of the multilateral system. For our part, therefore, we have no doubt that this debate deals with one of the most crucial issues of the present Session, and that what we decide here in this Assembly over the next few days will be of the utmost importance for the future of this Organization. The Twelve have been struck, Mr

President, by the attention paid to this issue during the General Debate, and by the thoughtful contributions we have heard there. We are encouraged that so many of those who spoke have given their broad support to the report in front of us.

Many speakers have pointed out that the situation we face is political and not simply a problem of finance: it stems from a crisis of confidence which is felt not only in this building but much more widely. The mandate we gave to the Group of 18 High Level Intergovernmental Experts did not include an instruction to resolve the financial crisis. Nevertheless I think we are all conscious that there is in practical political terms a close link between their report and the long term administrative and financial well-being of the Organization. I believe there is a general hope in this Assembly that the report of the Group of Eighteen will help us to resolve or at least to alleviate the financial crisis. We cannot close our eyes to the extent and the urgency of the financial situation. As the Secretary-General has emphasized in his useful and important review on the report of the Group of Eighteen (A/41/663),

the Organization continues to face a grave and immediate financial crisis. Whether the United Nations will remain solvent in the last months of this year remains even now an open question.

This is a warning of the utmost seriousness.

We are aware of the widespread feeling that the Organization will somehow cope with its problems until next year. Even if it does – and there are grave doubts that it will – it will have achieved only a temporary respite from its illness, not a cure. We have the responsibility, and the opportunity, to find a cure, and we must seize that opportunity now while there is time.

The Twelve have consistently made clear their view that all States should pay their assessed contributions in full, in accordance with their Charter obligations. To fail in this respect is to be in breach of international obligations. It remains the position of the Twelve that respect for international obligations is indispensable if UN finances are to be placed on a sound footing.

Another basic obligation under the Charter is to respect the sovereign equality of all member States. Every country, both large and small, should not only have its voice heard, but be assured that it is heard. But we should also face up to political realities. As the Secretary-General pointed out last December, even though the budget then adopted by the Fifth Committee provided for a real growth of only 0.1%, member States which accounted for almost 80% of the assessed budget either cast a negative vote or abstained in the vote (A/40/PV.122). The Secretary-General described this situation as disturbing evidence of a growing division in the membership on financial matters which, if long continued, could have very negative implications for the Organization. The Twelve agree with this view. It is plainly unsatisfactory when the budget, which reflects the work of the Organization, is a matter for serious contention. The Twelve believe that a solution must be found to the problem of promoting agreement on key budgetary issues.

The recommendations of the Group of Eighteen before us comprise administrative and financial reforms of the kind which any Organization must implement if it is to achieve efficiency and effectiveness. After forty years of growth and activity it is appropriate for the United Nations to have a spring cleaning. The recommendations will help us to do this. They provide an essential basis for the changes which the organization will need to implement if it is to secure its long-term well-being. We look forward to the comments which the Secretary-General expects to submit on individual proposals in the report as the General Assembly pursues its consideration of it.

The Group of High Level Experts has done an excellent job, in the limited time available to them, and we congratulate them. Their report is a substantial foundation on which we can build. Indeed, it is more than a foundation, it is the greater part of the building. The bulk of their recommendations – in Chapters I to V of the report – seem to us to be valuable, constructive, necessary and at times self-evident. This is why we can accept them broadly as they stand.

Nevertheless, an important element of the edifice, that part concerning the budgetary process, namely Chapter VI, remains incomplete. If it is not finished properly, and soon, the weather may get in and damage the rest. The Twelve share the crucial judgement of the Secretary-General that there is evident agreement on several central points in this regard, including – I quote –

the need for an improved intergovernmental machinery that can deal more thoroughly with questions related to the budget; the advisability of earlier participation by member States in the programme and budget process; the importance of coordinated programme planning and programme budgeting; and the need for early establishment of guidance by the General Assembly on the level of resources within which expenditures during a biennium would be accommodated.

We also agree with the Secretary-General – and this is a vital point – that with a further effort, an agreement on this subject which is consistent with the Charter can be reached. The Twelve are resolved to support and assist to the best of their ability negotiations to bridge the final gap in a manner acceptable to the membership as a whole. We believe it can be done, and that it must be done.

The Twelve have given careful consideration to these issues, which in our view go to the heart of the political and financial problems that beset the organization. We believe, Mr President, that changes should be made in the system, changes which will produce broader consensus on financial issues and help overcome the reluctance of some members to meet their financial obligations. In particular, we support the creation of an improved mechanism to consider the programme budget, structured so as to ensure effective decision-making and to contribute to greater rationalization and efficiency within the system. We are firm in our support for the Charter and for a strong and effective Organization. Greater budgetary discipline, improved coordination and rigorous adherence to priorities can only strengthen the Organization and ensure its future stability and vigour.

Mr President, the Twelve are delighted that, under your auspices, a debate has been arranged so early in the Session. We share your conviction of the urgency of this matter. We believe that following this debate the item should be remitted to the Fifth Committee, and that that Committee, after a factual examination of the report within the scope of its responsibilities, should submit its findings to Plenary, so that we can take up the debate again next week and bring it to a satisfactory conclusion. It is our sincere hope that in the light of these discussions it will be possible to reach agreement here by consensus on the way ahead. The agreed changes must then be implemented constructively and expeditiously.

Finally, Mr President, the Twelve, as responsible States members of the United Nations, stand ready to play their part in achieving such an outcome.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/41/PV.36, item 38.

## **86/298. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 14 October 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Renton:* Mr Chairman, it is my privilege today to take the floor on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community. In doing so, I extend to you Mr Chairman – whom I welcome as a fellow European – and to the other members of the Bureau our congratulations on election to your demanding office. We trust that under your leadership this Committee will conduct its business not only efficiently but with success.

I will obviously want to make some comments on the recent meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev in Reykjavik. But I will start with some general remarks about the attitude of the Twelve to disarmament and arms control. Philosophy must be tempered with down-to-earth reflections. This Committee is the first in order at the United Nations. It should also be the first in priority. The issues with which it deals – peace, security and a safer world for all – can never be relegated to the second rank of world attention. But as we look around this room at each other we must ask ourselves this: How much in concrete terms has this Committee contributed to achieving such

objectives? Mr Chairman, people around the world are continuing to die every day and every hour as the result of wars, internal and international; as the result of flagrant violations of human rights; as the result of man's inhumanity to man, to woman and to child.

We strongly believe that the objective of the countries represented here should be to make people everywhere feel more secure for themselves, for their families, and for their futures. The important principle guiding the work of this Committee should therefore be to consider what we can do in a realistic and practical way to move towards these goals.

I need hardly remind you, Mr Chairman, that Europe's historical and geographical position means that war, be it nuclear or conventional, would spell ruin, indeed catastrophe for our continent. Arms control and disarmament have a central role in the achievement of the goals in the United Nations Charter, including international security, and that means measures to enhance security at the lowest possible levels of armaments are vital for the Twelve.

We have been heartened by the heightened activity the last year has seen in this field. We have welcomed the success of Stockholm. We have seen the multilateral process continuing to work here, in Geneva, and Vienna. And of course there are the crucial bilateral discussions between the United States of America and the Soviet Union. There are proposals on the various tables for deep cuts in US and Soviet strategic nuclear arsenals, for the complete elimination of their intermediate range nuclear forces, for the elimination worldwide of all chemical weapons, and for the progressive reduction of conventional forces in Europe. These proposals remain on the table.

But expectations must not be confused with success. The former can be easy, all too easy to arouse: the latter much harder to achieve. What is now urgently needed is continued and sustained effort. It is high time to break the relentless cycle of escalation of armaments. The wide-ranging proposals currently on the table must not be allowed to suffer the fate of so many earlier proposals, to languish in limbo. Practical negotiations concentrating on specific proposals are essential if concrete results are to be achieved at the negotiating table.

Mr Chairman, several elements are common to all arms control and disarmament negotiations. First, that arms control and disarmament measures can and should increase confidence. Substantial and balanced reductions in the world's arsenals to the lowest possible level, are of course vital. But they will not by themselves be sufficient to guarantee greater security. We must also work for improved confidence between States, resulting from clearer and more predictable military behaviour. To adopt a set of mutually complementary confidence – and security-building measures designed to reduce the risk of military confrontation in Europe – that has been the precise aim of the Twelve at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence—and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, on which I shall have more to say later.

The question of security is complex. Arms control and disarmament are not the only instruments for safeguarding international peace and security, but their importance is indisputable. The existence of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction underscores this view. Ultimately security is a political and diplomatic as much as a military problem, requiring dialogue and greater understanding as well. Security is also affected by the way States deal with many everyday aspects of human behaviour, by the respect they show for human rights, by their conduct of good-neighbourly relations. We want to see international security based not on armed co-existence. We need to orient it towards cooperation. Such a result could in itself certainly be a positive factor for development. But the first contribution arms control and disarmament can make is this: the enhancement of stability and predictability in relations between nations.

Second, within the arms control and disarmament process, confidence and greater predictability must be instilled by adequate provisions for the verification of compliance. The degree of confidence and transparency which exists will be a key factor when States come to assess the verification arrangements appropriate to each agreement. This means that the verification arrangements will differ in each individual case. But the net result must be unambiguous and effective provisions providing the maximum incentive for strict compliance.

For we in the European Community believe that adequate verification is not merely a slogan, an optional extra, another of the tired catch-phrases left behind by the tide of earlier disarmament efforts.

No, Mr Chairman, adequate verification is crucial now, today, and in all future agreements. And that should surprise no one. For such verification is in everyone's interest. The acceptance of obligations under an arms control agreement is in itself a recognition that States are willing to circumscribe their sovereign rights. Verification may appear to be a further encroachment on sovereignty. Yet it is only by accepting such measures that arms control will be effective and confidence will be strengthened between States.

Mr Chairman, I will now deal with specific areas of arms control and disarmament. For the countries on whose behalf I speak today nuclear disarmament is one of the highest priorities. Our common wish is to see the achievement of substantial and balanced reductions in the global level of nuclear weapons beginning with those of the two superpowers. This time last year, our hopes had been raised by the resumption of bilateral discussions between the United States and the Soviet Union. We welcomed the Geneva Summit last year between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev. We welcomed the commitment of both sides to early progress in the current negotiations and we support the purpose of these talks, namely preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on earth. And we endorse the overriding aim of creating conditions to prevent any war whether nuclear or conventional. The talks that have been in progress since March 1985, between the two powers who have the overwhelming majority of nuclear weapons, are therefore of vital importance for everyone and not least for the Twelve. We urge and we support the need for significant achievements there.

We continue to take that view after the meeting this weekend in Reykjavik. Arms control agreements of potentially major significance seem to have been in prospect. That they were not reached is of course a disappointment. But this setback does not and should not mean that the search for agreements is at an end. The talks at Geneva were making some real strides. We, the Twelve, look to the two sides to continue the search for agreements in these talks, building on those areas where movement has already taken place. That the Reykjavik meeting was not able to reach agreement on a very wide range of issues must not mean a return to square one. Far from it. By consolidating what has been won, by building on what has been achieved, by moving patiently step-by-step and with determination, by tackling and disposing of each problem as it arises — in that way, Mr Chairman, we will in the international community truly create a safer world. That rule applies to all our disarmament efforts. And it applies with special force to the bilateral Geneva talks.

While it is of primary importance that the two countries concerned should pursue their efforts we also believe that all nations should give them full and patient support. The success of their negotiations would do much to bring about that improved confidence which as I have said before, is such an essential prerequisite for further, sustained progress. The Twelve underline the importance of existing arms control agreements — including the bilateral ABM Treaty of 1972 — being strictly observed, and being seen to be observed by the parties concerned.

Mr Chairman, in our support and encouragement for bilateral discussions we do not overlook another need: for multilateral negotiations. The role of the Conference on Disarmament, as the sole permanent multilateral negotiating body, is particularly important. Nor should we neglect the role of other multilateral forums for discussion — this Committee itself, and the UN Disarmament Commission which this year continued its valuable deliberations.

Negotiations on the global ban on chemical weapons are currently underway in the Conference on Disarmament. The commitment of the Twelve to the early conclusion of an effective and verifiable global ban on chemical weapons is well known. We attach to it a particularly high priority. A comprehensive convention is needed before the genie of chemical weapons escapes forever from the bottle. I am, therefore, glad to be able to say that movement towards this goal in the Conference on Disarmament is encouraging.

The report of the Conference to this session of the General Assembly registers remarkable progress in important areas of the draft convention. The area of common ground between the delegations of the Conference on Disarmament has been enlarged. Members of the Twelve have played important parts in this work. One Member State has this year provided the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Chemical Weapons which is the forum for the negotiations. The Government of another Member organized a valuable workshop in The Hague and Rotterdam in June. This successful event contributed

to one important step forward: a new Article VI on 'Activities Not Prohibited by the Convention'. This will provide assurance that the civil chemical industry is not being misused for the manufacture of chemical weapons. Similarly, the latest draft contains new texts for Articles IV and V of the Convention. These deal respectively with the elimination of existing stocks of chemical weapons and of facilities for production.

Much however remains to be done. I spoke earlier about the dilemma between sovereignty and verification. This is exemplified sharply in the field of chemical weapons. Verification measures will affect a large number of civil chemical companies that never have had anything to do with chemical warfare, nor will they in the future. Yet we accept some international supervision in this area is essential if everyone's security concerns are to be properly safeguarded, and we heartily welcome the international consensus that this should be so. It is generally agreed that this assurance should be provided as far as possible, by routine methods of verification, including on-site inspection of declared facilities.

It is also agreed that a system of challenge inspection is also required, as a safety net, to provide the ultimate source of confidence in the Convention. Challenge inspection potentially involves the greatest encroachment on sovereignty, but this safety net will constitute a crucial part of effective verification arrangements. In order to establish common ground on this last issue I recently made in the Conference on Disarmament a new proposal on behalf of the United Kingdom which we believe provides the right way forward in this important area, forming a stable keystone in the arch of confidence in the Convention. This proposal has already received welcome support. We look forward to further, substantive reactions from all the negotiating partners.

It is important that work on the Convention continues during the present recess of the Conference on Disarmament. Once this First Committee has completed its task, there will be further consultations in Geneva to prepare for the next formal session in January. We hope that this General Assembly will take note with satisfaction of the progress already made in Geneva. We trust the United Nations will encourage the Conference on Disarmament to conclude as a matter of urgency a convention which rids the world completely of chemical weapons. That is our objective, worthy of the Conference on Disarmament and worthy of the United Nations. Help us to meet it.

The Conference on Disarmament has on its agenda the subject of a comprehensive test ban. Although agreement has not been reached on an appropriate mandate for an *Ad Hoc* Committee in this area, useful work is being done on verification by the Seismic Expert Group, which has expanded its work programme this year. At the same time we note the recent round of talks between the United States of America and the Soviet Union on verification and nuclear testing.

Mr Chairman, I have already noted the attention paid by the European Community to the Geneva bilateral talks on preventing an arms race in outer space. We also attach much importance to the work of the Conference on Disarmament *Ad Hoc* Committee on Outer Space, and Members of the Twelve have played an active part in establishing common ground there. This is the essential preliminary to decisions on what further arms control measures may be needed. We hope that, in the coming year, the Conference on Disarmament will be able to agree quickly on an appropriate and generally acceptable mandate for further work on multilateral issues. It goes without saying that work at the Conference on Disarmament must complement the results of the Geneva bilateral talks. It certainly must not prejudice them. Rather the *Ad Hoc* Committee should aim to carry out its work in a realistic way.

Mr Chairman, I have already stated that nuclear arms reductions and disarmament remain one of the highest priorities for the Twelve. But we would not wish to lose sight of the terrible destruction that can also be wrought by conventional weapons. It is conventional weapons alone that have been responsible for millions of deaths since the end of the Second World War. Despite the fundamental difference in character between nuclear and conventional weapons in terms of their capacity for indiscriminate destruction, millions of bereaved families would tell us that death by the latter weapons is just as final as by the former.

The Twelve therefore believe that the process of arms control and disarmament must apply in all fields. Progress to achieve verifiable conventional arms control agreements – whether in central Europe, or in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, or in a global context – is crucial. But conventional disarmament is particularly important for Europe. There we see the largest concentration of weapons and forces in the



world. There we find the greatest need to achieve balance at the lowest possible level of forces. And there we must instil confidence – confidence that reductions in one field will not be undermined by imbalances in another or increases elsewhere.

In September, an important and substantial step forward was taken in the building of confidence in Europe. The Stockholm Conference reached agreement on detailed measures to this end. This, the first security agreement including nations from East and West since 1979, came as the result of painstaking and now productive negotiations. The Twelve, who made a substantial contribution to that result, will seek to build on it both in the field of arms control and more widely in the CSCE process. In the latter context, those of the Twelve who participate in the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction talks in Vienna hope that it will now be possible to make rapid progress there, on the basis of the constructive Western proposal of December 1985.

Equally we support efforts in Latin America, in Africa and Asia as well as in Europe which can contribute to a favourable atmosphere for regional disarmament measures. The Twelve hope that such efforts will prosper. The key is to reduce the problems posed by tension, fear and misperceptions in different regions of the world. I should like to underline at this point that a valuable study on conventional disarmament was recently completed under the auspices of the United Nations. The Twelve believe that this has made a substantial contribution to international wisdom on this issue. And we hope that the lessons it contains will be taken to heart.

This session of the First Committee, like some of its predecessors, may look at proposals for the creation of nuclear weapons free zones. The creation of such zones could, in certain parts of the world, contribute to stability in the areas concerned, to non-proliferation and to the disarmament process in general. This is however conditional upon the States concerned being prepared to participate on the basis of agreements freely entered into and in keeping with internationally recognized principles.

The Twelve continue to attach the utmost importance to an effective international non-proliferation regime. Those members of the Twelve who are parties to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty note with great satisfaction the successful outcome of the NPT Review Conference in 1985. With equal satisfaction they note the subsequent increase in parties by a further four, to a current total of 136. They believe that these events demonstrate the support of the overwhelming majority of States for the non-proliferation objectives enshrined in the Treaty.

Mr Chairman, the Twelve welcome the successful conclusion of the recent Review Conference of the Biological Weapons Convention in September. We believe that the authority of the Convention, as the international norm against biological and toxic weapons, has been strengthened as a result. None the less, we feel that more can and should be done. We therefore look forward to the meeting of experts scheduled for next April, at which we hope that the process of increasing confidence in the biological weapons control regime can be taken a stage further. The Twelve believe that the Biological Weapons Convention requires and deserves the support of the entire international community. We call upon those countries which have signed the Convention to hasten their ratification. And we urge those yet to sign to do so without further delay.

Mr Chairman, last year, on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the United Nations, we reflected on the utility of the Organization in general and of this Committee in particular. We concluded that the First Committee had played a useful role as a forum for deliberations on questions of disarmament and international security. At the same time, we recognized the need to improve the efficiency of the Committee. This requirement has become even more urgent as a result of the budgetary crisis which the United Nations faces. The Twelve believe that it is entirely possible for this Committee to make a contribution to the search for economy and efficiency within the United Nations without making unacceptable sacrifices.

During the 30th Session of the General Assembly the number of resolutions adopted in the First Committee was 29. By the 35th Session the figure had risen to 44. Last year it was 73. We question the actual benefits in terms of results to be derived from this rapid increase in the number of resolutions. We of the European Community believe that the objective of resolutions should be the encouragement of effective and verifiable measures of arms control and disarmament. We therefore attach less importance to the total number of resolutions tabled than to the extent of consensus achieved on them. This practical

approach will remain the starting point of the Twelve. We await with interest in this context the results of the review of the UN approach to disarmament, currently being undertaken in the United Nations Disarmament Commission on the initiative of a group of African countries. We hope specific recommendations will be submitted to next year's General Assembly.

One of the tasks of the First Committee this year, Mr Chairman, will be to set dates for convening the Third Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I need hardly say that we of Western Europe will play an active and constructive role in the preparations for the Special Session. But I do need to note the particular relevance to these preparations of the budgetary restraint to which I have already referred.

The First Committee is also expected to decide upon dates for the United Nations Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development taking into consideration the conferences and the venues scheduled in the field of disarmament at the UN. We of the Twelve recognize how complex is the relationship between expenditure on armaments and the problems of development at a global and national level. Complications and variables abound. The regional differences admit of no simple short-cuts, nor crude panaceas. We are looking forward to a keen examination of all aspects of the relationship between disarmament, development and related issues of security. We will be open-minded. And, as always, we will be realistic.

Mr Chairman, general and complete disarmament remains our ultimate goal, though we recognize that it can only be achieved gradually. In present circumstances, it is vital that the negotiations now under way – whether at the bilateral or multilateral or regional level – should result in agreement on reduced levels of armaments. This would both help strengthen international security and increase mutual confidence. It should, we hope, create a 'virtuous circle' leading to further and even more significant reductions. The Twelve will continue to work actively in pursuit of these goals. We call upon other States to join us in this endeavour.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.1/41/PV.4.

### **86/299. Statement in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Importance of the Universal Realization of the Right of Peoples to Self-Determination<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 15 October 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Ms Young:* Mr Chairman, my delegation has asked for the floor to make a statement on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community on item 88, 'the Importance of the Universal Realization of the Right of Peoples to Self-Determination'.

The Twelve have no wish to engage in polemical discussions. But we have heard statements on this item from a good many delegations, and we take this opportunity to set out our view of this important issue.

In accordance with the principles set out in the Charter, the common first article of both International Covenants proclaims the right of self-determination. It is important to remember that, under the Covenants, self-determination is a right of peoples. It applies with equal force to all peoples, without discrimination.

We have heard many speakers in this debate refer to peoples deprived of the right of self-determination through foreign invasion or occupation. And rightly so. But the mere absence of foreign invasion or occupation does not mean that a people is free to exercise its right of self-determination. Self-determination is not a single event – one revolution or one election. The exercise of this right is a continuous process. If peoples are to, in the words of the Covenants, 'freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development', they must have regular

opportunities to choose their governments and their social systems freely; and to change them when they so wish. This in turn means that each individual must be able to exercise the other rights set out in the Covenants, such as the rights to freedom of thought and expression; the rights of peaceful assembly and freedom of association; the right to take part in the conduct of public affairs, either directly or through freely chosen representatives; and the right to vote and be elected at genuine periodic elections. It is on these fundamental rights that the democratic societies of the Twelve are based.

The right of self-determination cannot be applied selectively. Lasting peace and security are unattainable without it. The Twelve will continue to uphold this fundamental right in all circumstances, in particular wherever it is threatened.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.3/41/SR.14, item 88.

### **86/300. Statement in the Special Political Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Peace-Keeping<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 16 October 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Watt:* Mr Chairman, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community.

The views of the Twelve on the importance of United Nations peace-keeping are well known. The peace-keeping role of the United Nations, the primary responsibility for which lies with the Security Council, is of fundamental importance to the effective implementation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. United Nations peace-keeping operations represent a concrete manifestation of the desire of the world community to maintain international peace and security. It is generally recognized that peace-keeping operations constitute one of the most successful innovations of the United Nations.

The Twelve have consistently supported peace-keeping operations themselves, within the framework of the United Nations and in conformity with the Charter, as well as efforts aimed at ensuring as sound a basis as possible for the principles governing their establishment and conduct.

We regret that, for yet another year, the Special Committee on Peace-Keeping Operations has made no progress in carrying out its mandate, and indeed has not found sufficient grounds even for convening a meeting. It is not necessary to recall here the causes of the continuing deadlock. A great majority of the members of the Committee, which includes six members of the Twelve, are already agreed upon principles which reflect accepted and proven practice in the successful conduct of peace-keeping operations. An overwhelming majority, which of course included the Twelve, voted in favour of General Assembly Resolution 38/81 of 15 December 1983. It is our sincere hope that the four members of the Committee who found themselves voting against that Resolution will give further thought to their position on the issues involved, and that they will be able to indicate their willingness to cooperate in making genuine progress.

In the meantime, the Twelve wish to reaffirm their belief in the importance of the mandate given to the Special Committee. They would like to see further efforts made to carry it out. They recognize, of course, the need for adequate preparations to be made for a further meeting. The members of the Twelve represented on the Committee remain at the disposal of its Chairman and of the other members for whatever consultations may be thought necessary.

Mr Chairman, peace-keeping forces serve the goal of bringing stability to a conflict area. They are meant to create conditions in which a political solution to the underlying dispute can be sought. Their aim is to maintain peace, and not to enforce it. The full cooperation of the parties concerned, and the continuing full support of the members of the Security Council, is required for the success for any peace-keeping operation. It is intolerable that any party should seek to impede the execution of the

mandate given by the Security Council to a peace-keeping force by preventing its deployment, hindering its freedom of movement or threatening the security of its personnel. The Twelve take a serious view of any such action tending to frustrate the purpose of a peace-keeping force.

Mr Chairman, another serious difficulty facing UN peace-keeping is the failure of member States to pay their duly assessed contributions to the financing of peace-keeping operations constituted in accordance with the Charter. The failure of member States to pay their assessed contributions endangers the very existence of UN peace-keeping as an instrument in the preservation of international peace and security. It also places a heavy and unfair burden on the countries providing troop contingents for the various Forces. Some of these are developing countries, which can ill afford the financial shortfall they suffer for their service to the international community. Others are developed countries, including currently five out of the twelve Member States of the European Community. They too find it increasingly difficult to understand why they should have to bear a disproportionate share of the costs.

The UN has had a long and unhappy experience of the refusal by a certain group of countries, among them the Soviet Union, to make the required payments. Substantial sums remain unpaid, and the obligation to make good these arrears must be honoured. The Twelve were none the less encouraged by the decision announced in April this year by the Soviet Union to begin paying its share of UNIFIL's costs. They urge the Soviet Union and countries in a similar position to pay their arrears in respect of UNIFIL and previous peace-keeping operations.

It is with regret that the Twelve note a serious current shortfall in the United States' contribution to UNIFIL. This failure for the first time to pay has compromised the previously outstanding record of the United States in supporting United Nations peace-keeping. The Twelve welcome the undertakings given by the United States to make good this shortfall and to resume full payment of their annual contribution.

The Twelve appeal to all States to pay their fair share overall in the financing of United Nations peace-keeping operations.

Mr Chairman, the Twelve take a particularly close interest in the operation of two peace-keeping forces, UNIFIL and UNFICYP, by virtue of the importance of their respective tasks in assisting in the avoidance of conflict and in the furtherance of peaceful solutions. Five Member States of the European Community contribute troop contingents to them. A solution to the grave situation facing UNIFIL will not be possible without a complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory in accordance with the resolutions of the Security Council. At the same time the situation has been aggravated by the recent wholly unacceptable attacks upon the personnel of the Force carried out by armed elements operating in defiance of the Lebanese Government. The Twelve insist that all parties are under the obligation to cooperate fully with UNIFIL in the execution of its mandate entrusted by the Security Council.

The Twelve wish also to reiterate the importance they attach to the operation of UNFICYP, and they take due note of the statement by the Secretary-General in his report on 31 May this year contained in document S/18102 that

the continued presence of UNFICYP remains indispensable in helping to maintain calm on the island, which is an essential condition for the search for a just and lasting settlement to the Cyprus problem.

Finally, Mr Chairman, the Twelve wish to reaffirm their confidence in the manner in which the Secretary-General has conducted peace-keeping operations on behalf of the United Nations. His efforts deserve our thanks and our support. We also commend those Governments which have contributed Forces and equipment to peace-keeping operations, and we pay tribute to the soldiers of many countries who have performed their duty with courage and dedication under the UN flag. A special tribute is due to those who have given their lives or suffered injury in the course of their duties on behalf of international peace.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/SPC/41/PV. or SR.9, item 73.

**86/301. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning Cooperation Between the United Nations and the League of Arab States<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 17 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: New York  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN  
 Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Birch:* Mr President, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve States Members of the European Community, which have voted in favour of the resolution just adopted, in order to make a few general comments.

Over the last few years the General Assembly has been asked to consider a number of resolutions relating to cooperation between the United Nations and various organizations holding observer status. The Twelve are well aware of the advantages of such cooperation and have been happy to join in expressions of support and encouragement for its development within the framework of the United Nations Charter. The Twelve would prefer that such resolutions should deal with the question of cooperation in terms which avoid introducing contentious issues. Against the background of the financial crisis currently faced by the United Nations, the Twelve also urge that every effort be made to minimize the number of meetings and of documents whose cost falls to the Organization, with the aim of contributing to an overall reduction in expenditure.

It is essential that the scarce resources of the United Nations which are made available for cooperation of this sort are applied to the best effect. In this connection we urge that due account be taken of the constructive recommendations contained in the report of the Joint Inspection Unit transmitted under a note by the Secretary-General on 16 September as document A/41/615.

With regard to paragraph 3 of the operative part of resolution A/41/L.5 relating to the Cooperation between the United Nations and the League of Arab States, the Twelve wish to draw the attention of the Assembly to the need to avoid prejudicing the role of the Secretary-General, and wish to record that they have not supported all the resolutions referred to in that paragraph.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/41/PV.41, item 23.

**86/302. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning Cooperation Between the UN and the Asian African Legal Consultative Committee (AALCC)<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 17 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: New York  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN  
 Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Thomson:* Mr President, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community. The Twelve have long admired the work of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee. We have lent support to many of the initiatives it has taken over the thirty years of its life and we admire the legal and diplomatic skills displayed by its distinguished and long-standing Secretary-General, Dr Barry Sen.

We listened carefully to Dr Sen's statement this morning about the work of the Consultative Committee during the last twelve months. We should like, if we may, to single out one particular project undertaken in that period, namely the Committee's recommendations for improving and rationalizing the work of the General Assembly which were circulated to the membership of the United Nations in the annex to document A/41/437 of 1 July 1986.

Much work has, of course, been done over the years to improve the way in which we handle our business in the Assembly, in particular in its main committees. But a good deal remains to be done if we

are to carry out our work in the most effective way and be seen to be doing so. It is in this respect that the AALCC's recommendations would, if suitably adopted, make a most useful contribution. Some of the Consultative Committee's suggestions were made also by the distinguished past Presidents of the Assembly and recorded in a UNITAR study circulated as General Assembly document A/40/377. These in turn received the support of the distinguished Representative of Canada and the Representatives of many other countries, including some of the Twelve, during the 40th session of the General Assembly. We believe that the recommendations have very wide support.

Lastly, Mr President, the Twelve believe that the AALCC's recommendations should be useful to assist in taking forward in this respect consideration of the work of the Group of High-Level Intergovernmental Experts. It is significant to note that their implementation would not entail amending the General Assembly's Rules of Procedure. The Twelve applaud this useful initiative taken by the AALCC and wish it well in its work in the years ahead.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/41/PV.41, item 30.

### **86/303. Statement on South Africa**

Date of Issue: 17 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: London  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Declaration

The Twelve express their serious concern at the South African Government's announcement of its intention deliberately to stop the employment of Mozambican workers in South Africa and at reports that South Africa might be contemplating military action against Mozambique. The Twelve strongly urge the South African Government to show full respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of their neighbours and to do nothing to worsen relations with those neighbours or add to suffering in Southern Africa. They draw attention to the existence of machinery for consultations between South Africa and Mozambique under the Nkomati Accord, which provides a means for resolving differences between them.

The Twelve deplore the decision of the South African Government to declare the UDF an 'affected organization'. This retrograde step against a leading non-violent group is contrary to the goal of genuine national dialogue for which the Twelve have consistently called. The Twelve reiterate that it is essential that freely chosen representatives of the black population should be in a position to take part in peaceful political activity if a negotiated solution is to be achieved in South Africa. The Twelve urge the South African Government to withdraw without delay their decision to declare the UDF an 'affected organization'.

### **86/304. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Situation in Kampuchea<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 20 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: New York  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN  
 Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Thomson:* Mr Chairman, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve States of the European Community.

The Cambodian problem has become distressingly familiar to this Assembly. For seven successive years, an overwhelming majority of the nations represented here has called upon Vietnam to withdraw its forces from Cambodia, so that the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country can be restored and so that the Cambodian people can at last enjoy peace and freedom. Last year a record

number of countries, 114 of them, including the then ten Members of the European Community, and also Spain and Portugal, joined in supporting this resolution on Cambodia. The Vietnamese occupation of Cambodia has, however, continued in violation of the UN Charter and the fundamental principles of international law.

The lot of the Cambodian people has not improved since the Assembly last met to discuss this problem. They remain subjected to illegal occupation by foreign troops and governed by a regime which has no claim to legitimacy. Vietnam prides itself on its struggle to win independence and the right to determine its own destiny; it should now grant that right to the people of Cambodia. Instead Vietnam continues to violate their fundamental rights and to endanger their culture and national identity.

The Twelve have no intention of contributing to the re-establishment of the Pol Pot regime in Cambodia. We share the collective abhorrence felt by the world community at the terrible abuses inflicted by Pol Pot and his *Khmer rouge*. But this provides no justification for Vietnam's illegal occupation of its smaller neighbour for nearly eight years or its imposition of an illegitimate regime. The Cambodian Resistance continues to challenge the Vietnamese forces. The possibility of establishing a free and pluralist society in Cambodia still exists.

The aim must be to achieve a negotiated settlement of the Cambodian question, not one imposed by force of arms. For this reason, the Twelve have supported the efforts of the countries of the Association of South East Asian Nations and other parties to find such a solution. It is lamentable that Vietnam has consistently rejected the peace proposals that have been put to it: this year, for example, Hanoi and the Government installed in Phnom Penh turned down out of hand the eight point proposal put forward by Prince Sihanouk in March. The Twelve have called upon Vietnam to reconsider this position and we do so again today. We continue to believe that the Declaration of the International Conference on Kampuchea offers the best basis for a settlement. But we have yet to see an indication of any serious will on the part of Hanoi to negotiate or to discuss the implementation of successive UN resolutions based on the International Conference on Kampuchea principles.

Much has been made of Vietnam's declared intention, announced last year, to withdraw all its forces from Cambodia by 1990. Some partial withdrawals have already taken place, but the overall strength of Vietnam's occupation force has remained much the same. Resolutions endorsed by this Assembly have called upon Vietnam to withdraw its forces *immediately* from Cambodia. This should remain our aim. Talk by Hanoi of a 1990 withdrawal date should in no way serve to legitimize a Vietnamese military presence in Cambodia until then. The Vietnamese Government have no right to put a timetable on the restoration of Cambodia's independent status. We support the efforts made by the Secretary-General, his representatives and the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the International Conference on Kampuchea to persuade Hanoi to agree to a settlement in accordance with resolutions adopted by the United Nations. Any settlement would *inter alia* need to include guarantees against Vietnamese forces re-entering Cambodia after their withdrawal.

Last year the Assembly met in the wake of the most ferocious Vietnamese military offensive in Cambodia since Hanoi's invasion of the country in 1978. Some quarter of a million Cambodian civilians had been forced to flee across the border into Thailand. The situation for these unfortunate people has not changed; they have not been able to return to their homes in Cambodia. Vietnam has maintained its forces in the Thai border area, from where they have continued, in violation of international law, to make incursions and fire artillery into Thailand, causing casualties among the civilian population. The laying of mines on both sides of the border by Vietnamese troops has also caused unnecessary suffering. Thailand has drawn the Secretary-General's attention to these abuses. The Twelve urge Vietnam to cease these attacks forthwith.

We should not overlook the severe refugee problem which is a distressing consequence of Vietnam's policy towards its smaller neighbours. Of particular concern is the plight of the Khmer border population who remain totally dependent on international relief. The Twelve applaud the humanitarian role played by the Government of Thailand in providing succour for these civilians who have been forced from their country by Vietnamese force of arms. We would also remind this Assembly of the admirable role played by representatives of the international and voluntary organizations, including many nationals of

European Community Member countries, in looking after this population. The European Community and its Member States will continue to play their part, in supporting the programmes, coordinated by the United Nations Border Relief Operation, for the benefit of these unfortunate people.

But the root cause of the Cambodia refugee problem lies in Hanoi. This problem will persist for as long as Vietnam remains in illegal occupation of Cambodia, and the sufferings of the refugees provide a forceful humanitarian argument for Vietnam to comply with UN resolutions.

The Twelve will once again give their full support to the resolution tabled by the ASEAN countries, calling for a peaceful and just solution to the conflict in Cambodia, based on a total withdrawal of foreign forces and free and fair elections. We call on other Member States to join us in supporting this resolution and in pressing Vietnam to take immediate action to end its illegal occupation of Cambodia, and to respect the sanctity of international frontiers and the territorial integrity of that troubled country.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/41/PV.42, item 30.

### **86/305. Statement in the Sixth Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Consideration of Effective Measures to Enhance the Protection, Security and Safety of Diplomatic Missions and Representatives: Report of the Secretary-General<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 20 October 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Edwards:* Mr Chairman, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community. As we know from the reports made to the Secretary-General pursuant to General Assembly Resolution 40/73 of 11 December 1985 and its predecessors going back four years, the incidents of attacks against diplomats, consuls and their missions have shown an increase until the latest report. It seems clear, however, that it is not possible to take much comfort from the 1985 figures as set out by the Secretary-General in his report. Many incidents remain unreported and, according to the Secretary-General, the picture is a fragmentary one. The Secretary-General then goes on to make a number of interesting suggestions for improving the quality of the overall picture and I shall return to these in a moment.

Last year the distinguished representative of Belgium, also speaking on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, spoke in vigorous condemnation of the crimes committed against diplomatic and consular missions and representatives. He pointed out that such crimes endangered international relations by attacking the very people whose task it is to work for harmonious and peaceful relations between States. The dangerous implications of the actions that are the subject of this agenda item are therefore clear to see. The Twelve wish to repeat today their condemnation of all violence against diplomatic and consular missions and representatives.

The Twelve would also confirm their belief, expressed at the 40th Session, that current international conventions provide adequate means to secure the protection and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives. Two important matters require attention. First, all States parties to the relevant conventions must comply with their obligations and make full use of all the means at their disposal to ensure the protection and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives. Secondly, States not party to the international conventions on diplomatic and consular relations should seriously consider becoming party without reservations that might be incompatible with the object and purposes of those conventions. In the meantime, such States must observe meticulously their obligations in this regard under customary international law.

The Twelve also wish to draw attention to the potential danger of abuses of diplomatic and consular privileges and immunities. Such abuses damage the credibility of those who are entitled to them and who



are required, as a matter of law, to respect the laws and regulations of the receiving State. The Governments of the Twelve remain determined to prevent abuses of diplomatic and consular immunity and have continued their cooperation, reported in the Sixth Committee last year, to combat it.

I turn now to the Secretary-General's note of 30 July 1986, to which was attached a survey of the operation of the reporting procedures provided for in operative paragraph 9 of Resolution 40/73. With regard to reports to the Secretary-General, the Twelve wish to stress that whenever a State reports to the Secretary-General serious violations of the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives, such reports should only contain facts which have previously been made available to the State where the violations took place, or facts which were generally available through other channels. In addition, reports to the Secretary-General should refer only to serious violations, particularly those which may endanger the normal conduct of relations between States. Reports containing criticism of a State should be submitted to the Secretary-General well before the drafting of the latter's report to enable the State criticized to have its reply included in the report, thus giving it more balance. The Twelve also wish to point out that incidents which fall within the competence of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country should not be dealt with *in extenso* under the agenda item under consideration. A mere reference to reports submitted to the Host Country Committee would seem more appropriate. The Twelve are grateful for the interesting analysis prepared by the Secretary-General and note the suggestions for improvements that he had made. In particular, they see value in States making an annual report to the Secretary-General even when no violations have occurred and the report would simply state that fact. With reference to the Secretary-General's suggestion that he should address reminders to States where violations have occurred and have been reported, if no follow-up report has been made by such States within a reasonable period of time, the Twelve wish to emphasize that they attach great importance to follow-up reports on this subject. While they see certain difficulties with the suggestion made by the Secretary-General, they would propose that his annual report might contain a separate paragraph on the status of follow-up reports. The Twelve note that the Secretary-General continues to include in his reports information received from States concerning violence against the premises of international organizations and their personnel. This kind of violence is, of course, no less serious than that against diplomatic and consular premises and representatives. Nevertheless, it does present different problems that require careful study, perhaps under agenda item 117[B] entitled 'Respect for Privileges and Immunities of Officials of the United Nations and Specialized Agencies and Related Organizations'. The Twelve have doubts about the desirability of the establishment of a systematic compilation of practical measures to enhance the protection and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives as put forward by States from time to time. While cooperation in this field can prove useful, and indeed is very close among the Twelve, we doubt whether a very broad framework would be appropriate for this type of activity, given that such measures are best kept confidential if they are to be effective.

The Twelve will cooperate with the other members of this Committee in drawing up a resolution which will suitably reflect the consensus which may be achieved on the Secretary-General's ideas and others which have already been, or may be, put forward by States during the debate on this item. We are particularly glad that operative paragraph 13 of General Assembly Resolution 40/73 (which contains a new idea put forward originally by the delegations of the Nordic countries) has led to constructive proposals for improving the reporting procedures. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.6/41/SR.23, item 128.

## **86/306. Joint Declaration of the 6th EC-ASEAN Ministerial Meeting (20-21 October 1986)**

Date of Issue: 21 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: Jakarta, Indonesia  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Foreign Ministers  
 Status of Document: Joint Declaration

1. The Ministers had a full exchange of views on international and regional political and economic problems and found a wide degree of consensus. They reaffirmed the need for both sides to continue to cooperate and consult each other on matters of mutual interest. The discussions were conducted in the atmosphere of friendliness and understanding which has become the hallmark of EC-ASEAN ministerial meetings. The EC Ministers expressed their sincere thanks to their ASEAN hosts for the excellent arrangements for the meeting.

#### *International political issues*

##### *Kampuchea*

2. The Ministers reiterated their view that the Vietnamese military occupation of Kampuchea continues to be an obstacle to peace and stability in South East Asia. They agreed to continue to promote the search for a negotiated settlement to the conflict in Kampuchea in accordance with the resolutions adopted by the United Nations and the International Conference on Kampuchea, which call for the total withdrawal of all foreign troops, the right of the Kampuchean people to determine their own destiny free from outside interference, and the restoration and preservation of Kampuchea's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. They noted that Vietnam has consistently rejected proposals to resolve the Kampuchean problem, including the March 1986 proposal of the coalition of Democratic Kampuchea under Prince Sihanouk, which, together with principles endorsed by the UK, the International Conference on Kampuchea [ICK] and ASEAN, contain constructive elements for a peaceful settlement. Opposition to Vietnam's occupation made a military solution impossible. An early settlement would meet the concerns of all parties involved. ASEAN and EC Ministers called on Vietnam to begin serious negotiation for the withdrawal of all its forces from Kampuchea. They reaffirmed that no assistance should be given to Vietnam of such a nature as to sustain and enhance the Vietnamese occupation of Kampuchea.

3. ASEAN and EC Ministers shared the view that the plight of those who have fled from Indo-China, including those still in refugee transit camps in ASEAN countries and those along the Thai-Kampuchean border, remained the cause of serious concern. These refugees and displaced persons had an inalienable right to return to their home countries. For those refugees with no prospect of a safe return, resettlement in their countries must continue as an alternative solution. ASEAN stated that the pace of resettlement continued to be a matter of grave concern and expressed the hope that the momentum would be sustained. ASEAN and EC Ministers stressed their determination to maintain their coordinated response to the humanitarian needs of the refugee population.

##### *Afghanistan*

4. The Ministers agreed that the occupation of Afghanistan by Soviet forces was a grave concern to the international community and continued to be a major source of international instability. ASEAN and EC Ministers paid tribute to the resistance of the Afghan people against foreign occupation. The key to peace lies in the complete and rapid withdrawal of Soviet forces in accordance with UN resolutions.

##### *East-West relations*

5. EC and ASEAN Ministers exchanged views on recent developments in East-West relations and discussed the prospect following the Reykjavik meeting.

##### *Southern Africa*

6. ASEAN and EC Ministers reviewed the problem of Southern Africa and explained their respective positions. They were in complete agreement in expressing grave concern at the increasingly tense and repressive situation in South Africa. They stressed the urgent need for a genuine national dialogue across the lines of colour, politics and religion and called for continuing strong international pressure to bring about the total abolition of apartheid. In discussing Namibia they reaffirmed their commitment to the UN's efforts to bring about as early as possible genuine independence for Namibia through the implementation of Security Council resolution 435.

*Middle East*

7. The Ministers exchanged views and informed each other of their respective positions on the range of problems affecting the Middle East. They viewed with concern the unresolved Arab-Israeli conflict and called for renewed efforts to achieve a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement by negotiations. On the situation in Lebanon, they reaffirmed their support for efforts to re-establish full sovereignty, territorial integrity, national independence and unity. They called on Iran and Iraq to cease hostilities and negotiate the resolution of their dispute.

*International terrorism*

8. Terrorism, wherever it occurs and whoever commits it, is a major international problem and is condemned universally. ASEAN and EC Ministers agreed that it is the duty of Governments resolutely to combat terrorism and to resist terrorist demands and undertake to cooperate closely in combating terrorism.

*Narcotics*

9. ASEAN and EC Ministers stressed the continued threat posed to member States by the increasing problem of drug production, trafficking and misuse. They were determined to cooperate closely in tackling effectively all aspects of the problem. ASEAN Ministers expressed their appreciation to the EC Ministers for their support in combating the drug problem.

The Ministers warmly welcomed the holding of the International Conference on Abuse of Drugs and Illicit Trafficking which would take place in June 1987. They considered this as a very important step in international efforts to eradicate the drug problem and stressed the significance of committing the international community to combat the drug problem at the highest political level. The EC Ministers agreed to inform their respective Governments of the request of ASEAN for support of its candidacy to the post of President of the International Conference on Abuse of Drugs and Illicit Trafficking.

*United Nations financial crisis*

10. ASEAN and EC Ministers noted with concern the financial crisis faced by the United Nations. They supported efforts being made to find a comprehensive and durable solution to the problem, including those made by the UN Secretary-General and the High Level Group of Eighteen. ASEAN and EC Ministers appealed to all members of the United Nations to support those efforts.

*Cultural cooperation*

11. The Ministers agreed on the significance of the social and cultural dimension of their cooperation. They also agreed that greater emphasis should be given to enhancing and upgrading this area of cooperation in the future.[...]

**86/307. Questions Concerning South Africa<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 21 October 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Questions

*Oral Question O-104/86 by Mr Vergeer and others concerning Sir Geoffrey Howe's report on South Africa:*

What conclusions do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation draw from the report on the missions that Sir Geoffrey Howe undertook to Southern Africa on the instructions of the European Council?

*Oral Question O-110/86 by Mr d'Ormesson concerning the situation in South Africa:*

According to President Houphouët-Boigny,

it is because Pretoria is making such great strides towards the abolition of apartheid that Moscow has decided to blow everything sky-high.

It might therefore be asked whether the upheavals currently taking place in South Africa are not a consequence of the warning given by the President of the Ivory Coast and whether they are not designed to divert the attention of governments away from the constantly deteriorating situation in Angola?

*Question O-112/86 by Ms Veil and others concerning the situation in South Africa:*

Following the meeting of the European Council, what steps do the Ministers plan to take to put an end to the system of apartheid with its spiral of violence and retaliation and the resulting and continuing deterioration in the country?

What measures may be taken to promote dialogue between the legitimate representatives of the South African population as a whole?

Will the Ministers convene a conference under Community auspices, inviting representatives of the ANC, the PAC, the UDF, the Progressive Federal Party, the Inkatha Movement, the South African churches, the trade unions, business circles, the National Party and the Government?

Can the Ministers not agree that it would be highly desirable to hold such a conference, as this would be a peaceful means of promoting dialogue between leaders of all races to build a new South Africa where human rights, including the rights of minorities, would be universally respected?

Can the Ministers give an assurance that the Governments of the Twelve will lend their material and moral support to all South African organizations willing to commit themselves publicly to a pluralist democracy?

*Question O-117/86 by Mr Wurtz and others concerning economic sanctions against South Africa:*

Following their latest decision of 16 September on the measures to be taken against South Africa, can the Foreign Ministers of the Twelve meeting in political cooperation state when they will implement all the recommendations made in the European Parliament's 10 July resolution on South Africa<sup>2</sup>, which called for a series of economic, cultural and sports measures to be taken against South Africa?

How do they explain the exclusion of coal and gold and other precious metals from the measures adopted on 16 September 1986?

*Question No O-129/86 by Mr Arndt and others concerning EEC sanctions against South Africa:*

At the Hague Summit on 26-27th June 1986 the British Prime Minister persuaded her colleagues not to implement sanctions against South Africa for three months, while the British Foreign Secretary as President of Council undertook a mission to Southern Africa; but a list of measures was agreed for consideration in the event of failure of the mission: a ban on new investments, and on the import of coal, iron, steel and gold coins from South Africa.

By the end of July the mission had ended in humiliating failure. In spite of this the Council of Ministers at its meeting on 15th-16th September failed to agree to implement even the limited package of measures it had decided in June were the minimum necessary. Owing to the opposition of Portugal and Germany, and with the approval of the British Prime Minister, the Council rejected by far the most effective measure in the list, the ban on coal imports from South Africa: coal imports have more than twice the value of the imports affected by the Council decision, which are only 6% of total EC imports from South Africa.

This decision does not meet the European Parliament's demands in its resolution of 10th July 1986, and leaves the Community in the dishonourable position of lagging far behind world opinion in the action it is prepared to take to avoid a blood-bath in South Africa.

For in the meantime the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group, set up at the Nassau Commonwealth Summit on 20th October 1985, in a delaying tactic by the British Government to prevent immediate Commonwealth sanctions, has reported to a Commonwealth mini-summit (Australia, the Bahamas, Canada, India, the United Kingdom, Zambia and Zimbabwe) and all those States except the United Kingdom have agreed on 5th August to implement a wide range of measures against South Africa, listed in the Nassau 'Commonwealth Accord on Southern Africa'.

Furthermore, on 12th September the US House of Representatives overwhelmingly voted to endorse the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Bill passed by the Senate on 15th August, which also contains a far wider range of measures, notably a ban on loans and on air links, a ban on imports of uranium, textiles and agricultural products, a wider scope for and stricter application of the arms embargo, a ban on exports of not only oil but also oil products, and an investigation to reduce the import of strategic minerals.

Council is therefore asked:

1. How does it justify the refusal of certain Member States to agree the very limited package of measures which the Hague Summit agreed should be considered if the Howe mission failed?
2. Will the Member States who were willing to implement all the measures now proceed to do so?
3. Do the measures agreed and those under consideration apply to Namibia?
4. Since the Community believes in coordinated action with other powers against apartheid, how does the Council justify adopting measures which fall so far short of those agreed by the US Congress?
5. Will Council now consider without delay the adoption of further measures against South Africa to bring the Community into line with the action agreed by the US Congress and leading member States of the Commonwealth?

*Ms Chalker, President-in-Office of the Council and of the Foreign Ministers:* Mr President, may I at the opening of this debate sadly confirm the tragic death not only of President Samora Machel but of some of his Ministers and his senior advisers, when the presidential aircraft in which he was travelling crashed into a mountain right on the Swaziland-South African-Mozambique border.

The President-in-Office has sent a message to the Government of Mozambique expressing our deep regret at the loss of this statesman who had done so much to try to help peace in Southern Africa. We very much regret that this should have happened to anyone, but it is a tragedy for all those in Southern Africa that we have lost such an effective man in bringing others together.

May I now turn to the questions which have been put to the President-in-Office. The Twelve have repeatedly made clear, on the subject of South Africa, their total abhorrence for apartheid. It is an immoral system which breeds hatred and violence. The Twelve are committed to the complete abolition of apartheid and its replacement by a fully representative non-racial system of government. The Twelve's consistent policy has been to work for the genuine national dialogue in South Africa which is so obviously and so urgently needed if there is to be a peaceful solution to that country's problems.

The Twelve have also repeatedly highlighted the damage done to South Africa as a whole as a result of the South African Government's policies. The Twelve have condemned in particular South Africa's armed incursions into neighbouring States.

As Honourable Members will know, Mr President, the Twelve have pursued this policy actively in recent years. The Troika Foreign Ministers went to South Africa in August 1985 in an attempt to impress on the Pretoria Government the need to take early steps to encourage a national dialogue. In the light of the South African Government's response the Twelve decided on 19 September 1985 to adopt a package of measures designed to underline the strength of their concern and the inevitability of fundamental change<sup>3</sup>.

This package contained a number of restrictive measures covering in particular oil exports and military contacts as well as positive measures designed to help the non-white majority. Ten million ECU have been set aside for these positive measures in 1986 and the Commission has proposed that a further 15 m ECU should be committed in 1987.

When the Twelve announced the Luxembourg package of measures they made clear that in the absence of progress they would consider further steps. At the European Council in The Hague in June they decided, against the background of a deteriorating situation in South Africa and the imposition of a state of emergency, to take additional action<sup>4</sup>.

They agreed on an increase in financial and material assistance to the victims of apartheid, in particular those affected by the disturbances in Crossroads and also to political prisoners, including those arrested in connection with the state of emergency. In addition, the Presidency's Foreign Minister was sent to Southern Africa on a mission, a mission to explain the Twelve's policies, first to Southern Africa's neighbours, which was to follow up the successful meeting with the front-line States in Lusaka in February, and second to reiterate to the South African Government the urgent need for progress towards a peaceful negotiated solution to the country's problems.

The South African Government was left in no doubt whatsoever that the Twelve would proceed to consider further restrictive measures if it failed to take the steps to allow a national dialogue to begin. Specifically, those steps were: releasing Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners and lifting the ban on the ANC, the PAC and other political parties. On 16 September the Twelve announced, in the light of a report by Sir Geoffrey Howe on his mission to Southern Africa, that they would be introducing a ban on new investment in South Africa and a ban on the import from South Africa of iron, steel and gold coins. The suspension of iron and steel imports has already been implemented and urgent discussions are taking place about the implementation of the other measures.

On some of the specific issues raised I should like to make the following points. First, as was made clear at The Hague in June, the Twelve attach importance to consultation with other industrialized countries on action in relation to South Africa. During the summer the Presidency discussed this question with the United States, Australia, Canada and Japan. Such consultations will continue as appropriate. The Twelve also take into account the views of other groups of countries such as the Commonwealth.

The Twelve acknowledge that some reforms have been introduced in South Africa, but much more needs to be done and without delay. The Twelve have no plans to organize a conference of representatives of the various groups in South Africa. What is required at this stage is evidence of a readiness on all sides in South Africa to move towards a genuine internal dialogue about the country's future.

The Foreign Ministers of the Twelve undertook on 16 September to work towards a programme of political action designed to promote the achievement of the Twelve's objectives through peaceful reform. The restrictive measures decided on 16 September were agreed to be a suitable way of sending a strong political signal to the Government in Pretoria.

On the question of a possible ban on coal imports, the Presidency undertook to continue to seek a consensus. That it is doing. The restrictive measures agreed by the Twelve on 16 September do not apply to Namibia.

Mr President, those are my initial remarks.

*[Upon the ensuing debates, Ms Chalker stated, moreover:]* What the debate has done is to underline once more that South Africa is an issue of profound international concern to us all. We have had a very wide variety of views here, but the difference is that in the European Parliament and in our national parliaments we hear all views. In South Africa black people have no voice, no democracy and no participation in what happens.

In my first intervention earlier, I explained the policy of the Twelve towards South Africa and recent developments. I want to concentrate now on the South African situation and make one or two additional observations. I shall seek to respond to some of the points made by Honourable Members. I regret that it is impossible to take up all points. In response to Commissioner De Clercq to whom we listened with great interest, may I just say one thing. A number of the Member States are already applying national measures to implement the decisions taken in political cooperation. They are doing this in addition to the measures they have individually taken.

Turning now to implementation in the context of European political cooperation: in all Member States that implementation should be completed very soon. The necessary measures must soon be brought into effect and Ministers will be discussing the matter on Monday next. There is one matter I want to get out of the way now. I reiterate what I said about the contribution of the late President Machel as a force for peace in Southern Africa. On the other hand there are the activities of others who are intent

on fighting in a way which cannot bring peace. May I inform Mr d'Ormesson that Mr Jonas Savimbi will not be received by Presidency Ministers, and I understand that he will also not be received by other Ministers, whatever the rumours may have been.

I shall concentrate first on the real internal situation in South Africa. It causes all of us very grave concern. There is continuing violence, repression and unrest and I understand the force of the remarks that Mr Price made. Even the official South African Government figures admit 1 832 deaths, of which 1 776 were of civilians, since September 1984. I have to say that the information that we have received from a very wide variety of South African sources, including Black Sash, the ANC, Chief Buthelezi and others, show us day by day just how very grave this situation is. The Twelve have made absolutely clear the need for the South African Government to end the state of emergency reimposed in June. They have made absolutely clear that they should cease their repressive actions and put an end to the practice of detention without trial. We believe that over 9 000 people are currently so detained. But according to the Detainee's Support Committee I understand that some 20 000 may have been detained since the state of emergency was imposed.

The recent action of the South African Government in declaring the UDF an 'affected organization' is most certainly a step in the wrong direction. It can only reduce the prospects for genuine peaceful progress towards change in South Africa which is the objective that we all share.

In my earlier remarks I mentioned the effect of South African actions on neighbouring countries. We have had another deeply regrettable example in the decision by the South African Government on 8 October that they would bring to an end employment of Mozambiquean workers. This is increasing regional tension in Southern Africa and is already causing great suffering and further economic distress, particularly in Mozambique, but it is spreading over a wider area too.

There have been recent reports of alleged South African plans for military action against Mozambique. I have to tell this Parliament that these reports are profoundly disturbing, as in the public sabre-rattling by certain South African Ministers against her neighbours.

South Africa has a duty to respect the sovereignty, the independence and the territorial integrity of neighbouring States.

Madam President, there can be no doubt as to the Twelve's abhorrence of apartheid. It is an unjust system. It is immoral. It is an affront to basic human rights and it is certainly an affront to Christianity. Apartheid must be abolished.

The reforms that are needed are many because it is dismantling the legislative infrastructure which underpins and sustains apartheid that has to be tackled much more actively. I would say to Mr Nordmann, who referred to the removal by the South African Government of some of the appalling apartheid measures, it is simply no good to remove the Mixed Marriages Act, because without the removal of the Group of Areas Act concerning where people live, and similar discriminatory legislation, the overall discrimination is not removed.

We are calling in particular for repeal of the Group Areas Act, the Separate Amenities Act, and ultimately the Population Registration Act. But even these reforms are not enough, because it is progress towards a non-racial democracy that needs to be greatly advanced.

The Twelve remain committed to work to promote peaceful fundamental change through dialogue. That is the reason that I met Oliver Tambo in June this year and that the President himself met Oliver Tambo in September. We believe it is right that this dialogue is carried on with all those who can bring about peace in Southern Africa.

We believe, too, that the South African Government must negotiate with the acknowledged leaders of the black community. We have to have a climate where that negotiation is possible. That is why the state of emergency must be ended and the South African Government has to release Nelson Mandela and the other political detainees and un-ban the ANC, the PAC and other political parties. They must cease from any further action of the sort they have taken recently against the UDF.

It is essential that an atmosphere is created in which all communities which have an interest in negotiations are secure in the knowledge that their interests and their security will be respected. The

South African Government must be brought to realize not only that change is inevitable but that it is urgent, and it is in their own interest too to work for a mutually acceptable solution.

These are the fundamental tenets which have determined the policy of the Twelve, and many of us feel that the dialogue that is necessary on South Africa can only be achieved through a suspension of violence, but all sides need to desist from violence.

The restrictive measures about which we have heard a good deal in this debate are numerous. They are the measures taken by the Twelve against South Africa and they are an important means of seeking to convince the South African Government that fundamental change is imperative. But whatever measures we have taken, general economic sanctions, however much they may be called for, are certainly not going to bring about the change that we all want in the time period we want it. Sanctions are not an end in themselves, and we have, in every measure we take, to consider the efficacy of that measure as a means of ending apartheid and promoting the dialogue leading to democracy.

Of course the Twelve have had reservations about comprehensive sanctions and we have been opposed to general sanctions because they would further polarize and worsen violence and they would increase the South African Government's obduracy. And one of the main reasons, expressed so often, is our concern for the suffering that some of those measures could cause to black people in South Africa and the neighbouring States. There is no sense in punishing ordinary South African black people simply because the South African Government is pursuing bad policies.

It is also in nobody's interest to create an economic wasteland in South Africa. Oliver Tambo sat in my office and told me that himself. I have to say that whichever country may have had investment there, each is seriously considering what the future holds for them because of their responsibility to black people in their employment.

May I just say one further thing about this. The Twelve's commitment is to finding practical ways to promote a peaceful end to the untenable situation in South Africa. Our commitment is unshakeable, but I have to say that we need to seek fresh practical ways to promote common objectives. Those fresh practical measures have got to promote internal forces for change and to assist the victims of apartheid in South Africa. I spent some time only yesterday with a senior representative from industry in South Africa who said quite clearly that their action within industry was to take this message of the necessary dialogue down through all levels of business, down to the lowest level on the shop floor where the vision of a non-racial democracy may have been harder to understand. They are proceeding with that, and that is quite right.

But what we in the Twelve have to do is to work actively to coordinate and to strengthen our existing programmes of assistance to the black populations of South and Southern Africa. They are many. Because of time I will not reiterate them all. We also have to create a climate for change amongst the South African people. That is done by the many and varied personal contacts that all of us must have. The Honourable Member, Mr Perinat Elio, spoke of constructive action. That constructive action has to take place in every single section of society in South Africa.

I can say to this House, the Presidency will neglect no opening which may lead to a faster end to apartheid and the beginning of a non-racial democracy. We are doing all we can, but our goal cannot be achieved simply, as some Honourable Members in this House seem to think. The problem of South Africa is likely to be with us for far longer than we would wish. We remain totally committed to the abolition of apartheid and to a peaceful but fundamental change towards that non-racial society in which the interests of all communities are fully represented and respected.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *OJ* No 2-343 of 7 October 1986, pp. 63-72, and *OJ* No 2-344 of 21 October 1986, pp. 29-45.

<sup>2</sup> *OJ* No C 227 of 8 September 1986, pp. 94-101.

<sup>3</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 85/172.

<sup>4</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/185.



**86/308. Question No O-30/86/rev. by Mr Elles and Others  
Concerning a Common Industrial Policy and Purchases of Military  
Equipment, and Question No O-103/86 by Mr Poettering and Others  
Concerning the Political and Economic Aspects of Security<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 21 October 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Questions

Question No O-30/86/rev.:

How do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation interpret the provisions relating to cooperation in security matters contained in the Single European Act, notably in Article 6, paragraph 1, of the section on political cooperation? How, for example, do the Foreign Ministers define economic aspects of security? Do the Foreign Ministers consider that it would be proper for Defence Ministers occasionally to meet together to discuss political aspects of security under the aegis of European political cooperation?

*Question No O-103/86:*

1. Having regard to the European Parliament's requests of 11 July 1985 that the Foreign Ministers should address themselves more systematically to the political and economic aspects of European security in the context of EPC, what conclusions have the Foreign Ministers drawn from the debate on security policy it held with the European Parliament on 14 May 1986<sup>2</sup>?
2. How do the Foreign Ministers interpret the phrase 'the political and economic aspects of security' as laid down in the Single European Act?
3. How will the Foreign Ministers ensure that the European Community adopts a uniform stance at European conferences on security (CSCE, CCBDE, MBFR)?

*After the Parliamentary debate Ms Chalker, President-in-Office of the Council and of the Foreign Ministers, speaks:* Madam President, as far as this particular intervention is concerned, I shall address the issues raised in the debate in this House on 14 May<sup>3</sup> and in its Resolution No 6904/86 adopted on 15 May this year<sup>4</sup>. Later I may come back to some of the things that have been said in this debate.

Honourable Members may wish to be aware of the following facts. First, the Twelve, as members of the United Nations and signatories to the Helsinki Final Act, are committed to refrain in their international relations from that threat or use of force. They promote these same principles in their dealings with other States in their efforts to encourage peaceful settlements to regional crises, and also in their strong stand against international terrorism. As the House will know, the Twelve are preparing together for the forthcoming CSCE Follow-up Meeting in Vienna. They will work to keep the CSCE process vital and relevant. The Twelve will insist on maintaining its integrity and balance and on conducting a thorough review of the way participating States fulfil the undertakings entered into at Helsinki and Madrid. They will work for a substantive result in Vienna.

The Twelve attach great importance to the overall balance and coherence of the CSCE process in all its aspects. As for the security aspects of the CSCE process, a very welcome conclusion has recently been reached at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. That agreement is a significant contribution towards reducing the risk of military confrontation in Europe and towards greater confidence between East and West. The Twelve have made a substantial contribution to that result and they will seek to build on it in the field of arms control and, more widely, in the CSCE process as a whole.

The Twelve are cooperating closely in a number of international forums to improve chances for progress in disarmament negotiations. They are making every effort to bring about a comprehensive and verifiable global ban on chemical weapons. As regards a general policy on the sale of arms to third

countries, this has not been discussed within European political cooperation. But policy on arms exports to certain countries such as South Africa has been discussed and agreed. The relationship between disarmament and development is the subject of consultations within the United Nations and a special conference on this issue has been proposed.

I now come to the issues covered by the terms 'political and economic aspects of security'. As I think Honourable Members are aware, and I refer to the reply given to Oral Questions Nos 213/85 and 176/85 by Mr van Eekelen on 14 May this year<sup>5</sup>, European political cooperation covers the political and economic aspects of security but not the military aspects. Defence Ministers do not meet within the framework of European political cooperation. The economic aspects of security can be defined as economic factors that have a bearing on the security of the Community and its Member States in a broad sense. This definition may cover at one level such issues as European technological potential, and I understand what has been said about that. On another level, it may cover the degree of interdependence between the Community and its Member States on the one hand and third countries on the other; that is, in the fields of commerce, raw materials and finance. So, different aspects of these questions may be discussed within the framework of European political cooperation or, more usually, of the Community.

As stated in the Single European Act, the Twelve are determined to maintain the technological and industrial conditions necessary for their security. To this end they coordinate their policies within the framework of competent institutions as appropriate. The completion of the internal market by 1992 is, of course, relevant in this context.

The political aspects may be defined as those aspects of foreign policy which have a direct bearing on security. For example, the Twelve have regular discussions both at expert level and at political level, with a view to reaching common positions on East-West matters within the CSCE process, including the recently concluded Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. This is also the case in the UN General Assembly on issues within the field of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva and on chemical weapons export control measures as well as in the field of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices.

The Twelve also coordinate their positions on regional issues related to international peace and security. I can name the Middle East and Afghanistan as two such examples. Furthermore, the Twelve continue to support the role of the United Nations and its peace-keeping in the interests of international peace and stability.

There is much more I could say even to the first four contributors, but I think I should save that for the end of this debate. However, I would like to say one thing on behalf of the United Kingdom. Budget pressures and the cost of armaments combined with the need for inter-operability will continue to spur greater collaboration, and that is exactly right. Some 15% of the UK equipment budget in the last five years has been spent on collaborative projects. That is only a beginning. Experience in collaboration teaches us a number of lessons. First of all, we need to bring together the operational concepts and requirements. We need to extend the collaboration to cover the research stages of projects, and we need to pay attention to the management and work-sharing problems inherent in projects with a large number of partners.

The UK commitment to European collaboration was reaffirmed by our Defence Secretary on the day he took office. The UK is involved in many major European collaborative projects. Probably the best known of these are Tornado, the European fighter aircraft, precision-guided anti-tank munitions, the EH 101 and the A 129 helicopters. All these are of vital importance. They are not the end of the road. They are a beginning, as far as the United Kingdom is concerned. I am quite certain that with the policies of the European Community, there will be further collaboration, not just between individual nations but across the Community as a whole.

*[Upon the ensuing debates Ms Chalker stated moreover:]* There is no question that arms control and disarmament lie at the centre of East-West relations. It is therefore crucial to the security of all European States that we are involved in what is going on around us. These issues touch directly on European interests and it is right that we should exchange views, and that we do.

I very much welcome your discussion. I spoke earlier for the Presidency and perhaps before closing in speaking for the UK I must just comment on two points made, one by Mr de Vries, and the second the

question by Mr James Elles. I was fascinated by Mr de Vries's contribution. I listened with care to Commissioner Cockfield who followed him and with whose views on this special issue in relation to Mr de Vries's remarks the Twelve can fully agree. May I go further on Mr Elles' initial question and say in reply that the Council and the Member States are aware of the contents of the resolution passed by the European Parliament on 26 October 1983<sup>6</sup>. The Council has not discussed procurement as such nor has the Council received from the Commission any proposals specifically relating to the problems raised in the European Parliament's resolution of that date on arms procurement with a common industrial policy and arms sales. I would refer Mr Elles to what I have just said in relation to Mr de Vries and Commissioner Cockfield's remarks earlier on in this debate.

May I turn now to Sir Peter Vanneck's report<sup>7</sup> and congratulate him. It is quite right that we should have an emphasis on the complementary relationship between arms control and disarmament and the maintenance of strong defence. Without it we would be nowhere. Stability requires both dialogue with the East, in particular on arms control and disarmament, and a clear demonstration by Western countries of the will to maintain adequate means to preserve our own security and to protect our nations. I thought during the remarks of the last speaker, Ms Piermont, how different Europe would have been if without NATO we have not had forty years of peace. I think that puts the matter in perspective.

Arms control is very much at the head of the East-West agenda. Agreements which many hoped for may not have been reached in Reykjavik but it was far from a return to square one. The discussions there were of major significance and the Twelve now look to both sides to continue the search for agreements consolidating and building upon the progress achieved in Iceland. That meeting in Reykjavik was certainly not designed as a forum for the conclusion of major arms control agreements. Both sides used it to get so close to that goal, that is surely proof of the value of the meeting and the commitment throughout to progress. We warmly welcome the extent of agreement that did prove possible. We regret the Soviet step backwards in making all arms control agreements, including the one on INF, dependent on the United States' SDI research programme. But the Reykjavik meeting was just one step on the long road to reaching a balanced and verifiable agreement on arms control and the task before us is to build on the progress that has already been made.

I reply to Mr Hänsch, let me say that of course we know that the Twelve do not sit at that particular superpower table. But Europe has been very closely involved through NATO in the preparation of thought and action and we can continue to play that supportive role as well as contributing directly to negotiations in other forums which back up that superpower effort. The Twelve are committed to the achievement of a balanced and verifiable arms control and disarmament agreement with the intention of achieving stability at the lowest possible level of forces. We should be encouraged by the recent successes at Stockholm. The consultation amongst the Twelve contributed to Western cohesion and to the achievement of significant results.

The Stockholm Agreement, if fully implemented, will represent an important step forward on the road to a safer, more stable Europe. Stockholm is the first multilateral arms control agreement since 1975 and that surely is a step forward. It represents a qualitative improvement in confidence-building measures in accordance with the Helsinki Final Act. By increasing openness about military activities in Europe it will reduce suspicion and therefore contribute to the stability that we so much strive for.

The detailed arrangements for verification through on-site inspection that were agreed at Stockholm will play a particularly important part in this process. But we must hope too that success at Stockholm will contribute to progress in other negotiations. Several members of the Twelve participate in the mutual and balanced force reduction talks in Vienna. It is important that we see movement there too. We Europeans will never be able to sleep quietly in our beds while the enormous disparity in conventional forces along the central front remains unaltered.

While the attention of our public and our media tends to focus on negotiations about nuclear weapons, it is very important not to forget the dangers threatened by conventional forces. The Twelve are playing an active role in arms control and disarmament discussions within the United Nations framework. I would mention in particular the efforts to achieve a global ban on chemical weapons currently underway

in the Conference on Disarmament. The commitment of the Twelve to an early conclusion of an effective and verifiable global ban on such weapons is well known and the Twelve attach to it a particularly high priority. It is therefore encouraging that the movement towards this goal is evident.

In sum, the Twelve can endorse the Vanneck report in its call for the achievement of a substantial reduction in strategic nuclear weapons, for the elimination of medium-range nuclear weapons, for a worldwide ban on chemical weapons and for a balanced reduction in conventional forces. All of these must be adequately verified and be accompanied by the negotiation of confidence-building measures. The Twelve are firmly committed to achievement of all these objectives. I would add that the Twelve also place importance on strict observance of the existing arms control agreement, including the bilateral ABM Treaty of 1972.

If I may now turn to the question of defence, we must recognize that this is not an area where the Twelve can work collectively. As has already been said, not all are members of NATO. For collective action we look to other forums with which we coordinate and collaborate. First and foremost, in our British view and I think in the minds of many others who have spoken today, is NATO. This is because the United States' contribution is indispensable if European security is to be preserved. We heard this from Mr Klepsch and many other Members.

I would commend to this House Mr van Eekelen's statement in this forum just last May when he was President-in-Office that a decisive consideration for Europe is that the Soviet Union continues to work actively to drive a wedge between Europe and the United States and we must not allow that to happen and it is up to all of us in each and every forum in which we operate to ensure that that does not happen.

Within the NATO framework the European allies are already making a significant contribution to strong defence. We note the emphasis in Sir Peter Vanneck's report on the need for better use of resources particularly in the field of arms procurement. Speaking of the United Kingdom, I would agree on the need for greater cooperation in this area. The forums to achieve that already exist. I mentioned the Independent European Programme Group and the Eurogroup. Many of the Twelve, including the United Kingdom, play an active role in these bodies and we shall continue to do so.

Let me conclude, Mr President, by emphasizing that the United Kingdom shares the general concern for the maximum possible policy coordination on security matters within the framework of political cooperation. We are pleased that this has worked so well at the Stockholm Conference. We and our partners aim to continue that process at the CSCE follow-up conference at Vienna. But this must complement, it must not cut across, the work we are doing in NATO and the Western European Union. That has been made clear in the Single European Act.

Those Europeans concerned already exchange views in the Western European Union and consult closely with the North American allies on a whole range of issues falling within the scope of NATO, not just on arms control, but right across the board.

In our view, this close intra-alliance consultation and cooperation are of the greatest importance to European security. Within that framework Europeans everywhere in each and every forum, I repeat, must continue to contribute fully and they must make their voices heard. In that respect I fully welcome the debate we are having here in this Parliament today.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *OJ* No 2-344 of 21 October 1986, pp. 46-51 and pp. 54-72.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/140, *OJ* No 2-339 of 14 May 1986, pp. 99-121, and *OJ* No C 229 of 9 September 1985, pp. 109-110.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *EPC Bulletin*, oc. 86/140, *OJ* No 2-339 of 14 May 1986, pp. 99-121.

<sup>4</sup> Resolution on a European project for strategic defence, *OJ* No C 140 of 16 June 1986, pp. 90-91.

<sup>5</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/140.

<sup>6</sup> Resolution on arms procurement within a common industrial policy and arms sales, *OJ* No C 322 of 28 November 1983, pp. 42-44.

<sup>7</sup> Doc. A 2-107/86 by Sir Peter Vanneck on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on arms control and disarmament and their importance to the European Community.

## 86/309. Question No H-395/86 by Mr Saridakis Concerning Turkey's Application for Accession to the European Communities

Date of Issue: 21 October 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

According to reports from reliable sources, Turkey – with encouragement from Community circles – proposes to submit by the end of 1986 an application for accession to the European Communities. Since it is not anticipated that such a request by Turkey could be entertained, the Community body responsible for delivering an opinion will, according to the same reports, devise a status of 'pre-accession' or 'upgrading of the Association Agreement with Ankara' as a means of getting round the requirement, in the case of full accession, for the agreement of the Community Member States. The special 'pre-accession' arrangement will provide for Turkey's involvement in the political cooperation process (even if only as an observer member) and for special Community aid to be granted in 'preparation' for its full accession.

Will the Council say whether these reports have been the subject of official or unofficial discussions, negotiations or comment in the context of political cooperation or in any other Community context?

*Ms Chalker, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers:* The issues referred to have not been discussed within European political cooperation.

*Mr Saridakis (PPE):* I take note of the statement, namely that the issues referred to have not been discussed, but would like to ask the President-in-Office whether she is able to assure Parliament that the practice hitherto adhered to is still to apply, namely that only full Members of the European Community take part in political cooperation, and that countries associated with the Community in any way, or countries still negotiating their accession, will not be allowed to participate in political cooperation either as voting members, or as observers, or in any other way at all.

*Ms Chalker:* I think I can give the Honourable Member the assurance he seeks. It is only full members of European political cooperation who meet together and decide on matters. In the accession period leading up to the beginning of January this year, when Spain and Portugal were preparing for their full membership, they did not participate. The same system has worked with all the additions to the Community.

*Mr Taylor (ED):* Since Turkey has had a major role in the historical development of Europe over the centuries and is now on the frontier of democracy in the Eastern Mediterranean, and since Turkey is already a valued member of NATO and is represented here in Strasbourg in the Assembly of the Council of Europe, would the President-in-Office agree that Europe will not be complete until, when conditions are right, Turkey takes its proper place in this Community and that we should work towards that objective?

*Ms Chalker:* I think it is entirely wrong to speculate when the country concerned has not made an application to join the Community. It is, in any case, a matter for the Council and not for European political cooperation. Article 28 of the Association Agreement states:

When operation of the agreement has made it possible to envisage the full acceptance by Turkey of the obligations arising out of the Treaty setting up the Community, the contracting parties shall consider the possibility of Turkey's accession to the Community.

However, Turkey has made no application and I feel we should avoid commenting on what is pure speculation.

*Mr Hindley (S):* When the President-in-Office says it is pure speculation, I take it that she is saying categorically in answer to Mr Saridakis that there have been no approaches from Turkey on the question of membership. May I presume that that is the case?

None the less, could we have a categorical assurance that should Turkey apply during the British Presidency, it will not be allowed to accede to the European Community as long as the occupation of Cyprus continues and as long as human rights continue to be abused in Turkey?

*Ms Chalker:* I think that in reply to previous questioning on this matter I have made the position of the Twelve totally clear. The answer to the honourable gentleman's first question is yes. However, it is really not for the Twelve in political cooperation to be discussing this matter. When and if it should arise, it will be properly considered. However, I can give absolutely no details because the question simply does not arise at the present time.

### **86/310. Question No H-397/86 by Mr De Vries Concerning the 1986 United Nations Human Rights Programme**

Date of Issue: 21 October 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

On 9 May the UN General Assembly accepted a package of budget cuts that included a radical reduction of the human rights programme – which, at a mere 0.7% of the UN budget, was already underfunded. As a result, meetings of the Working Group on Disappearances and the Human Rights Committee had to be cancelled. Particularly serious was the cancellation of the 1986 Session on the Sub-Committee on Minorities, as this meant postponing for a year the crucial '1503 procedure', i.e. examination of complaints by individuals about systematic violations of human rights. In the light of their own Human Rights Statement on 21 July, what action will the Twelve take to have the abovementioned meetings reinstated?

*Ms Chalker, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers:* The Twelve attach particular importance to the maintenance and strengthening of the mechanisms established by the United Nations for the protection of human rights and particularly to the '1503 procedure', which is an essential element of the proper functioning of the Commission on Human Rights. They regret the deferral of the meetings referred to by the Honourable Member of Parliament. They have made it clear that they expect the Sub-Commission to meet in 1987. The Twelve will continue to make every effort to ensure that budgetary constraints are not allowed to have an adverse impact on the United Nations human rights programme.

*Mr de Vries (LDR):* In the light of that positive answer I do not wish to put a supplementary. I would like to thank the Presidency for the efforts it has undertaken in this very important matter.

*Mr Balfe (S):* While thanking the President-in-Office for that very positive reply, could I ask her whether the Council will consider making representations to the Government of the United States, whose cuts of an indiscriminate nature have largely caused the cut-back in the activities of the United Nations, to ask them in particular, whatever their policies may be with reference to the UN, to use their best endeavours to ensure that human rights work within the United Nations is not curtailed? My information is that the United States Government has not made a priority of this during the current year.

*Ms Chalker:* I understand what the honourable gentleman has said. I have to say that in answering for the Twelve I have no particular competence about the United States. I am obviously concerned, on behalf of the Twelve, that budgetary constraints should have no impact or a minimal impact on the important mechanisms established to protect and promote human rights. As I understand that a thorough study is made of the proceedings of the European Community, and no doubt those of this House as well, I am sure that it will come to the attention of those concerned in that foreign Government he mentioned.

### **86/311. Question No H-463/86 by Mr Christensen Concerning the Nordic Foreign Policy Cooperation *vis-à-vis* European Political Cooperation**

Date of Issue: 21 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Unlike the supranational cooperation provided for in the EEC Treaties, EPC is based on the international principle of the voluntary cooperation of sovereign States. Confirmation is therefore sought that, under the terms of EPC, Denmark is entitled sovereignly to decide on its own foreign and security policies and to adhere, for example, to the general rule that decisions of the Nordic Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation take precedence over EPC at all time.

Will the Foreign Ministers confirm that Denmark's involvement in the Council of Nordic Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation will not be subordinated to the Community's foreign and security policies within EPC even where the Community Ministers meeting in EPC and the Nordic Ministers are dealing with identical fields?

*Ms Chalker, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers:* European political cooperation does not undermine the freedom of Denmark or indeed of any partner sovereignly to decide on its own foreign and security policies. The Twelve strongly believe, however, that it is in their interests to speak and act together whenever possible. That we do.

*Mr Christensen (ARC):* I do not really think that I got an answer to my question i.e. whether the Council would confirm that the Danish Parliament, if it so decides, is entitled in all situations to give precedence to Nordic foreign policy cooperation over EPC. I have noted that the EPC agreement specifically refers to NATO and the Western European Union, but it does not mention Nordic cooperation. There is only a Danish protocol to the effect that the Danish Government considers that the EPC agreement does not conflict with Nordic foreign policy cooperation. It would therefore be reassuring if the President-in-Office of the Council could explicitly state that the Danish Government is completely free, even where identical fields of work are being dealt with, at any time to give higher priority to Nordic foreign policy cooperation than to EPC.

*Ms Chalker:* I can assure the honourable gentleman that to the best of my ability, so far as I am aware, everything I said to him in answer to his first question was correct. However, what takes priority in the Danish Parliament is a matter for the *Folketing* to decide. It is not for the European Parliament to decide. It is not for European political cooperation to decide. I can assure the honourable gentleman that European political cooperation does not undermine the commitments of member Governments. I can give him two immediate examples of that: the Western European Union and NATO. So he must, in all fairness, take this particular question to the *Folketing*.

### **86/312. Question No H-469/86 Concerning Maltreatment and Torture in El Salvador<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 21 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

The legal independent humanitarian aid organization '*Socorro Juridico Cristiano*' (Christian Legal Aid) in El Salvador has reported at length on maltreatment and torture in the *La Esperanza* prison in that country. The Auxiliary Archbishop, Joaquin Rosa Chávez, has spoken of the 'inhuman treatment' to which some prisoners are subjected.

Amnesty International has repeatedly reported on the various methods of torture — the limed hood, electric shock, and the 'aeroplane' — used routinely in that country during the first fortnight of solitary confinement under Decree No 50 of February 1984.

El Salvador is not, like some other countries, subject to a dictatorial regime. The President of the Republic, Mr J.N. Duarte, has himself promised 'to fight openly and untiringly to control abuses of authority and acts of violence by extremist elements'.

Are the Foreign Ministers aware of these facts? Can representations be made, if they have not already, to ensure that the good intentions of the President of the Republic of El Salvador are fulfilled?

*Ms Chalker, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers:* The Twelve have frequently made clear their view that all the governments of Central America, including that of El Salvador, should strive to end human rights abuses. In a resolution at the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in March, all the partners represented on the Commission noted the Government of El Salvador's policy for reducing human rights abuses but called for further improvement.

*Mr Arbeloa Muru (S):* I would like to thank the Minister for her very positive reply to my question. I hope that the Foreign Ministers will take our questions on human rights as encouragement to work together to promote the most deserving attitudes and intentions among the most democratic elements in those countries, which are so close to our hearts, as opposed to the anti-democratic and reactionary elements. This means, in the case of El Salvador, of supporting President Duarte in his opposition to the most extreme individuals and groups within his administration.

I hope also, Madam Minister, that the Council of Ministers would always take our proposals as our way of ensuring that Political Cooperation is based on maximum cooperation for the purposes of safeguarding and protecting human rights.

*Ms Chalker:* I have to say to the honourable gentleman that there have been some improvements since President Duarte came to power: that, I believe, has been fairly widely recognized, and indeed recognized by the United Nations Human Rights Commission. However, further progress, I would fully agree, must be encouraged. The increase in guerilla violations noted in the last Special Rapporteur's report must also be recognized. As the honourable gentleman probably already knows, we are awaiting the 1986 interim report of the United Nations Special Rapporteur. That will give us a more up-to-date and comprehensive assessment of the human rights situation in El Salvador. We in the United Kingdom will welcome further improvements just as much as anyone else. We have ourselves in the United Kingdom expressed concern over the alleged violations which have been brought to our attention and have encouraged the Salvadorian authorities to improve the situation further. I am sure all members of the Twelve will want to join in that too.

*Mr Boesmans (S):* In the light of the dramatic events in El Salvador last week, the President-in-Office of the Council is perhaps not unaware of the increasing corroboration of the rumours that help is being given first to victims who live in the wealthier districts and only then to the people living in the poor districts, the refugees. This too is a violation of human rights, in a different way perhaps, but it is still a clear violation of human rights. Does the Council President not therefore feel that the aid which must undoubtedly be given to El Salvador following this disaster should benefit everyone, and particularly the most seriously affected, and not primarily those who still have enough money to help themselves?

*Ms Chalker:* I can understand that if such rumours are abounding, people will be very concerned about aid to victims of the disaster in El Salvador. However, European Community aid of course goes via the Commission, which would be able to answer far better than I the question the honourable gentleman has put. A large amount of the rest of the aid goes through non-governmental organizations, and whilst this may be difficult to track down in terms of where it is being received, I can only tell the honourable gentleman that, as far as the United Kingdom is concerned, where and how we have sent aid in this particular situation has been closely monitored. I am quite sure that it is getting through to all areas, particularly the areas of greatest need. That is exactly the way in which we always operate such disaster funds. I hope it will also be true for European Community aid and for non-governmental aid.

<sup>1</sup> Former Oral Question without debate (O-92/86) converted into a question for Question Time.



**86/313. Question No H-365/86 by Mr Marshall Concerning Cyprus**

Date of Issue: 21 October 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

How often have the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation discussed the question of Cyprus during the past six months?

*Ms Chalker, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers:* In 1986 the issue of Cyprus was discussed by Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Twelve on 21 April and on 21 July.

*Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED):* Would not the President-in-Office agree that this should be one of the top priorities? The Community has a special responsibility towards Cyprus. Would she not further agree that the moves by the Secretary-General of the United Nations probably represent the best hope for a settlement between the Turkish element and the Greek element in Cyprus which is not helped, I must say, by the further advent of settlers coming in from Turkey? Will she pay special attention and give particular direction on the Ministers to cooperate as far as possible with the Secretary-General in getting something moving on that island?

*Ms Chalker:* I told the Parliament just two weeks ago that we have indeed been urging further efforts by the United Nations Secretary-General, but, of course, it is very difficult when only one side, namely the Turkish Cypriots, have felt able to give a positive reply to the Secretary-General. While it is a disappointment, that won't stop us trying to get everybody to respond in order to resolve a most unsatisfactory state of affairs. A lot of hard thinking is needed on the issue. We have urged restraint on all parties. The Twelve have done all we can to support the Secretary-General. We shall continue to do so.

I understand that the Secretary-General has now met both President Kyprianou and Mr Denktash in New York. I hope now, therefore, that progress is going to be made. But I do have to say to the honourable gentleman that indeed the number of settlers who have come into the island is a very worrying element and this must be something of which everybody takes note, particularly those who are responsible for those settlers going there.

*Mr Balfe (S):* The President-in-Office answered the question by giving the dates on which Cyprus was discussed. I wonder whether she could tell us briefly at least what the salient points were, and secondly I wonder whether she would join with me in welcoming the assurance I received from Mr Inonu today. Mr Inonu, who is the leader of the major opposition party in Turkey, assured me that he did feel that the Cyprus issue could be solved and that his party welcomes the activities of the UN Secretary-General in searching for a solution.

I am sure this assurance by Mr Inonu, who has just been elected to the Turkish Parliament, will be welcome to the Council.

*Ms Chalker:* I too was lucky enough to meet Mr Inonu briefly here today and I am glad to hear that he is here and meeting with Members of this Parliament.

We have always understood the concern in this Parliament about the situation in Cyprus. It was well expressed in the resolution of 10 July<sup>1</sup> and fortunately the crossing-points that at that stage were closed were then re-opened. Our priority, as I said in answer to Sir James Scott-Hopkins, has been to concentrate on the Secretary-General's initiative.

The Honourable Member asked about the progress of the discussions. At the discussion on 21 April, Ministers in the Twelve took note of the statement by Greece on the latest reactions of the Cypriot Government to the proposals that came from the United Nations Secretary-General. Again the Twelve reiterated their support for the Secretary-General's efforts. Then in July, when we discussed the issues again – at that time I believe it was over lunch – the Greek Foreign Minister made clear his Government's concern about recent developments.

What has happened is that all Ministers have stressed their continuous support for the efforts being made by the United Nations Secretary-General. They have all expressed their hope that the parties will

avoid action that might make progress towards settlement more difficult. I am quite certain that in any bilateral discussions each member of the Twelve will be making exactly those same points amongst the Twelve.

<sup>1</sup> Resolution on the escalation of tension in Cyprus, *OJ* No C 227 of 8 September 1986, pp. 125-126.

### **86/314. Question No H-527/86 by Ms Simons Concerning the Conflict in the Western Sahara and EEC-Maghreb Relations**

Date of Issue: 21 October 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Have the Ministers considered what consequences the continuing conflict in the Western Sahara may have on relations between the European Community and the Maghreb countries? In particular:

As a result of Spanish accession, the Community has assumed the responsibility for implementation of the fisheries agreement signed in 1983 between Spain and Morocco. Does this not constitute security for the annexation by Morocco of the territorial waters of the Western Sahara? What attitude does the Community intend to adopt when this fisheries agreement comes up for renewal?

Would the Community help in the search for a solution to the conflict in the Western Sahara by urging the two sides to negotiate with a view to establishing a cease-fire and organizing a referendum under the aegis of the OAU and the United Nations?

*Ms Chalker, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers:* Questions such as fishery agreements falling within the competence of the European Community are not discussed in European political cooperation.

As to the Western Sahara conflict, the Twelve have appealed to the parties to respond positively to the UN Secretary-General's efforts to find a peaceful solution.

*Ms Simons (S):* I thank the President-in-Office of the Council for the latter part of her brief reply in which she says that the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation support the peace proposals of the United Nations and presumably the virtually identical proposals of the OAU. May I ask what form this support takes and draw attention to the very important and interesting negotiations being conducted since April of this year by the UN Secretary-General, Pérez de Cuéllar. May I in this context also remind you of the resolution passed recently by the ACP-EEC Joint Assembly in Vouliagmeni which asked the European Community to take concrete action through its appropriate institutions?

What is the position as regards the Community's undertaking to remain neutral in the war between Morocco and the Polisario? Does neutrality not mean that one does not favour one side? Ought not the aid given very regularly to Morocco by the European Community to be reviewed in this context?

*Ms Chalker:* Perhaps I could just clear up a slight misunderstanding. Although sometimes I listen to the German translation, I cannot listen to the German translation and to my own answers at the same time as giving them.

Can I just repeat what I said in the second part of my main answer to the honourable lady. That was: As to the Western Sahara conflict, the Twelve have appealed to the parties to respond positively to the UN Secretary-General's efforts to find a peaceful solution.

That is something we have done in relation to the parties concerned. The honourable lady went on to ask me how we were going to provide support to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Of course that is done by bilateral efforts between member countries of the Twelve and the countries concerned, and those diplomatic efforts go on all the time. This is not a question which has been discussed in European political cooperation and there is no separate initiative for the European Council either. Really the best way forward is through the national governments of the Twelve in their bilateral discussions with the countries concerned and in supporting the activities of the UN Secretary-General's efforts, because that is the only way, I believe, in which such a matter is going to be resolved.

*Mr Medina Ortega (S):* Madam Minister, it has been most gratifying for me to hear your remarks on the interest within political cooperation with regard to this subject. I would, however, like to ask a question which is not strictly political, but humanitarian. It is humanitarian in that it concerns protection for citizens of the European Community. It would appear that here in this Parliament, and throughout the Community in general, we are most concerned for everyone else, but at times we do not display the same degree of concern for simple working people — such as fishermen or marine workers — who have come under attack, have been injured or killed during military operations taking place in the zones in which they work. So far, sufficient protection has not been provided by the Community. To be more specific, a couple of days ago, a number of citizens of a Community country, France, were taken hostage by an organization operating in the marine sector.

I would ask the Minister if within the framework of political cooperation there is any consideration of these humanitarian aspects, in order for protection to be given for once and for all to Community citizens and not to the citizens of other regions and other countries.

*Ms Chalker:* Of course we are mainly preoccupied about the protection of citizens of the Community, but particularly at this Question Time the European Parliament always shows itself very much aware of the human rights needs of people in many different parts of the world.

I am not aware of any specific issues concerning fishermen which the honourable gentleman may be referring to. But I would say to him that if there is a matter here which is for the Presidency or indeed for the Twelve to take up, then it would be as well to let us have details of the same. Apart from that I can only say that of course the world is not the safe place we would like it to be. There are bandits on all sides and fishermen get caught up with those bandits just as much as anybody else.

### **86/315. Question No H-415/86 by Mr Pranchère Concerning the Restrictions on the Movement of a Member of Parliament in Israel**

Date of Issue: 22 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Are the Ministers meeting in political cooperation aware of the situation of the Anglican minister, Ryah Abou Assal, a native of Nazareth and a member of the Knesset, a member of the Progressive List for Peace, who has been forbidden to leave the country by the Israeli authorities? Do they not feel that they should act to have this Member of Parliament's freedom of movement restored?

*Answer:*

The particular case of Canon Ryah Abou Assal has not been discussed by the Ministers of the Twelve in political cooperation. However, the Presidency understands that a number of countries have made known their concern to the Israeli authorities about this case.

### **86/316. No H-434/86 by Mr Gerontopoulos Concerning the Continued Illegal Settlement of Turks in Cypriot Territory Occupied by Turkey**

Date of Issue: 22 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

It has recently come to light that, at the beginning of September, Turkey transferred a further 5 000 settlers to Cypriot territory occupied by troops and gave them houses and property belonging to Greek Cypriots who now live in the southern part of the island.

What measures have the Foreign Ministers taken or do they intend to take to compel Turkey to withdraw the more than 60 000 Turkish settlers, who have been settled so far in occupied territory within the Republic of Cyprus with a view to altering the region's demographic structure and bring about its eventual annexation?

*Answer:*

The Twelve have repeatedly stated that the problem of Cyprus remains an important matter of international concern and have made clear, in the European Parliament and elsewhere, that they unconditionally support the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity of Cyprus in accordance with the relevant UN Resolutions. They support the Secretary-General in his mission of good offices and continue to stress the need for all concerned to avoid any action which might make progress towards a just and viable solution of the problem more difficult.

### **86/317. Question No H-481/86 by Mr Megahy Concerning Turkey**

Date of Issue: 22 October 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

What were the major issues discussed at the recent meeting between Foreign Ministers and the Turkish Government and what agreements, if any, were reached?

*Answer:*

On 16 September there was a ministerial level Association Council meeting between Turkey and the European Community. Any questions about what was discussed at this meeting should be directed to the Council.

### **86/318. Question No H-505/86 by Mr Marleix Concerning the Fight Against Terrorism**

Date of Issue: 22 October 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Can the Ministers say whether they intend to give priority to the fight against terrorism in the Community in the near future, and to take prompt and effective measures to prevent and to combat the scourge of international terrorism, as the extraordinary meeting of the Trevi Group held on 25 September gives reason to hope?

*Answer:*

The Honourable Member will be aware of the useful conclusions reached by the Trevi Ministers on 25 September. Terrorist threats are continuously and very carefully examined by the appropriate authorities of the Twelve. For obvious reasons, it is not possible to give further details on security matters of this kind.

**86/319. Question No H-515/86 by Mr Boesmans Concerning  
Nicaragua**

Date of Issue: 22 October 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

What specific representations have the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation made to the United States authorities to date to persuade that country to pay to Nicaragua the reparations ordered by the International Court of Justice in its ruling of 27 June 1986, and what representations were made to the Honduras authorities to persuade that country to put an end to its attempts to intimidate possible witnesses to aggression against Nicaragua in the proceedings against both Honduras and Costa Rica which Nicaragua has instituted before the International Court of Justice?

*Answer:*

Foreign Ministers of the Twelve have not made joint representations about the judgment of the International Court of Justice of 27 June 1986. The Twelve have not seen any reports (still less evidence) that attempts had been made to intimidate potential witnesses in connection with the proceedings which Nicaragua has instituted at the ICJ against Honduras and Costa Rica.

The Twelve have repeatedly made clear their view that the problems of Central America cannot be solved by armed force but only by a political solution coming from the region itself. They have consistently supported the efforts of the Contadora Group and have urged countries with links and interests in the region to contribute to the creation of conditions favourable to the peaceful resolution of its problems. The Twelve have ensured that all concerned are fully aware of their views.

**86/320. Question No H-526/86 by Mr Garcia Arias Concerning the  
Sahrawi Civilians Reported Missing Since 1975-1976**

Date of Issue: 22 October 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Many Sahrawi civilians have been reported missing in Morocco, some since 1975-79. The Sahara Red Crescent has provided me with a list bearing 200 names.

Members have in the past expressed their disquiet at these disappearances, especially that of Mr El Bellal Ould Lahbib El Bellal, who was arrested in February 1976 with 100 or so of his fellow countrymen in Zak.

These disappearances have been corroborated by Amnesty International but denied by the Moroccan authorities.

Will the Ministers meeting in EPC look into this matter and request the Moroccan Government to provide long-awaited information about these missing persons?

*Answer:*

The Twelve are aware of reports about the disappearance and subsequent detention of persons believed to be Sahrawi in Morocco in 1976. One partner made bilateral representations to the Moroccan Government in 1981 over this case. The Moroccan authorities stated in response that Mr El Bellal had never been arrested or tried in Morocco. The matter has not been jointly raised by the Twelve since then. The Moroccan authorities are well aware of the Twelve's continuing concern over human rights and will no doubt have noted the Honourable Member's interest in the case.

### **86/321. Statement Concerning the PLO Attack on the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem**

Date of Issue: 22 October 1986  
Place of Issue: London  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Declaration

The Twelve deplore the grenade attack in Jerusalem which took place on 15 October and the renewed air strikes by Israeli forces against targets in Lebanon. They reiterate their view that attacks of this kind only place additional obstacles in the way of progress towards peace. They call on all concerned to exercise restraint and work for the peaceful negotiation of a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement of their differences.

### **86/322. Statement in the Fourth Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Non-Selfgoverning Territories<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 22 October 1986  
Place of Issue: New York  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN  
Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Walpole:* On behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community, I have the honour to speak to the Draft Resolution and Draft Decision Contained in A/41/23 (Part III).

The Twelve are unable to support the Draft Resolution contained in A/41/23 (Part III). In the opinion of the Twelve, the Draft contains unhelpful and contentious propositions that are unlikely to advance the interests of non-selfgoverning territories. The Twelve reject in particular the assumption in the Draft Resolution that all foreign economic interests, wherever they operate, are by definition an impediment to self-determination and therefore detrimental to the needs and aspirations of non-selfgoverning peoples. The Twelve believe that foreign investment in non-selfgoverning territories has played and continues to play an important role in their economic and social development. There is moreover an inherent contradiction between the negative view of foreign economic interests as exemplified by this Draft Resolution and the frequent calls on administering powers, in separate resolutions and decisions of this Committee, to accelerate and expand economic development in the territories for which they are responsible.

The Twelve also have reservations about the call for the total isolation of South Africa in paragraph 18 of the Resolution as well as the singling out by name of three Member States of the European Community in paragraph 17.

The Twelve also wish to express their concern at the proposal to vote the Draft Decision in A/41/23 (Part III). The Draft Decision deals with a subject that does not appear on the list of agenda items allocated by the General Assembly to the Fourth Committee. Moreover, the Twelve have reservations concerning the implicit endorsement in paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision of the use of armed struggle and the call for military assistance.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.4/41/SR.18, item 104.

### **86/323. Explanation of Vote Presented at the 25th International Conference of the Red Cross (23-31 October 1986)**

Date of Issue: 23 October 1986  
Place of Issue: Geneva, Switzerland  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: British Delegation  
Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

I am making this statement on behalf of the Member States of the European Community.

The position of the Member States of the European Community on apartheid is clear. In his statement to the United Nations' General Assembly on 23 September on behalf of the Community and its twelve Member States, the British Foreign Secretary said:

The Twelve have repeatedly made clear their revulsion at apartheid. We have demanded that it should be abolished. We utterly reject the philosophy which denies opportunity or liberty to one person, yet gives ordinary rights and privileges to another solely on the basis of his or her colour. Such a system breeds hatred and violence.

However, today's vote was not about apartheid, but about the right, under the Statutes and Rules, of the representatives of a State party to the Geneva Conventions to participate in this Conference. Every State party is entitled to participate, and the Twelve therefore voted against the exclusion of [the] South African Government Delegate. It is important for the future of the Red Cross and its mission for the Rules and Statutes to be strictly adhered to.

### **86/324. Statement in the Special Political Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning UNRWA<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 27 October 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Birch:* Mr President, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Community and of its Member States.

Thirty-six years have passed since UNRWA began its work on behalf of the Palestinian refugees displaced by the fighting of 1948 and 1949. The Agency has brought, and continues to bring, vital humanitarian assistance to the population in its care, now numbering over two million people. Its highly successful record in providing education, health services and emergency relief reflect the great dedication and professionalism of its staff, who work with limited resources and at times in dangerous circumstances. There can be no doubt that the international community, which assumed responsibility for the refugees by General Assembly Resolution 302(IV) of 8 December 1949, has been well served by UNRWA.

The Twelve wish to record their particular thanks to the Commissioner-General, Mr Giorgio Giacomelli, for his outstanding efforts since taking office early this year, and for the excellent report he has submitted to the General Assembly. Like those of previous years, the report illustrates the conditions of difficulty and danger in which the Agency at times is forced to operate. The situation of the refugee camps in Beirut and Tripoli, and near Sidon and Tyre, has once again been of great concern as a result of the prevailing instability and fighting, which has included air raids on the camps in the South. The violence which broke out in May affecting the civilian population in Beirut, including the inhabitants of the Palestinian refugee camps, caused the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Security Council to issue statements urging the utmost restraint, and calling for UNRWA and other humanitarian organizations to be allowed to carry out emergency relief operations. The fighting none the less continued, and the Foreign Ministers of the Twelve, meeting at The Hague on 27 June, endorsed and reiterated these appeals<sup>2</sup>.

We have profound sympathy for the civilian population caught up in the violence in Lebanon. The Twelve have consistently called for every effort to be made to end the bloodshed and for the sovereignty, unity, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon to be respected. It is wholly unacceptable that the civilian populations of the camps served by UNRWA should be attacked or that armed elements should expose them to attack by establishing within them bases for their activities.

The Twelve furthermore take a serious view of the unjustified destruction of refugee shelters by the authorities of the occupying power in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. They also wish to draw special

attention to the grave concern expressed in the report of the Commissioner-General, and which they fully share, about the deteriorating living conditions in the Gaza Strip.

The Commissioner-General has reported a marked increase in arrests and detentions of UNRWA staff without charge or trial. This practice now extends to all UNRWA's fields of operation and has led to increasing concern on the part of the Twelve. We wish to express our deep sympathy also to the families of the UNRWA teacher killed four days ago and of the five UNRWA employees killed during the period of the Commissioner-General's report, as well as for those employees who have been wounded or abducted. Of special concern to us is the case of Mr Alec Collett, a British subject working on behalf of UNRWA and well known for his sympathy with the Palestinian people, who was abducted in March last year. We appeal once again for news of his whereabouts and for his release without further delay.

Mr President, UNRWA has long suffered from insufficient funding for its activities on behalf of the Palestinian refugees. We should not be deceived by the relative improvement of the financial situation this year, which has in part been due to exchange rate variations, after the near crisis of 1985. The funding base for UNRWA remains dangerously narrow. The European Community and its Member States provide 30% of the total budget by paying some \$ 55 m. A single large contributor, the United States, provides 36% by paying \$ 67 m. Another seven Western countries contribute over 24% with \$ 45 m. It is not right to expect these donors, who have long made generous payments to UNRWA, to meet on their own the projected small growth year by year in the Agency's funding requirements. The Twelve are conscious of the burden already carried by the countries that are hosts to the refugees under UNRWA's protection. They are aware, too, of the economic difficulties currently facing many developing countries, and of the generosity of some of these who already contribute to UNRWA. But it cannot be ignored that financial support for the Agency is a commitment assumed logically by all those who voted and who continue to vote in favour of the relevant resolutions. The absence from the contributors list of countries which proclaim their support for the Palestinian people, and which profess the desire to work towards to a settlement of the Middle East conflict is, at the very least, difficult to explain. The human dignity and social cohesion of the Palestinian refugees, to which UNRWA makes an important contribution through its education and health programmes, are fundamental to any solution. It is a mark of our commitment to a just, comprehensive and enduring settlement of the conflict in the Middle East that we contribute wholeheartedly to the financing of UNRWA.

For the same reason we wish to record our appreciation of the comprehensive review carried out early this year by the Commissioner-General of the future needs of the Agency, the results of which were made available at the informal meeting held in Vienna in May. The European Community and a number of its Member States were among the participants. The Twelve warmly welcome the preparation for the first time of a comprehensive three-year medium-term plan, to be rolled forward annually, and the new division of the budget into three parts. They endorse the concept of multi-year planning for the management of UNRWA's operations. The full potential of these measures can only be realized if there is better assurance of adequate funding year by year and by regular contributions.

In addition to their contributions to the UNRWA budget, the European Community and a number of its Member States are providing an increased number of scholarships to Palestinian refugees in accordance with the relevant General Assembly resolutions under this item.

Mr President, the mandate of UNRWA is indissolubly linked to the finding of a just and comprehensive negotiated settlement to the conflict in the Middle East. It is our firm belief that the role played by UNRWA is vital in creating the fundamental conditions without which such a settlement would be difficult to achieve. The Twelve are committed to the search for peace, and urge all those with a similar objective to play their part in supporting UNRWA's continued activities.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/SPC/41/PV. or SR.13, item 75.

<sup>2</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/186.



**86/325. Explanation of Vote in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolutions Concerning the Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 27 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: New York  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN  
 Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Ms Young:* Mr Chairman, I have asked for the floor to make an explanation of vote on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community on the draft resolutions under items 83, 84, and 88 contained in L.11, L.12 and L.13 respectively.

As regards L.11 the Twelve very much welcome the fact that it has been possible to maintain consensus on the Second Racism Decade, an issue to which we attach considerable importance. We pay tribute to the efforts made by the African Group to ensure that this consensus was not lost.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.3/41/SR.25, item 83.

**86/326. Explanation of Vote in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolution Concerning Adverse Consequences for the Enjoyment of Political, Military, Economic and Other Forms of Assistance Given to the Racist and Colonialist Regime of South Africa<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 27 October 1986  
 Place of Issue: New York  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN  
 Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Young:* Mr Chairman, I turn now to item 84. The Twelve were not able to support the draft resolution contained in document L.12. These votes have no connection with our views on apartheid itself. As I made clear in my intervention earlier this afternoon, the Twelve have repeatedly condemned the system of apartheid, which we regard as a violation of the most basic human rights, and we have called for it to be abolished. As we made clear in our statement in the debate on this item, the Twelve consider that the report of the Special Rapporteur, like the previous reports on this subject, does not represent a useful basis for debating the important and complex issues raised by the title of this item. The lists of companies included in the report are inaccurate, selective, and — apparently for political reasons — exclude many State and other corporations which are well known to conduct regular trade with South Africa. Companies from over 100 countries are involved in such trade, yet the report refers to little more than 30. The further guidance given to the Special Rapporteur in operative paragraph 9 will not redress the situation. Nor will the provision of still more resources, which the Twelve regard as irresponsible at a time of financial crisis.

In addition, the draft resolution contains other elements which the Twelve find unacceptable. In particular, the Twelve reject all arbitrary and unjustified attacks, whether by name or implicitly, on Member States of the United Nations or groups of countries. They therefore voted against preambular paragraph 10 and operative paragraph 3.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.3/41/SR.25, item 84.

**86/327. Explanation of Vote in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolution Concerning the Importance of the Universal Realization of the Right to Self-Determination<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 27 October 1986  
Place of Issue: New York  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: British Delegation to the Un  
Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Ms Young:* I turn now to the draft resolution in L.13. The Twelve firmly support the right of self-determination in accordance with the Charter and the International Covenants on Human Rights.

But we are unable to support the draft resolution in document L.13. There are several elements in the text which the Twelve consider raise substantial difficulties or are even unacceptable. And we have to note yet again that the draft has been put forward without any attempt to consult all the groups represented in this Committee. The text overall is negative and unbalanced.

It is curious, Mr Chairman, that the text should refer to certain individual cases where the right of self-determination is violated, but omits any reference to the flagrant violations of this right which continue to be committed in Afghanistan and Cambodia on which resolutions are adopted by this Assembly each year by an overwhelming majority.

As regards South Africa, the Twelve have repeatedly condemned the system of apartheid, and demanded that it should be abolished. We have also repeatedly called for the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners. But we wish to reiterate our view that the United Nations should above all encourage peaceful solutions to international problems in accordance with the principles of the Charter. Nor can we accept the assertion that the maintenance of relations with a State implies encouragement or approval of that State's policies.

As regards Namibia, we take this opportunity to reaffirm our conviction that its people should be enabled to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination by means of free elections under United Nations supervision, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 435.

As regards the Middle East, the Twelve continue to take the view that peace in that region can only be guaranteed if the security and legitimate interests of all States and peoples in that region are taken into account. Lasting peace in the Middle East can only be achieved if the right of all States in the region to exist within secure and recognized frontiers is confirmed and if the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, with all that that implies, is also fully recognized.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.3/41/SR.25, item 88.

**86/328. Explanation of Vote in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolution Concerning the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the Status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 27 October 1986  
Place of Issue: New York  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN  
Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Ms Young:* Mr Chairman, I have asked for the floor to make an explanation of vote on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community on the draft resolution in L.8 which is now before the Committee.

Our votes on this resolution have no connection with our views on apartheid itself. The Twelve have repeatedly condemned the system of apartheid, which we regard as a flagrant violation of the most basic human rights, and we have called for it to be abolished. But we continue to take the view that this

Convention makes no contribution to the elimination of apartheid. We support the stated aim of the Convention, but we have grave reservations about the means envisaged in the Convention which in our view raise serious legal difficulties.

The Convention is defective on a number of legal grounds. Our reservations, which are well known, are compounded by the fact that the Convention defines the violations covered by it only very imprecisely.

As regards draft resolution in L.8, we have a number of major difficulties, of which these are the most important:

As regards the preambular paragraph 5, genocide is clearly defined in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. We do not accept that a resolution adopted by this Assembly can purport to extend that definition, or the area of application of that Convention. Only the States parties to the Convention or the appropriate international organs are competent to pronounce on its interpretation.

As regards operative paragraphs 5 and 8, this Convention, like other international agreements, is applicable only to States which have ratified it and to the citizens of those States. To act otherwise would be contrary to the generally accepted principle that treaties have no legal effects on States which are not party to them.

The Twelve will therefore vote against these three paragraphs. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.3/41/SR.25, item 89.

### **86/329. Statement in the Sixth Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention Against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 28 October 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Ms Foakes:* Mr Chairman, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community. We note, of course, that the *Ad Hoc* Committee did not meet this year and that there is, therefore, no report to be considered by the Sixth Committee. In these circumstances, it was our hope that, in order to save valuable time, members of the Committee would not feel the need to speak on this item.

However, in view of the fact that a substantial number of speakers have chosen to make statements and, more important, in the light of recent developments on this subject in the Third Committee, we feel it necessary to make some comments.

The Twelve have been concerned to learn of some of the contents of the draft resolution (document L.14) which is presently before the Third Committee. Operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution would request the Secretary-General to report on this matter when he already reports to the Assembly under agenda item 129; an example of duplication that we deplore. We also regret that the co-sponsors of L.14 have moved away from the consensus language which has been achieved in the past within the Sixth Committee. In our view, this will not facilitate the drafting of an international convention on this question in the *Ad Hoc* Committee, work in which members of the Twelve are actively participating.

In the continuing absence of even an agreed definition of a *mercenary* for the purposes of a draft convention, the Twelve regard it as inappropriate, as it has been proposed, that a Special Rapporteur should be appointed on this question. Also, it strikes us as curious that this matter is being addressed by the Third Committee at all. In our view, the question of mercenaries is primarily a matter affecting relations between States, rather than a human rights issue.

We understand that the vote in the Third Committee on Document L.14 has been postponed until this afternoon, and that it may therefore not be too late for the necessary adjustments to be made to ensure an orderly consideration of the question of mercenaries which is on the agenda of the Sixth Committee, not the Third Committee. We would suggest, Mr Chairman, that you yourself, in your capacity as Chairman of the Sixth Committee, should approach the President of the General Assembly and the Chairman of the Third Committee to inform them of the current responsibilities of the Sixth Committee and the *Ad Hoc* Committee in this matter, in order to find a solution to this unfortunate development.

In closing, Mr Chairman, the Twelve wish to emphasize their continuing readiness to make an active contribution to the preparation of a practical and widely acceptable international convention. The Twelve would, of course, be glad to have your reaction to our suggestion. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.6/41/SR.25, item 129.

**86/330. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Armed Israeli Aggression Against the Iraqi Nuclear Installations and its Grave Consequences for the Established International System Concerning the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and International Peace and Security<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 29 October 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Birch:* Mr President, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community.

On 7 June 1981 in an attack which was in clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international conduct, Israeli aircraft destroyed the Osirak research reactor near Baghdad. The attack was strongly condemned by the Security Council in its Resolution 487 of 19 June 1981, which was adopted unanimously. The matter was thereafter raised at the 36th session of the General Assembly, and at subsequent sessions.

The Twelve's attitude was and remains clear. We condemned the attack. We endorse the repeated appeals made to Israel to comply in full with the provisions of Security Council resolution 487. We reaffirm our belief that every State has the right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy under effective international safeguards in strict conformity with the aims embodied in the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It is moreover of the greatest importance that any State should refrain from acts of violence which inevitably aggravate existing tensions in the Middle East.

Last year the International Atomic Energy Authority concluded its consideration of the agenda item on the subject in question by adopting its Resolution 443. That resolution considered that the letter of 23 September 1985 from the Resident Representative of Israel, and the statement by the Representative of Israel on 26 September 1985, contained undertakings on behalf of their Government in response to the IAEA General Conference Resolution 425, and noted that Israel had thereby committed itself not to attack or threaten to attack peaceful nuclear facilities in Iraq, elsewhere in the Middle East, or anywhere else.

Mr President, the Twelve recall that the general question of the protection of nuclear facilities is under discussion in the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Radiological Weapons of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. Without detracting in any way from our position taken on the subject of the attack, we would question whether this item need be included any longer on the agenda. The Secretary-General, in his

report this year on the work of the Organization, expressed his belief that the important purposes of the General Assembly under the Charter are seldom served by excessive repetition. The Twelve share this view.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/41/PV.51, item 24.

### **86/331. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies and the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 29 October 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Dr Cromartie:* Mr Chairman, I would like on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community to make some comments on agenda items 62[E] and [F] regarding the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies and the work of the UN Institute for Disarmament Research.

In addition to important exchanges on several specific studies, we are pleased to note that the Advisory Board also continued, during its two sessions in 1986, to discuss the general subject of UN studies in the field of disarmament. Delegations will recall that one member of the Twelve introduced a resolution, 40/152K, which was adopted without a vote and which invited Member States to submit views on the broad question of disarmament studies. It also asked the Advisory Board to submit a report on this matter to the General Assembly at its forty-second session. Several Governments have already responded and we hope that more will do so before the Advisory Board presents its report next year.

The Twelve are also pleased to note that, acting in its capacity as trustees of the UN Institute for Disarmament Research, the Board reached agreement on a number of proposals regarding the Institute's programme of work and budget, which take account of the serious financial situation of the UN as a whole.

It is with considerable concern, however, that we note that the Director of UNIDIR was unable to prepare and submit his annual report on the work of the Institute. These tasks had to be undertaken by his Deputy.

It is clear, both from the Advisory Board's report (A-41-666) as well as that submitted by the Deputy Director of UNIDIR (A-41-676) that Mr Bota is being prevented from returning to his post – for almost ten months now – and that this situation has seriously impaired the work of the Institute. The effect is particularly critical at this point in the Institute's development when the presence of an active Director is vital.

Several countries, including from the European Community, contribute voluntarily to the funding of UNIDIR. And all Member States contribute through the subvention which the Institute receives from the regular budget of the United Nations. It is in the interests of all of us that UNIDIR should function properly and effectively. Clearly it cannot do so without its Director at the helm.

Like a number of other Governments, the Twelve have taken a direct interest in Mr Bota's case in support of the Secretary-General's persistent efforts to secure his return to his post. We believe that it would be valuable if the Secretary-General could inform the Committee of the efforts that have been made on Mr Bota's behalf and of the present situation.

In conclusion, Mr Chairman, the Twelve wish to repeat our appeal to those who hold the key to a solution to bring this matter to a speedy conclusion to the satisfaction of everyone concerned.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.1/41/PV.25, item 62[E] and [F].

## 86/332. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Chemical and Biological Weapons<sup>1</sup>

Date of Issue: 30 October 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Dr Cromartie:* Mr Chairman, I have the honour to speak on behalf to the twelve Member States on item 59 of our agenda, 'Chemical and Bacteriological Weapons'.

Mr Chairman, the Twelve welcomed the successful conclusion of the Second Review Conference of the Biological Weapons Convention in September and made a joint contribution to this outcome. We look forward to the meeting of experts to be held in April when we hope that measures can be agreed to strengthen confidence in and the control regime of the Convention. The Twelve, all of whom have ratified the Convention hope that the First Committee will call upon all those countries which have not yet done so to become parties to the Convention and very much hope that these countries will do so at the earliest possible opportunity. We support the draft resolution submitted by the delegation, Austria, which provided the Presidency of the Review Conference.

Mr Chairman, I must regretfully reiterate in the Committee the unequivocal condemnation by the Twelve of all use of chemical weapons. We strongly urge all parties to the 1925 Geneva Protocol scrupulously to honour their obligations under the Protocol and to observe the generally recognized principle rules of international law applicable to armed conflict. Members of the Committee will be aware that the Twelve have taken measures together with other countries to control the export of certain compounds which could be misused for the production of chemical weapons. These controls are kept continuously under review and their scope was extended during the course of this year. We shall continue to give them close attention and to apply whatever export control measures are necessary to prevent the abuse of relevant compounds.

In his statement on behalf of the Twelve in the general debate on 14 October, Mr Timothy Renton, Minister of State of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, emphasized the high priority attached by the Twelve to the early conclusion on an effective and global ban on chemical weapons. As the current Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Chemical Weapons of the Conference on Disarmament I am glad to be able to say on behalf of the Twelve that the negotiations are progressing at an accelerating pace. As a result of the hard work done in the *Ad Hoc* Committee, especially in the last three years since it received its present mandate a lot of common ground has been identified, to an increasing extent in the form of provisionally agreed treaty language, within the basic structure of the Convention agreed in 1984. Building on this foundation, the Committee has in its reports of 1985 and 1986 developed further what is called the rolling text of the draft Convention, which records the current state of the negotiations and reports the progress made to the Conference and to the General Assembly.

As you will see from this year's report we have been able to register remarkable progress in some areas of the draft Convention notably its Articles IV, V and VI. The Government of one member of the Twelve organized a valuable workshop in The Hague and Rotterdam in June which made a major contribution to a new Article VI on 'Activities not prohibited by the Convention' and we are progressing towards agreement on effective verification of the elimination of chemical weapons and the facilities for producing them. We are also progressing towards agreement to verify effectively by routine methods that stocks of chemical weapons and the facilities for producing them are eliminated during the ten-year transitional period and that civil chemical industry is not misused to make chemical weapons. It is generally accepted that routine methods of verification need to be supplemented by a system of challenge inspection under Article IX of the draft Convention as a safety-net to provide the ultimate source of confidence in the Convention. Another member of the Twelve has made a proposal in this field which has been supported by a number of speakers in the general debate in this Committee. We look forward to reactions to it from other Delegations.

All these subjects are on the agenda for the next session of the Committee due to take place in January before the opening of the 1987 session of the Conference on Disarmament, which will be preceded by a

period of open-ended consultations in Geneva starting on 24 November after the Committee has concluded the consideration of the disarmament items on its agenda. The aim of inter-sessional work is to make use of the momentum that has been generated in the 1986 session and to build on some of the progress that has been made.

The Twelve hope that the General Assembly will welcome the substantial progress that has been made in the negotiations so far and will encourage the Conference on Disarmament to reinforce its efforts with a view to the earliest possible conclusion of a Convention to rid the world completely of this whole class of particularly repugnant weapons.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.1/41/PV.26, item 59.

### **86/333. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Review of the Role of the UN in the Field of Disarmament<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 30 October 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Dr Cromartie:* The twelve Members of the European Community on whose behalf I am speaking, are gratified that at the initiative of a group of African countries led by Cameroon, a review is being carried out of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. The Member States of the European Community submitted their detailed views on the issues raised as set out in document A/CN.10/69/Add 1. The subject has been under consideration in the Disarmament Commission for two years now, and we hope that the Commission will be allowed to complete its work so that a report and recommendations can be submitted to the next General Assembly, and as necessary to the next Special Session devoted to disarmament.

The Twelve agree fundamentally that the United Nations must play a central role in the sphere of disarmament. This is consistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter, full observance of which would definitely enhance the contribution made by the UN.

It should however not be overlooked that UN bodies have already made major contributions to the cause of disarmament and arms control. A number of agreements, some of great importance, have been concluded under the auspices of the General Assembly and other UN bodies.

It is true that, in recent years, there have been few new agreements concluded but in the Twelve's view this is not the fault of the United Nations. Rather this situation reflects a period of erosion of international confidence. Apart from avoiding actions which are contrary to the Charter, members of the UN can make a contribution to avoiding such a position in future by striving for greater understanding on the part of Member States generally of the security concepts and principles which guide each others approaches.

Happily, in the last few years, the international atmosphere has improved, negotiations of various sorts have re-commenced or been re-inaugurated and we look forward to the fruits of this whether without or within the UN system, for example the chemical weapons negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament.

As I indicated at the outset the Twelve welcome periodic reviews of [the] United Nations machinery. It has been some years since this machinery in the field of disarmament was last examined and restructured.

We believe that the role of the General Assembly and in particular that of its First Committee, is essential, given the commitment of the United Nations to peace, security and a safer world for all. It is the main deliberative organ of the United Nations in the field of disarmament where all States, including those not participating directly in specific negotiations, can make their views felt. Here also States can bring to bear their particular geographical, regional, security, social and economic perceptions.

However, as my Minister of State, Mr Renton, pointed out on behalf of the Twelve in the general debate on 14 October, there has been a proliferation of resolutions and a decline in consensus. In our view, the process of deliberation and review in the First Committee would gain significantly if resolutions were directed to the achievement of concrete action. The need for great efficiency and effectiveness is made the more urgent as the result of the budgetary crisis which the United Nations faces.

The Twelve consider that the Disarmament Commission has a significant contribution to make as a deliberative body. Its existence permits in-depth examination of specific issues, which cannot be undertaken elsewhere. In order for this to be done effectively, it might be useful to have periodic rotation of the issues under consideration.

The Twelve attach great importance to the work of the Conference on Disarmament as the permanent multilateral negotiating body. Clearly, negotiation can only take place on subjects where common ground exists. In present circumstances, we believe that one of the most urgent priorities in the Conference on Disarmament is the conclusion of an agreement banning chemical weapons. We should also like to see the agreed enlargement of the Conference taking place as soon as possible.

Turning from forums of discussion and negotiation to other areas of UN activity, the Twelve hold that the best possible use of resources should be made and unnecessary duplication avoided. The Department for Disarmament Affairs has a primary co-ordinating role in this respect. We would wish to emphasize at this point that we much appreciate the value of the work done by the Department.

We also believe that studies conducted under United Nations auspices, should be related clearly to specific practical objectives.

We believe that the First Committee should show restraint in commissioning new studies, which in any case should be the subject of proper consultation. The Secretary-General's Advisory Board also has an important role to play as a coordinating clearing-house for studies of a more independent and academic nature and to avoid overlapping with one another and with studies carried out by experts appointed by the Secretary-General. We welcome the initiative launched in resolution 40-152K on the subject of studies.

In conclusion, we believe that pragmatic measures on the lines indicated would do much to improve the UN's handling of disarmament issues.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.1/41/PV.27, item 60[F].

### **86/334. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Review and Appraisal of the Implementation of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Second Disarmament Decade<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 30 October 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Dr Cromartie:* The twelve Members of the European Community, on whose behalf I am speaking today, share the purposes and objectives of the Second Disarmament Decade proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly in Resolution 35/46 of 1980. They attach the highest priority to progress on arms control and disarmament, which they believe is essential if the goals of enhanced security at the lowest possible levels of armaments, and increased confidence and trust are to be achieved. Six years after its adoption the Declaration remains a basis for action by Member States.

Sadly, the beginning of the Decade was marked for a variety of reasons by a decrease in international trust and a corresponding increase in suspicion, which naturally had repercussions for arms control and disarmament. More recently the international atmosphere, and thus the prospects for agreements, has improved. In our view, the demonstration of compliance with existing agreements as well as greater openness about military matters will hasten this process.



Undoubtedly the area of primary interest is the one where the two powers with the overwhelming preponderance of nuclear weapons as well as the leading military capability in space bear special responsibility. The Twelve welcome the heightened activity in this area in the past year and have been encouraged by the meetings between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev which have taken place. Though no agreements have been concluded, we have noted with great interest the common ground reached between the participants in the recent discussions in Reykjavik. In this respect the Twelve support the draft resolution tabled in document A/C.1/41/L.3.

The Twelve also welcome the considerable progress made this year in the Conference on Disarmament towards the important objective of concluding a complete ban on the production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons. Members of the Twelve have played a full part in this process.

We are also pleased by the positive outcome of the Second Review Conference of the Biological Weapons Convention, which took place in Geneva in September.

In the Twelve's own region, the successful outcome of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe was of great importance. The confidence- and security-building measures agreed are a step in the right direction towards strengthening and enhancing security and trust between States. Those members of the Twelve who take part in the Vienna negotiations on Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions in Central Europe maintain their determination to continue to seek mutually acceptable solutions and have accordingly made major efforts to move these negotiations forward.

The Twelve have continued to play an active part in UN bodies devoted to disarmament, including this Committee, where they have brought forward a number of resolutions; and in the Disarmament Commission, which was this year chaired by a Member State of the European Community.

The Twelve have been pleased to note that the Disarmament Commission was able to reach agreement on a report on the implementation of the Second Disarmament Decade at its 1985 session, which [was] in turn reflected in the Resolution 40/152L adopted by consensus by the First Committee last year. In our view this pragmatic and realistic approach reflects well on the sponsors of the resolution.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.1/41/PV.27, item 62[M].

### **86/335. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Reduction of Military Budgets<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 31 October 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Dr Cromartie:* Mr Chairman, I should like to address some comments today to agenda item 58, namely the reduction of military budgets. The twelve Member States of the European Community, on whose behalf I am taking the floor, have retained a consistent and active interest in this subject.

It has been estimated that, by 1985, global military spending was running at the staggering rate of US \$ 900 billion per year. Although it is difficult to be certain, on the basis of available information, how accurate that figure might be, no one would dispute that military budgets are absorbing far too great a proportion of the world's human, financial, natural and technological resources. This places a heavy burden on the economies of all countries – big and small, industrialized and developing. There is thus a mutual interest in finding ways of reducing these expenditures.

If the shortcomings of high military spending and the advantages of reductions are obvious to us here in the First Committee, it is reasonable to assume that governments charged with determining the levels of defence expenditure are equally well aware of them. It is also reasonable to assume that they take these factors fully into account when considering priorities in allocating resources. The balancing act is not an easy one. Governments have a duty to protect their national interests including the right of States to undiminished security. Defence is not, therefore, an 'optional extra'.

Nevertheless, as I pointed out a moment ago, the international community has a common interest in looking for mutually acceptable ways to reduce military budgets. Agreements on balanced disarmament measures could themselves make a major contribution to that objective. Accordingly the twelve Member States of the European Community continue to attach priority to making progress in disarmament negotiations that are currently under way. In addition they have taken an active part over the years in work at the United Nations related to the reduction of military budgets, including at the UN Disarmament Commission.

We were pleased to note that some progress was made during the 1986 session of the UNDC on the drafting of principles covering the actions of States in the field of freezing and reducing military budgets. In developing the draft principles, members of the Twelve contributed to various compromise formulations and noted that there was wide acceptance in the Commission of the need for a prior understanding about the exchange of relevant data and about the comparability of military budgets. Notwithstanding the progress achieved, much work remains to be done and we believe that the Disarmament Commission should continue work on this subject with a view to finalizing the draft principles at its session in 1987.

Whilst a set of general principles in this area would no doubt be useful, compliance with and implementation of concrete measures in the field of arms control and disarmament remains of primary importance.

The United Nations reporting matrix, established through General Assembly resolution 35/142B provides a universal framework whereby States can supply information about their military expenditures in standardized form. That is to say, in a comparable and non-prejudicial form. It is clear from the range of countries who have participated in the exercise already that differences in social and economic systems are not an obstacle to completing the reporting instrument. We therefore hope that more countries, in particular Eastern Europe, will do so in the future. For, whilst the provision of facts and figures does not solve all of the difficult problems associated with the reduction of military budgets, there is no doubt that a freer, more open flow of information as well as the political goodwill of all States concerned are essential prerequisites for the conclusion of worthwhile and reliable agreements in this field.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.1/41/PV.28, item 58.

## **86/336. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Confidence-Building Measures**

Date of Issue: 31 October 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Dr Cromartie:* I wish to make some comments on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community on item 61[A], entitled 'Consideration of Guidelines for Confidence-Building Measures: Report of the Disarmament Commission'.

In the view of the Twelve, the concept of confidence-building is particularly important in a world regrettably fraught with examples of the use or threat of use of force. We believe the concept is relevant in the regional as well as the global context.

Confidence-building measures (CBMs) are not of course a substitute for disarmament. But they can promote an atmosphere which is more conducive to progress in arms control and disarmament.

The most fundamental approach to confidence-building is respect for the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations; if all member States respected these vital principles, this would in itself transform the world's political climate.

In addition to this, practical confidence-building measures should be considered in order to diminish the roots of mutual misunderstanding, mistrust, fear and miscalculation. Such measures to be of value must be concrete and binding, and appropriately verifiable. Mere declarations of intent or of generalized principles are of little use.

CBMs should embrace greater openness about military activities including the provision of objective information on military matters.

The implementation of CBMs, step by step, can promote the atmosphere necessary for nations to contemplate real arms control measures. It is heartening that the Disarmament Commission when it continued its consideration of CBMs this year, reached a large measure of agreement. Under the chairmanship of a member of the Twelve, draft guidelines were agreed except on two issues, on which the Commission presented alternative formulations. We support the draft resolution in document A/C.1/41/L.26 which is co-sponsored by Member States of the Twelve.

Turning now to a concrete example of confidence-building measures, a process on the lines I have referred to, has been under way in the Twelve's own region in Europe. I refer to the outcome of the Stockholm Conference on Disarmament in Europe which concluded last month by reaching agreement on a set of confidence- and security-building measures. Along with others the Twelve made a substantial contribution to that result. The agreement known as the Stockholm Document, is designed to bring about a greater degree of openness and predictability about military activities in Europe[,] thus reducing tension, mistrust and the risk of military confrontation.

There are six main elements of the agreement:

- First, 42 days' notice will be given of military activities (exercises, concentrations, movements) involving more than 13 000 troops or 300 tanks.
- Second, observers must be invited to all such activities involving more than 17 000 troops.
- Third, annual forecasts of notifiable activities will be exchanged for the coming year by 15 November of the preceding year.
- Fourth, the Stockholm Accord will be verified by means of on-site inspection, by ground, air or both. Participants will be obliged to accept on request up to three such inspections on their territory per year.
- Fifth, military activities in the field involving more than 40 000 troops shall be notified in the annual forecast one year before they would normally be forecast. Activities involving more than 75 000 troops cannot take place unless so forecast.
- Sixth, the participating States reaffirmed their commitment to the principle of the non-use of force (a reaffirmation drawn from the Helsinki Final Act and the UN Charter).

The Stockholm Accord represents a significant and qualitative step forward from the modest confidence-building measures contained within the Helsinki Final Act (1975). It sets out a set of concrete, politically binding, confidence-building measures and gives practical effect to the zone of application (from the Atlantic to the Urals) laid down in the Madrid mandate for the CDE. It introduces a greater degree of openness and predictability in European security arrangements which should thereby help to reduce mistrust and the risk of miscalculation in time of tension. Thus, its achievement comes as a welcome impetus for the CSCE process.

The Accord is the first major multilateral agreement in the military and security field which includes nations from East and West to have been reached since 1979. It is significant in being the first agreement to provide for verification through on-site inspection by land, air, or both. These provisions for on-site inspection will no doubt form an important precedent for future arms control and disarmament negotiations.

Equally the Twelve support efforts in other regions, in Latin America, in Africa and in Asia which can contribute to a favourable atmosphere for regional disarmament measures. We hope that these efforts will prosper.

On the global scale also, the past year has seen developments on CBMs. Last month in Geneva, the Review Conference of the Biological Weapons Convention adopted a number of measures designed to increase confidence in compliance with the Convention. A meeting of experts next April will follow up this process.

It is to be hoped that these important steps in the area of CMBs this year will inspire further measures.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.1/41/PV.28, item 61[A].

**86/337. Statement in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the International Campaign Against Traffic in Drugs<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 31 October 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Birch:* Mr Chairman, drug abuse is not a new problem — there are well documented records going back several centuries. And the United Nations has been involved in attempts to control drug abuse and trafficking since 1946. But it is only in the past few years that the scope of the current problem has been widely appreciated and has attracted worldwide attention. With this attention has evolved a realization that the problem is truly international; that it transcends all boundaries; and that if we are to stand any chance of eradicating it we must all work together, both at the regional level and in international forums such as the UN.

I am therefore pleased to be able to make this, the first statement on drugs on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community.

I hope there is no need to try to explain the nature or scale of the problem facing us all. It is difficult to open a newspaper or listen to the radio or television without being confronted by the subject of narcotic drugs. Indeed if we are not, as some claim, 'buried under an avalanche of cocaine' we are certainly in danger of drowning in a sea of words: all the hyperbole[s] imaginable have been employed to try to describe our current predicament. But we do not need more words — we need concerted and effective action by everyone.

Action on drugs must begin on a national level. Every country has an obligation to tackle the problem domestically. Consumer countries should try to reduce addiction through effective education campaigns aimed at prevention. And there needs to be adequate provision for treatment and rehabilitation and the re-integration of former addicts into society. Combined with this, pressure must be applied to pushers and traffickers through stricter law enforcement. Producer countries need to eliminate the source of drugs through crop substitution and eradication programmes backed, where necessary, by appropriate law enforcement measures. And those countries who by force of geography are transit countries or repositories of the illegal profits of drug abuse or serve as refineries for drugs need to play their part too.

It is against such a background that we in Europe, faced with a continuing drugs problem, have been examining closely what the Twelve, and where appropriate the Community, can do to enhance existing regional cooperation and to assist in the wider international effort. It is therefore appropriate that the Twelve are making their first common statement on drugs at the General Assembly at a time when active consideration is being given to the evolution of a comprehensive European drugs strategy which seeks to strengthen national measures adopted by the Twelve and to complement rather than duplicate the work of existing international and regional drugs forums. The European Parliament, the Council and the Commission are all actively involved in this exercise.

Less than two weeks ago Interior and Justice Ministers of the Twelve met in London to discuss, amongst other topics, drug abuse. They expressed their grave concern about the serious problem of drug misuse and agreed on a joint plan of action. They produced a blueprint that calls on Member States to examine what they, where appropriate in conjunction with the Community, can do in the following fields:

- measures to reduce demand for drugs especially among young people;
- measures to improve the treatment and rehabilitation services for addicts;
- steps to ensure that legislation takes account of the need to maintain effective control over illicit drug trafficking, particularly at the Community's external frontiers;
- mutual enforcement of confiscation orders relating to drug traffickers' assets;
- ensuring that bilateral and Community aid supports, as appropriate, a recipient country's efforts to combat drug abuse;

- enhancing cooperation between law enforcement agencies by the posting of drug liaison officers within Member States and to other countries;
- preparation of joint assessments by Ambassadors of the Twelve in drug producing and trafficking countries to ensure a steady flow of recommendations for action by the Twelve.

This is not, of course, to suggest that European cooperation on drugs issues is merely an aspiration. The Pompidou Group of the Council of Europe, where the Twelve have the benefit in addition of the knowledge and experience of four other European countries, has for many years provided a forum for cooperation on all drugs issues. It has played and will continue to play a vital role in the coordination of European activity in this field. And Member States play an active part in the important forums for cooperation amongst law enforcement services at operational level. On the demand side the World Health Organization provides a valuable forum for cooperation on the treatment, rehabilitation and health education aspects of drug misuse.

Mr Chairman, the Twelve make all these points to illustrate that we are determined to add our collective weight to the struggle against drugs in which we represent only a few of the participants. We recognize and are deeply impressed by the efforts others are making. We warmly welcome for example the efforts of certain producer countries, often in very difficult circumstances, to expand crop eradication activities and promote alternative means for poppy and coca farmers to earn their living. And we welcome too the increasingly firm commitment of governments at the highest level to attacking the problem of trafficking.

The UN of course continues to play a leading role in guiding all of our international efforts in the drugs field and ensuring that the matter is kept at the forefront of the political agenda. We have welcomed the decision, made upon a proposal of the Secretary-General, to hold a ministerial level international conference on drug abuse and illicit trafficking in Vienna next year. This will be an event of primary importance. It not only provides a focus for our activities in the coming months but also, for the first time, affords every country – producer, consumer and transit alike – an equal opportunity to play a part in determining the thrust and direction of an internationally coordinated drugs campaign which will help guide our future national, regional and international activities in this field. Much useful work was done by the preparatory committee for the conference at its first meeting in February of this year but much still remains to be done. We strongly urge all countries to play their full part in ensuring the success of the conference; to resist any attempts to introduce extraneous political issues; and to view the conference not as the culmination of our efforts but as providing a launch pad for a more determined and concerted international drugs campaign. So far there has been a unique unity of purpose. The Twelve hope that this spirit will continue and will be the hallmark of the conference.

In the statement in which he first proposed the idea of a world conference, the Secretary-General expressed his hope that it should

serve to raise the level of world awareness of the dangers we face, mobilize the full potential of the United Nations system, reinforce other intergovernmental, non-governmental and regional initiatives, and encourage Governments to concert their efforts and to devote greater resources to combat drug abuse and trafficking.

In our view it is important that these aims should not be lost sight of. The conference must be an expression of the political will of those who participate – and its results must be accessible and relevant to everyone.

Many of us here today have worked hard in recent months to further the drafting of the proposed new convention on drug trafficking. We would like to thank the Secretariat for their efforts in this field and to offer support for their continued efforts in the months ahead. This task is not an easy one and will need to be carried out, not with undue haste for the sake of meeting unrealistic deadlines, but rather with painstaking care so that the convention is applicable to, and capable of ratification by, as many countries as possible. We look forward to examining the first draft of the Convention at the meeting of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs in February 1987. But there will still be considerable work to be done

thereafter. In this context we recall the resolution concerning the Convention adopted by the Commission at this year's Special Session and endorsed by ECOSOC at its spring session which set out a timetable for the drafting process.

With the flurry of new activity in the UN drugs field it would be all too easy to forget to mention the contribution made in the campaign against drugs by the traditional, but no less important work, of the existing UN drugs agencies. The priority we attach to the work of UNFDAC is illustrated by the continuing financial support given by members of the Community to the Fund's projects in major heroin and coca producing regions. UNFDAC has a major role to play in coordinating international assistance programmes. It promotes a sustained, coherent and unified approach to efforts to tackle all aspects of the drugs problem and has the ability to expand its activities in new areas of the world in response to rapidly changing production and trafficking patterns. This flexibility, made possible in part by donors' non-earmarked contributions, is one of the Fund's valuable assets and strengths. And we should not forget the International Narcotic Control Board. Much of its work is technical and not readily visible – but it plays an important role in monitoring the implementation of the existing Conventions on Narcotic Drugs.

I should also not conclude without paying tribute to the important conclusions of the recent Inter-Regional Meeting of Law Enforcement Officers held in Vienna. The Twelve particularly welcomed agreement at that meeting to exchange drug liaison officers where appropriate. We have encouraged this practice as a means of building on existing cooperation between law enforcement agencies and providing valuable intelligence on drug trafficking which allows sending States to direct more effectively their own police and customs operations. As I mentioned earlier, the principle of exchanging drug liaison officers was included in the conclusions of our Interior Ministers. We have always been pleased to accept drug liaison officers in our capitals where requested. And we are grateful to those who have accepted drug liaison officers from the Twelve.

It is a truism that adversity tends to unite. Over the past few years we have seen an extraordinary measure of cooperation developing internationally in this field. It has managed to bring together peoples and governments at all levels with a common purpose. We may at times differ in our approaches and what we consider to be the best solution to the problem but we must not allow anything to divide us or to distract from the overall aim – to eliminate the destruction and tragedy that results from illegal drug abuse.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.3/41/SR.31, items 100 and 12.

### **86/338. Explanation of Vote in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Resolution Concerning the Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 31 October 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Ms Young:* I have asked for the floor to make an explanation of vote on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community on the draft resolution we have just adopted in Doc. L.10/rev. 1.

Mr Chairman, the Twelve made clear in this Committee last year that they regretted the loss of consensus on this question. We also made clear our willingness to work actively to restore consensus on this important issue next year. To that end, from the beginning of this session we have held lengthy and useful discussions with the co-sponsors[, ] in particular the delegation of Yugoslavia. We pay tribute to the spirit of cooperation which the co-sponsors have shown and we very much welcome the fact that as a result we were today able to adopt the draft resolution by consensus. The text we have adopted will serve as a good basis for the Committee's future consideration of this question, to which the Twelve attach considerable importance.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.3/41/SR.32.

## 86/339. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Twentieth Anniversary of the Adoption of the International Covenants on Human Rights<sup>1</sup>

Date of Issue: 3 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Sir John Thomson:* Mr President, we are assembled today to commemorate a proud day in the history of the United Nations, the adoption of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its Optional Protocol. I have the honour, on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community, to address this vital subject.

An anniversary such as this is traditionally a time both to look back and to look forward. Human rights are not a discovery of recent years, nor even a discovery of the United Nations. As Europeans, the Twelve are proud to recall that under the name of 'natural rights' or 'the rights of Man' the concept has played a potent part in the political life of our continent throughout the last three centuries. Many of the great reforms of the 18th and 19th centuries were inspired by the belief that every individual human being, regardless of status or background, possessed certain inalienable rights.

The achievement of human rights has for centuries been a basic aspiration of men and women throughout the world. Demands for protection against the tyrannical acts of governments, for assurances against arbitrary or inhuman punishment, for freedom of assembly and expression, for the rule of law, for better economic and social conditions for all, these have been among the most insistent themes of political activity in many countries. These aspirations were embodied in the Covenants as human rights.

The Twelve seek universal observance of human rights. The joint declaration of 5 April 1977 by the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission stressed the prime importance we attach to human rights<sup>2</sup>. Our Foreign Ministers reaffirmed this in a declaration issued in Brussels on 21 July 1986 (and circulated as Document A/41/607 of this Assembly), in which they set out the principles of the Twelve in the human rights field. In this declaration they called for universal ratification of the major United Nations human rights instruments. Central among these are the two great Covenants whose adoption we are celebrating today. They proclaimed high but attainable standards for the protection and promotion of human rights, to which all States should conform. And they gave effect to the commitment in Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter to make the promotion of human rights the legitimate and continuous duty of the world community. Thus for the first time machinery was established under the auspices of the United Nations to consider the fulfilment by States of their international obligations to respect and to ensure to all individuals subject to their jurisdiction certain human rights. The Twelve again urge those countries which have not yet done so to consider ratifying or acceding to the Covenants and the Optional Protocol as soon as possible, to enable them to become truly universal.

The adoption of the Covenants and the Optional Protocol was a major achievement. But we must not rest on our laurels. Setting standards cannot protect human rights if the standards laid down are then blatantly disregarded. We are constantly reminded that human rights are still being grievously violated in very many parts of the world, even in certain countries which are party to the Covenants. Ratification is not enough.

Implementation is the essential task before us. We must be vigilant to defend essential freedoms where they exist, and make practical efforts to extend them elsewhere. States parties to the Covenants have a legal obligation to ensure that their actions are in line with the provisions of the Covenants. And at the international level we must ensure ever greater observation of the obligations which have already been accepted. This can be done in a number of ways. It can be done by making more effective use of the machinery which already exists to monitor the implementation of the standards in the Covenants, the Human Rights Committee, and the newly established Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Where States parties have made the declaration provided for in Article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, there is further provision for monitoring implementation. It can

also be done through the activities and procedures of United Nations bodies such as the Commission on Human Rights and the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities. All these activities need to be pursued urgently. The adequacy and effectiveness of the United Nations' machinery need also to be kept under constant review. As Sir Geoffrey Howe made clear in his speech in our general debate on 23 September, delivered on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, the Twelve attach particular importance to maintaining and strengthening the mechanisms established by the United Nations for the protection of human rights. It is essential that the necessary resources should continue to be made available for this purpose.

The task before us is a large one, and one that does not fall solely to the governmental organizations. Non-governmental organizations and individuals have made valuable and courageous contributions, which the Twelve salute, to the promotion and protection of human rights.

Information, education and publicity too are important tools for the promotion of respect for and awareness of human rights. The Twelve attach great importance to the wide circulation of international human rights instruments, in particular the Universal Declaration and International Covenants, not only in all official languages of the United Nations, but in other national languages also. We reiterate the appeal made in our declaration of 21 July 1986 to all States to enhance public awareness of the cause of human rights through educational programmes and by allowing non-governmental organizations freely to disseminate human rights information.

On this anniversary, the international community can indeed take satisfaction in its achievements: the International Covenants represent the broadest international codification of accepted standards for human rights. But this should not be simply an occasion for self-congratulation or complacency. It should instead be the occasion for a renewed commitment by all member States to the promotion of the ideals and objectives of the Covenants. The Twelve will play their full part in this.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/41/PV.54, item 97.

<sup>2</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/230.

## **86/340. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning Afghanistan<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 4 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Eggar:* Mr President, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community.

Nearly seven years after the invasion of Afghanistan the General Assembly will need no reminding of the consequences of the large scale military intervention by the Soviet Union some seven years ago in 1979. This act of force remains one of the most serious violations of the Charter of the United Nations since the founding of the Organization. It is a living proof of the determination of the Soviet Union to pursue its own ends by the massive and sustained use of military power.

Mr President, the occupation of Afghanistan continues. This Assembly has rejected on many occasions by an overwhelming majority the attempt to impose on the people of that country a regime set up and kept in power by force. Year after year the General Assembly has condemned the occupation. It has called for the immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops and a negotiated settlement which would make it possible to restore to Afghanistan its independence and its non-aligned status.

Mr President, the Soviet Union has made much of its withdrawal of six regiments in October which was announced by General Secretary Gorbachev in his Vladivostok speech in July. But, Mr President, this will have minimal, if any, military significance: three of the regiments were anti-aircraft, the Afghan Resistance have no aircraft: a fourth was a tank regiment of little relevance to the fighting in Afghanistan's mountainous terrain. Moreover, Mr President, serious doubts have recently arisen over the genuineness



of the withdrawal of the two motor rifle regiments. The fact is that the Afghan people are still left with an army of over 110 000 Soviet troops occupying their country. The Soviet presence in Afghanistan is as unpopular as ever. Instead of continuing to prevaricate over the real issue, we urge the Soviet Union to agree to a speedy and complete withdrawal of their troops in accordance with the resolutions passed by this Assembly.

Mr President, military operations are not confined to the territory within the borders of Afghanistan. The bombing of Pakistani territory has continued to increase. These activities constitute a clear threat to peace and stability in the region as a whole. Mr President, the Twelve utterly condemn them.

The Soviet invasion and occupation have led to unprecedented hardship for the Afghan people. The human misery now being endured in Afghanistan is enormous. Innocent men and women continue to lose their lives and their homes. The occupying forces attempt to suppress a most courageous resistance using all the military might of a superpower. The Twelve strongly condemn the brutal attacks, especially those made from the air, which are taking place against the civilian population of Afghanistan. These attacks have led to the destruction of villages, rural infrastructure and crops. Hundreds of thousands have been displaced, millions have fled abroad. The attacks are irreconcilable with the norms of international behaviour. They violate the fundamental rights of a people which is struggling to regain independence and freedom. There is, however, no sign of any weakening of resolve on the part of the Afghan people. The alliance of resistance parties formed last year is able to inform the international community of what is really taking place inside Afghanistan.

In 1984, the human rights situation in Afghanistan led to the appointment by the Commission on Human Rights of a Special Rapporteur. Mr Ermacora's second report to the Commission, presented in February this year paints a further picture of gross violations of human rights, including massacres and indiscriminate bombing. The report, Mr President, comments that 'systematic brutality characterized the conflict' in 1985. It estimates that civilian casualties reached some thirty-five thousand. Mr Ermacora also warned that continuing fighting 'will lead inevitably to a situation approaching genocide'. Mr President, the Twelve are appalled by this. We await with particular interest the Special Rapporteur's further interim report to the Assembly. We intend to participate actively in the debate which will shortly take place in the Third Committee on the question of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Afghanistan.

Another illustration of the seriousness of the situation within Afghanistan is the continuing and massive exodus of refugees to neighbouring countries. About a third of the Afghan population has now been forced to flee the country. It is estimated that there are now over four million Afghan refugees. About three quarters of them are currently in Pakistan; Mr President, you will be aware that they constitute the greatest concentration of refugees anywhere in the world. They place of course a very heavy burden on the limited resources of the host country. The European Community and its Member States have made a significant contribution to international relief efforts and will continue to provide that assistance for as long as it is necessary.

The Twelve wish to pay tribute to the hospitality and generous assistance provided to the refugees by the Government of Pakistan, to their fortitude in the face of increasing violations of their international border, and to the assistance provided by other countries through the relevant international relief organizations. But, Mr President, this can never be more than a temporary palliative. The refugees want to go home. The Twelve urge the Soviet Union to respect the will of the General Assembly to comply with its resolutions, and to create the conditions which will allow them to do so in peace and in safety. This will above all necessitate the immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops from Afghanistan.

The Twelve have read with interest the report presented to the General Assembly by the Secretary-General on 18 September. They welcome the assurance that those involved in the negotiating process at Geneva are now actively engaged in the consideration of practical measures to resolve the problems which remain to be addressed before a solution can be reached.

Mr President, the Twelve favour any proposals put forward for a political solution to the problems of Afghanistan to the extent that those proposals are based on the principles of United Nations resolutions. We shall continue to support the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Personal Representative, Mr Diego Cordovez. We hope that it will be possible to reach agreement on the outstanding issues. As the

Secretary-General has said in his report, political will is of the essence if a solution is to be reached; the international community expects that that will be forthcoming in the months ahead. An agreed timetable for the rapid withdrawal of all Soviet troops is of crucial importance. The Twelve regret the continued wide gap in positions, reported by the Secretary-General. Mr President, as long as there is no progress in that area, which is the key element to any solution, the Soviet Union will not have made the necessary contribution which will allow the Secretary-General's efforts to succeed.

The continuing occupation of Afghanistan is a threat to the stability of the region and a constant danger to international peace and security. This debate is a reminder of the importance the international community continues to attach to the question of Afghanistan; we cannot allow the present situation to be accepted as a *fait accompli*. The Twelve are confident that the General Assembly will once again confirm by its vote on this issue the importance it attaches to a genuine solution to the problems that Afghanistan faces. As my Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe said on 23 September, the success of the Secretary-General's efforts – and soon – can prevent further suffering. Mr President, consistent with their stand against aggression and foreign occupation the Twelve look to the Soviet Union to demonstrate their commitment to international peace and security. The Soviet Union must comply with the successive UN resolutions on the situation in Afghanistan and their obligations under the Charter. They must withdraw all their troops from Afghanistan.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/41/PV.56, item 23.

### **86/341. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Conventional Disarmament<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 4 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Cromartie:* On behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community, I wish to make some comments on the issue of conventional disarmament. This is a subject in which the Twelve take an active interest, especially since it is of particular importance to Europe.

The Twelve have been heartened by the increased emphasis placed by Member States on the need to achieve worthwhile and verifiable measures of conventional arms limitation and disarmament. We note with interest the number of statements made on the subject by a range of countries, as well as the draft resolutions put forward by others than Member States of the Twelve, including those in documents A/C.1/41/L.29 and A/C.1/41/L.66 by China and Peru respectively, which we are studying carefully and positively.

Nuclear arms reductions and disarmament remain one of the highest priorities for the Twelve. None the less, conventional weapons have been used, and continue to be used, in many parts of the world. Since 1945, the world has seen more than 150 conflicts in which terrible destruction and massive casualties amounting to tens of millions of lives have been visited on countries throughout the world. The Twelve recognize that there is a fundamental difference in character between nuclear and conventional weapons. However, in view of the millions of families bereaved by the use of conventional weapons, conventional arms control and disarmament is undoubtedly a subject ripe for consideration by the United Nations, and the First Committee in particular.

In addition, it is expenditure on conventional weapons that constitutes the overwhelming majority of the world's huge military budget. Nearly 90% of all military spending goes on conventional armaments and forces. If major savings are to result from disarmament, they will come primarily from the reduction of the massive arsenals of conventional weapons which currently exist and are constantly being added to. All the States of the world, not merely the major powers, have to become involved in the process of conventional disarmament to release the sums needed to make a major impact on the world's social and economic problems.

The Twelve therefore believe firmly that the process of arms control and disarmament must apply in the conventional as well as the nuclear field. Both processes could contribute to reducing the risk of war, including the danger of conventional conflict escalating into a nuclear one.

As I noted at the start, conventional disarmament is particularly important for Europe. The largest concentration of weapons and forces in the world is in Europe. Accordingly, there is also a pressing need to achieve balance at the lowest possible level of forces. At the same time confidence must be instilled that reductions in one field will not be undermined by imbalances in another or increases elsewhere. In our view, progress to achieve verifiable conventional arms control agreements – whether in central Europe, in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, in other regions of the world, or in a global context – is crucial.

The agreement reached at the Stockholm Conference in September was a significant step in the direction the Twelve believe that the process in Europe should move. The Twelve will seek to build on this agreement both in the field of arms control and more widely in the CSCE process. In the latter context, those of the Twelve who participate in the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction talks in Vienna hope that it will now be possible to make rapid progress there, on the basis of the proposal of December 1985 with which they are associated.

We support the draft resolution on this subject in document A/C.1/41/L.27 which has been brought by several Member States of the Twelve.

The Twelve welcomed the recent report by the Secretary-General concerning the study on conventional disarmament which resulted from an initiative by one of its Member States. The study contains a useful analysis of the current conventional arms race and made a number of worthwhile proposals on how steps should be taken to curb and eventually halt this. The Twelve believe that the time is now ripe for the UN to begin to study these recommendations in depth in an attempt to identify which of them may be most suitable for implementation.

The Twelve also consider that it would be most valuable for the Disarmament Commission to begin examination of the whole topic of conventional disarmament, with a view to identifying measures on which a consensus exists for tackling the problem of the conventional arms race. We therefore support the draft resolution in document A/C.1/41/L.17 brought by a Member State of the Twelve.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.1/41/PV.32, items 60[B] and [C].

## **86/342. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Disarmament and Development<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 4 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Cromartie:* I wish on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community to speak to agenda item 6[5] concerning the relationship between disarmament and development.

The Twelve share the concern of the international community expressed by many speakers in the general debate at the high level of military expenditure in the world. This level of expenditure places a heavy burden on all States and is difficult to reconcile with the unacceptable conditions in which a significant proportion of the population of the globe now lives, particularly in the developing countries. Our concern on this point is one of the reasons why we favour early negotiation of balanced and verifiable arms limitation and disarmament measures.

Mr Chairman, there is a growing awareness that the relationship between disarmament and development is not as straightforward as it might once have appeared; that the question of security emerges as a central feature in any detailed analysis of that relationship. Decisions to increase or reduce military expenditure remain tied to issues of international and regional security, a point which, of course, applies equally to developing and developed countries.

The Twelve warmly welcomed the decision to hold an international conference, which we now expect to take place in 1987, to consider the whole question of the relationship between disarmament and development in all its aspects. This Conference is being held at the initiative of a Member State of the Twelve. We very much hope that participation in the Conference will be universal. The Twelve also hope that further detailed preparatory work would be done before the Conference meets in order to complement what has been done already and to make for a well-ordered and substantive discussion there. More important, this would make the Conference a successful manifestation of international cooperation. Member States of the Twelve have participated actively in the preparatory committee for the Conference and will continue to work for a successful outcome.

Mr Chairman, we should all promote the transfer of resources released through arms control and disarmament measures for economic and social development, but disarmament measures will not automatically lead to savings, particularly in the short term. The Conference should address the question of reducing the levels of armaments and military expenditure generally. This goal can be achieved not only through disarmament agreements, but also by other means such as regional and sub-regional security arrangements, economic cooperation and integration, and confidence- and security-building agreements, as reflected *inter alia* in the Lomé Declaration of 16 August 1985.

Mr Chairman, clearly the above process of transfer of resources cannot be allowed to act as a brake on either disarmament or development. Equally, failure to achieve disarmament cannot of itself justify a low level of assistance on the part of States with large military budgets. Thus lack of progress in the disarmament process can in no way justify not living up to internationally agreed commitments in the development field. The Twelve believe that any evaluation of the impact of global arms expenditure must start from a reliable data base. The need for transparency and reliable data is both apparent in the disarmament and development field. We hope the forthcoming conference will also consider this issue.

Mr Chairman, the task of the conference will not be an easy one and the process of which it marks the beginning is likely to be lengthy. But the Twelve are determined to work together with other participants to make the conference a success and to produce an outcome worthy of the ideals which inspire it.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.1/41/PV.32, item 65.

### **86/343. Opening Statement for the CSCE Vienna Follow-up Meeting**

Date of Issue: 4 November 1986

Place of Issue: Vienna, Austria

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Sir Geoffrey Howe:* Mr Chairman, we are fortunate that Austria and the Austrian people have again thrown open their capital city to a major international meeting. In the months to come, Vienna can call itself the living heart of Europe in more than a geographical sense. Its task will be to illuminate Europe's present and help shape Europe's future, as it has helped to shape and embellish Europe's past. We are glad to have the honour and pleasure of working in such inspiring surroundings. We shall be reminded daily of the contribution which Austria herself, and other neutral and non-aligned countries, have made to confidence, security and cooperation in Europe as a whole.

On the tenth Anniversary of CSCE last year I spoke of the Helsinki Final Act as a European idea, 'a standard we in Britain are eager to proclaim'. Today I speak not just for Britain but for the European Community and its twelve Member States. In this context I should remind you that Member States have conferred powers to the European Community in a number of areas. The Community is taking part in this conference on that basis. In this Presidency capacity I want to focus on two questions that concern all countries here represented. What have the Twelve to contribute at Vienna? And what has this Vienna Meeting to offer Europe, and the world?

CSCE is about Europe. It approaches the problems of Europe in a uniquely comprehensive way. It has a unique part to play in overcoming the divisions that burden our continent. Yet, paradoxically, it is also

in CSCE that we are often most conscious of those divisions: because it is here that we came face to face with them and hope that we must pursue the remedies they demand.

Our aim is to reduce tension and the risk of conflict; to release new forces for cooperation; and to respect both national and individual rights. The twelve Member States of the European Community have a wealth of experience to contribute to these tasks. Our founding fathers set out after 1945 on an ambitious path to build stability and trust among the nations in Western Europe, who had fought countless wars in preceding centuries. The growth of mutual trust has allowed us to conduct our relations in peace; to break down barriers between peoples; and to increase our prosperity beyond the dreams of those founding fathers.

We have mastered many of the tasks we set ourselves. We have not done so alone but in cooperation with other free nations. The methods we chose will not be appropriate everywhere. But we have a special interest in seeing that all Europeans, and all States involved in Europe, share the benefits of peace and prosperity we have built for ourselves. We work for that in several ways. By our rich and varied national contacts – and our agreements as a Community – with other individual States in both East and West. By our attachment to the principles of democracy, compliance with the rule of law and respect for human rights. And by our efforts to make our own contribution to the preservation of peace and security in an ever more practical and more united form. The Single European Act, signed earlier this year, gave a treaty base for the first time to European cooperation in the field of foreign policy. This was a historic step. The Twelve will operate fully in its spirit at Vienna.

What should the Vienna Meeting be trying to achieve? Unlike some previous meetings, it takes place at a time when high level contacts give sign of promise; when consultations amongst our countries take place in many fields, when there are prospects for real progress in arms control negotiations. Mature reflection has shown that the recent meeting between President Reagan and Mr Gorbachev in Reykjavik was a significant, and valuable, exercise in exploration. Exploration of ways forward towards balanced and verifiable agreements on arms reductions. We hope that the two sides will follow up these new possibilities with energy and vision and make progress. Progress not only in the field of security, but also in respect for human rights and in regional issues. We hope too that the willingness of the Soviet Union to address humanitarian issues in Reykjavik will be reflected at this meeting. In the same way the recent Stockholm Agreement – a first success for the long, patient task of building confidence begun at Helsinki – is a good omen for further steps along this path at Vienna and beyond.

But this Vienna Meeting is different from the Stockholm Meeting: more than a negotiation about military confidence- and security-building measures. At Stockholm we set out to improve security, to prevent war. In CSCE we aim to do more: we aim to improve the quality of life for all Europeans. To serve that noble goal, our work here must respect the special dictates and disciplines flowing from the unique nature of the CSCE. Let me dwell on three basic tenets which the Twelve would hope to see guiding the work of the Conference.

First, the all-embracing nature of the CSCE process. Security cannot be divorced from the political, economic and human aspects of relations between States. Confidence and trust, essential to effective measures of arms control and disarmament, cannot mature in a Europe in which, in some countries, the rights of ordinary people are ignored. Confidence is indivisible. That is why, as Principle VII of the Final Act reminds us, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms is an essential ingredient of peace. The Twelve intend to do justice to all aspects of the CSCE process and maintain a proper balance between them.

Second, the concrete nature of the process. Helsinki commitments are specific. They belong to real life. The words in which they are expressed must not become a high-flown fiction. This entails ensuring that each level of the Helsinki edifice is solid when building another. We must check what has been done and is being done to realize the process before devising ambitious plans for the future. Ralph Waldo Emerson said: 'We are always getting ready to live but never living'. The people of Europe want to live now. They wish – they have the right – to see their governments' commitments honoured.

The third tenet is the human one: politics and the Helsinki process are about people. CSCE must do something for ordinary people. It must fulfil what it promises. It must give people enough information to enable them to know and act upon their rights. It must respect what Montaigne called their most

universal quality – their diversity. Only in this way can all Europeans become conscious of being Europeans: understand their European neighbours better; through contact and interchange achieve better lives for themselves; and contribute to a better world.

Frankness and free access to information are the only firm foundation for the CSCE edifice. Knowledge is the best antidote to tension. I have said before that truth is not always welcome, but it can never be the enemy of better understanding. That is why we welcome the provision of information that will take place under the Stockholm Agreement. Why we welcome the increasing emphasis on openness which we have heard from certain Eastern European countries in recent months, including in a recent statement by individuals from a number of countries in the region. We should apply this lesson to all parts of the CSCE process, from the provision of better economic statistics to the freer circulation of books and newspapers.

How should we apply these guiding tenets at Vienna so as to restore vitality to the CSCE process? Only by honest and rigorous assessment of compliance with the Helsinki documents. The Twelve will be guided throughout this Meeting by the desire to see all the principles of the Final Act and Madrid Concluding Document respected and their provisions fully implemented. The distinguished representative of the Soviet Union said at the opening of the Madrid Meeting: 'Life is nothing other than movement forward'. I agree. But forward movement does not mean merely adding paper on paper, provision upon provision. It means adopting measures which give better effect to existing commitments: it means improved practices and more open procedures.

As of now, too many commitments are honoured in the breach. We have held meetings about improving human rights and human contacts, which have sadly illuminated a bleak human landscape. A landscape in which families remain divided. Individuals who do not conform are brought ruthlessly to heel. Religious believers are harassed. Would-be emigrants of German, Jewish and other ethnic origins are denied the fundamental right – laid down in legally binding international instruments – to leave the country in which they find themselves. Members of groups established purely to monitor implementation of the commitments freely entered into by their governments have been persecuted. We salute those, like Andrei Sakharov, who keep alight the flame of the human spirit. And we remember too those whose names are not well known but whose lot is one of daily harassment, labour camp, exile or prison. While these things are so, it will remain impossible to establish full confidence between our States.

Basket I of the Helsinki Final Act defined a code of conduct to govern relations between States. This code is embodied in ten Principles, which must be respected in letter and spirit. In the absence of such respect our countries will be unable to live in harmony, and our citizens unable to achieve full dignity as human beings.

Security cannot exist where distrust and suspicion reign. The Stockholm Conference has taken an important step towards the creation of greater confidence, with measures of openness about the nature and purposes of military activity. Provided – and this is critical – the Stockholm measures are implemented fully, confidence will grow. But failure to implement them or any attempt to apply them selectively or restrictively, will undermine confidence, not add to it. A historic responsibility therefore lies on each of our 35 States.

We must not be complacent about what we have achieved. There is more – much more – that can be done. We must consider how best to achieve still greater transparency about military acts and intentions in Europe: by providing more detailed information about military dispositions and activities; by accepting military observers more readily on each others territory; by ensuring that no military activity can be a source of misunderstanding. Thus improving existing confidence- and security-building measures must remain one of our aims. But this does not preclude proceeding towards more ambitious measures in order further to strengthen stability and security in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. Increased openness and the establishment of a comprehensive and stable balance of conventional forces at the lowest possible level is an objective for all of the Twelve. We believe that the achievement of Stockholm on the path opened up by the Madrid mandate, should give an impetus to the process of creating greater confidence and security. We hope others share this aim.

In Basket II the European Community see economic cooperation as an essential element of the CSCE process. We will contribute effectively to strengthening this cooperation at the Vienna Meeting, in the

Economic Commission for Europe; and through the process of normalizing relations between the Community and CMEA member States. The economic field also has its 'human dimension'. We need to see improvements in the facilities available to businessmen, greater opportunities for Western businessmen to meet customers in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. We look forward to considering at this meeting signs of changes in the foreign trade practices of the Soviet Union which may serve this end. There is above all a need for more readily available and usable economic and commercial information. Greater openness in these matters would serve an immensely practical end. It is openness and rapid diffusion of information that have helped to generate the West's dynamic economic and technological development.

We are also ready at Vienna to consider new prospects for cooperation, for example, over alternative sources of energy and environmental questions. In doing so, we should respect the work of other international bodies. We should give it the necessary support where it is needed, but where it is productive, beware of duplicating or cutting across it. As the Chernobyl disaster has taught us, there is no room for a parochial attitude in these questions. The Roman poet, Horace said 'For it is your business when the wall next door catches fire'. The IAEA here in Vienna, in a remarkable display of international cooperation, has grasped the implications of Chernobyl. It is now pushing forward towards a safer Europe in which nuclear power will serve to the benefit of our peoples.

The Final Act's Mediterranean dimension was the subject of a seminar in Venice in October 1984. The European Community, from its inception, has attached great importance to its links with the Mediterranean countries. They have become increasingly close to almost all of them. Through the CSCE, we should be able to develop more extensive links between all the participating States and other Mediterranean countries.

It is Basket III that best represents the hopes of ordinary people for practical progress. When the governments of 35 States signed the Helsinki Accords on behalf of their people, they set an example to the world. By establishing standards which were common to all, which would benefit ordinary people in all 35 countries and bring them closer together. These standards are happily respected in most of our countries. In a few countries the results have, however, been lamentable. Modern technology makes it possible for technical links between newspapers, radio and television to bring our peoples closer than ever to each other. Broadcasts should be encouraged, not jammed. Books, magazines, poems and music should be circulated, not suppressed. Typewriters and photocopiers should be made more widely available, not confiscated. That would lead to a better understanding between our countries. That would be a response worthy of the spirit of Helsinki.

One part of Europe has developed the most comprehensive international judicial system ever seen for upholding the rights of ordinary people. In another part the basic standards of the Helsinki Accords are all too often not met. These standards are not double standards. We in the Twelve expect those other countries who publicly joined us in subscribing to them to respect them.

In Vienna we will take up the questions discussed at the valuable meetings held in Ottawa, Budapest and Berne. We shall work to remove restrictions on travel, to reunify families, to achieve a genuine freedom of emigration. And we shall re-examine the Helsinki proposals on culture, education, science and information (where we will have proposals to make). These are all areas which give scope for improving life and enhancing freedom for all people in Europe.

In Helsinki last year I said that the Final Act had lit a beacon. That beacon continues to shine. It is a sign to all the people of Europe that there is a way to overcome the political division which has disfigured this continent for decades. It is a symbol of hope.

But it is governments which have the responsibility for bringing that hope to fulfilment. Governments alone can assure their citizens the unimpaired enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Governments alone can establish the framework for mutual confidence – and therefore the mutual security which allows the people to live their lives in peace and prosperity.

The Twelve recognize these responsibilities and respect the spirit of Helsinki. Our citizens have the right to travel freely and to do so in unprecedented numbers. Our firms invest freely. Our newspapers, books and magazines circulate freely. Our peoples' rights are assured.

The Twelve believe that the Final Act can be a force for good and a force for change in European and East-West relations. If all 35 countries who signed the Final Act implemented its principles the political atmosphere would be transformed, and not only in Europe. Mutual mistrust would give way to mutual confidence. Uncertainty and insecurity would give way to security. Anxiety would give way to optimism.

We are realists. These results will not be achieved overnight. But we are also hopeful. This meeting at Vienna represents an opportunity not just to talk but to get results. Make no mistake, the enterprise is a great one. It is to build a Europe of which our children can be proud. A secure and prosperous Europe in which there is more openness; more contact; more exchange – the expression in freedom of the human spirit.

**86/344. Question No 1364/86 by Mr Beyer de Ryke (LDR-B)  
Concerning the USSR's Diplomatic and Trade Offensive in the South Pacific**

Date of Issue: 4 November 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency (on behalf of the Foreign Ministers and the Council)

Status of Document: Answer to written Parliamentary Question

The announcement made at the beginning of July that diplomatic relations are to be established between Vanuatu (formally the Franco-British New Hebrides) and the USSR throws some light on developments in the independent States of the South Pacific.

The USSR is holding talks on cooperation on technical matters and fisheries with some of these States including Vanuatu and also Fiji.

What policy does the Council intend to adopt, in what is a highly sensitive area for the balance of geopolitical forces, in response to the USSR's diplomatic and trade offensive, particularly as regards granting aid for tourism and fisheries to the South Pacific States (Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Western Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu)?

*Answer:*

The Council would point out that the aid granted by the Community within the framework of the Lomé Convention to the ACP States – which include all the States mentioned by the Honourable Member with the exception of Nauru and the Cook Islands – is not influenced by consideration other than the achievement of the objectives laid down by the Convention and the development of the ACP States.

It is for the ACP States freely to determine the principles, strategies and development models for their economy and society. The operations financed by the Community fit in with the objectives and priorities set by those countries both at national and regional level.

With particular reference to the fields mentioned by the Honourable Member, the Council would point out that in the past the Community has already assisted the ACP States in the South Pacific in the development of their natural resources, among which fisheries predominate, and in the promotion of tourism. Since Lomé I, the Community has financed research programmes in the field of marine resources. A regional programme funded by the 5th European Development Fund has recently been launched to develop tourism in the Pacific.

These two sectors are moreover included in the priorities selected in the programming of aid to be provided by the Community to the ACP States in the Pacific, in the context of regional cooperation under Lomé III.

(The question of a possible diplomatic offensive by the USSR in the South Pacific has not been discussed in the framework of European Political Cooperation.)<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Addition of this paragraph was requested by the Political Cooperation bodies.



## 86/345. Statement in the Special Political Committee of the UN General Assembly on Questions Relating to Information<sup>1</sup>

Date of Issue: 5 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Mortimer:* Mr Chairman, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community.

Mr Chairman, the Twelve take great pleasure in participating once again in the Special Political Committee's annual debate on information. We do so because freedom of thought, opinion and expression as well as the free flow of information and ideas are cherished values that underpin the fabric of our societies. They are also basic human rights, corner-stones of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. To put it more simply, we regard freedom of information as of fundamental importance: and by freedom of information we mean ensuring that individuals have access to information from a multiplicity of sources, including those beyond their national frontiers. We mean such practical things as the ability to obtain newspapers of all shades of political opinion published elsewhere, to tune into a radio or television programme of choice, the freedom to publish a political pamphlet.

Mr Chairman, the Twelve believe that the best defence of these basic rights lies in a well-informed and critical audience. This in turn depends upon diversity and choice of sources of information. We believe that mutual understanding is advanced by more communication, not less. The notion that communication can somehow be made subservient to the political, social and cultural policies of government is alien to us. For in a free society the media are not simply another instrument of government. They are there to inform, to monitor government activities, to reflect public opinion and freely to criticize.

It is against this background, Mr Chairman, that the Twelve view the work of the United Nations in the field of information, including in particular its efforts to promote a new world information and communication order seen as an evolving and continuous process. The Twelve see this process as aimed at improving and facilitating the international flow of information in such a way that the existing imbalances in international communication resources, which we recognize mainly affects developing countries, are corrected. Naturally, we wish this process to take place without involving any diminution of those basic freedoms to which I referred earlier. That would only work against the end results we all seek.

Mr Chairman, the Twelve recognize the legitimate concern of all countries, but especially of the developing countries, at trivialization and distortion. It is aggravating when, as so often seems to be the case, bad news makes the headlines while good news is ignored. But we are not in favour of proposals which would lead to restrictions, less access to information, under the guise of greater fairness or the imposition of censorship. We believe that free circulation of information is part and parcel of the democratic process and serves the cause of international peace. There is no contradiction, but rather complementarity between freedom of information, the existence of ethical standards freely arrived at by the professions concerned and the right of each community – in the first place each national community – to express and preserve its own language and culture.

Mr Chairman, the Twelve recognize the links that exist between levels of economic development and access to sources of information. The Twelve stand ready to consider what further practical steps might be necessary to correct the imbalance in international organs in the developmental field that can do much to enhance the public image of the UN. The Twelve strongly support the continued publication of 'Development Forum' and call on all UN specialized agencies to contribute financially towards it. On the social side, the Twelve believe that the Department of Public Information (DPI) should attach particular importance to promoting awareness of human rights issues, bearing in mind their frequent violation in many areas of the world.

But successful information policy, Mr Chairman, is not merely a question of selecting the right issues. Just as important is adherence to the highest standards in terms of the quality of output, impartiality and

the need to reflect objectively all points of view. Nor can we afford to overlook the cost of UN information work, especially against the background of the current financial crisis facing the United Nations. The need to improve the accountability of the UN system in the field of information and communications is now more important than ever.

Self-evidently, the United Nations, like any organization, is not blessed with unlimited funds. It must, therefore, take a hard look at its spreading priorities before directing scarce resources to where they are most needed. Above all waste and duplication must be avoided. Those responsible for the administration of UN information output should work for the containment and reduction of costs and to meet new programmes from within existing resources. We commend Under-Secretary-General Akashi for the reductions he has effected in this year's budget. This is a welcome step in the right direction. As part of this process the Twelve believe that a greater emphasis needs to be placed on the evaluation and follow-up of the Department's activities as well as on rationalization and consolidation of information work both in New York and in UN information centres. We are pleased with the efforts that have already been made in these areas. But more needs to be done. The Twelve note that the Group of Eighteen made a number of recommendations on information work in their report currently before the General Assembly.

Turning now to the report of the Committee of Information, the Twelve were deeply disappointed at the Committee's failure, for the second year running, to agree on a set of recommendations acceptable to all. The Twelve have never harboured any illusions about the difficulties involved in drawing up recommendations of the information field that reflect all shades of political opinion. But they particularly regretted the decision to vote this year on one of three sets of recommendations that had been tabled for discussion in the Committee. Short of combining those three sets of recommendations into one – and strenuous efforts were made to do just that – the most sensible course would have been to take no action but merely to append all three as an annex to the Committee's report. The fact that the Committee chose to do otherwise will have done nothing to improve the chances of consensus in the Committee. Rather it will have further eroded the spirit of cooperation that is so essential if mutual understanding in the information field is to increase.

Mr Chairman, the Twelve believe that real progress could so easily be secured if we would only concentrate our efforts on practical and productive work of benefit to all. Unfortunately, however, the Committee has, in recent years, chosen instead to focus on the one issue on which its membership is most divided, namely the difficult question of a new world information and communication order. This has led to unhelpful and sometimes polemical debate which has neither contributed to an effective UN information policy nor enhanced the image of the UN. This is all the more difficult to understand since the debate in UNESCO, which retains the central role on this issue, has taken a more practical turn and has largely set aside the divisive rhetoric of the past. The important consensus language defining a new world information and communication order as an 'evolving and continuous process' has in fact been agreed by the member States of UNESCO. Yet the Committee on Information has declined to endorse this language, with the result that much time and energy is expended on fruitless discussion that not only fails to bring about any practical results but also leads to growing tensions within the Committee.

The Twelve believe that it is time to set aside the conceptual debate of a new world information and communication order so as to remove what has become the major stumbling block to practical work with regard to DPI policy and activities. And we feel that the best way to do this is to bring the mandate of the Committee on Information into line with the consensus language agreed at UNESCO.

But the NWICO debate, Mr Chairman, is not the only problem facing the Committee. The financial crisis facing the United Nations, to which I have already referred, makes it imperative that the Committee in its monitoring function of the Department of Public Information should ensure that the necessary steps are taken to streamline, rationalize and focus on consensus priority activities of the department in order to bring the DPI information activities into line with financial reality. The Twelve also believe that the practice of selectively introducing controversial political questions into the Committee should be avoided.

The Committee could also do much more to cut back on the inordinate number of recommendations it submits each year to the Special Political Committee. We believe that instead of simply producing a

shopping list of unrealistic demands the Committee should elaborate a set of guidelines aimed at rationalizing the Department of Public Information and facilitating the drawing up of an order of priorities. That would do much to lighten the work load of the Special Political Committee. It would also inject a new sense of purpose and direction into consideration of information questions at the United Nations. For everyone would I am sure agree, Mr Chairman, that the very essence of information and communication is that it should bring people together, not divide them.

Mr Chairman, the Twelve believe that the restoration of consensus is still possible. But it will require a renewed sense of commitment and the political will of all concerned to achieve it.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/SPC/41/PV.20, item 74.

### **86/346. Statement in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Importance of the Universal Realization of the Right of Peoples to Self-Determination and on the Use of Mercenaries<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 5 November 1987

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Ms Young:* Mr Chairman, I have asked for the floor on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community to make an explanation of vote on the draft resolution in document L.14/Rev.1 which is now before the Committee.

The Twelve condemn unequivocally the recruitment, use or financing of mercenaries, and we well understand the concerns which led to the submission of this proposal. The Twelve are nevertheless unable to support the text for reasons of both substance and principle.

We have listened carefully to the comments of the distinguished representative of Nigeria. Nevertheless we continue to regret that the co-sponsors of this text have ignored the fact that this question is regularly on the agenda of the Sixth Committee. At a time of financial crisis for our Organization, it is particularly regrettable that, so far from working to rationalize the Assembly's business, the co-sponsors should be duplicating it.

We also regret that the co-sponsors have moved away from the consensus language which has been achieved in past. In our view, this will seriously undermine the chances of maintaining consensus on this question in the Sixth Committee. Nor will it facilitate the drafting of an international convention on this question in the *Ad Hoc* Committee, work in which the Twelve are actively participating.

The Twelve have particular difficulties with preambular paragraph 4, which even in its revised form purports to define and characterize the word 'mercenary' when, not only is there no agreed definition of this term, but there is no general agreement that any such concept should form the basis of a convention.

In the continuing absence of even an agreed definition of a mercenary for the purposes of the draft Convention, the Twelve regard it as inappropriate that recommendations should be made to the Commission on Human Rights to appoint a Special Rapporteur on this question. But we have even more profound objections to those recommendations. The question of mercenaries is primarily a matter concerning relations between States, rather than a human rights issue.

It is a matter of considerable regret to the Twelve that the co-sponsors of this text have been so unwilling to listen to our concerns on this and other elements in the draft, and that the tradition in this Committee of wide consultation among all groups should again have been set aside. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.3/41/SR.36, item 88.

**86/347. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning Apartheid<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 6 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Sir John Thomson:* Mr President, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community.

The Twelve have repeatedly made clear their revulsion at apartheid. For years we have unequivocally condemned it in all its forms and manifestations, both here at the United Nations and in many other fora. We have demanded that it be abolished. We utterly reject a system which denies opportunity or liberty to one child yet gives ordinary rights and privileges to another, solely on the basis of his or her colour. Apartheid is an insult to the dignity of those it affects and a flagrant violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms set out in the United Nations Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to which we attach the highest importance. It is, in short, an institutionalized system of State racism, which deprives the majority of the people of South Africa of their civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights.

Apartheid has bred hatred and violence. Indeed violence is inherent in the system. The South African authorities have reacted ruthlessly to the efforts of the large majority of the population to secure the abolition of apartheid. They have introduced some reforms. But these changes have been too few and too slow to stem the surging tide of bitterness and bloodshed in the country. They have done nothing to address the root of the problem.

As a result, the last twelve months have seen a deepening of the cycle of violence and repression in South Africa. The state of emergency, which was reimposed this year over the whole of the country has worsened, not improved, the prospects for peaceful change. The Twelve are alarmed that the situation has deteriorated further. The state of emergency has led to the imprisonment of many thousands of people without trial and has brought much anguish and suffering to the homes of their families and loved ones. The Twelve share the wide-spread anxiety felt by the international community over reports of the conditions in which some detainees are being held and particularly of the use of torture. We once again condemn arbitrary mass arrests, forced resettlement, and the practice of detention without trial and call for the release of all people so detained under the state of emergency, which must be brought to an end.

Under the state of emergency the South African authorities have seriously curtailed press freedom so that it is now impossible to report the activities of the South African security forces without heavy penalties. The Twelve view this development with great concern. We urge the South African Government to lift these restrictions on the press without delay. Freedom of information is part and parcel of the democratic process. We consider it a principle of fundamental importance, both as a basic right and as a means of promoting mutual understanding.

The goal of the Twelve is, quite simply, the elimination of apartheid. Apartheid must be abolished. There is an urgent need for peaceful change through a genuine national dialogue, across lines of colour, politics and religion. Violence – which has affected the black population in particular – must not be allowed to carry the day. The Twelve call for the suspension of violence on all sides. Conditions must be created in which dialogue can begin and the necessary changes can be made. But such a dialogue is impossible while black leaders remain imprisoned or detained and anti-apartheid organizations proscribed. At their meeting in Brussels on 15-16 September the Foreign Ministers of the Twelve deplored the fact that the South African Government was not yet prepared to take the steps to make a genuine dialogue possible. The Twelve have repeatedly called on the South African Government to release unconditionally Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners and to lift the ban on the African National Congress, the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania and other political parties. In this context we deplore the decision of the South African authorities to declare the UDF an 'affected organization'. This retrograde step against a leading non-violent group is contrary to the goal of genuine national dialogue.

In September 1985 the Twelve agreed on a series of measures designed to impress on the South African Government the inescapable need for fundamental reform. These were:

- an embargo on the export of arms and para-military equipment to South Africa;
- an embargo on imports of arms and para-military equipment from South Africa;
- a refusal to cooperate in the military sphere;
- the cessation of exports of sensitive equipment to the South African police and armed forces;
- the prohibition of oil exports to South Africa;
- the recall of military attachés accredited to South Africa and a refusal to grant accreditation to military attachés from South Africa;
- the freezing of official contacts and agreements in sporting and security matters;
- prohibition of all new collaboration in the nuclear sector;
- the discouragement of scientific and cultural agreements except where they might contribute towards the ending of apartheid or have no role in supporting it.

In view of the deteriorating situation in South Africa the European Council meeting at The Hague in June this year decided to take additional action. As a part of this process, Heads of State and Government of the Twelve asked the British Foreign Secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe, to undertake a mission to Southern Africa. As he told the General Assembly on 23 September, he made two visits to the area in July. He sought to explain the policies of the Twelve to South Africa's neighbours and to impress on the South African Government our deep concern and the need for steps to encourage a peaceful negotiated solution to the country's problems.

In the absence of any progress in that direction the Twelve agreed at Brussels on 15-16 September to adopt a further package of restrictive measures on the lines envisaged at The Hague. This consists of bans on new investment and on the import of iron, steel and gold coins from South Africa. The Presidency will continue to seek consensus on a ban on the import of coal from South Africa on the basis of the statement made by the Hague European Council.

Coupled with these restrictive measures the Twelve and the Community have embarked on concerted programmes of positive action designed to help the victims of apartheid both individually and collectively. Political, trade union, management, cultural, scientific and sporting contacts with the non-white community are being stepped up. The Twelve are helping those arrested under the state of emergency and, together with the Community, are putting heavy emphasis on programmes of training and education for black South Africans. This July we announced new reporting guidelines for the Code of Conduct for Companies Having Branches, Offices or Representatives in South Africa. This code has been in operation since 1977. The new reporting format is designed to adapt and strengthen the provisions of the code in the light of developments since then. Greater emphasis has been given to the role of independent trade unions representing black African workers; and companies have been asked to pay greater attention to education, training, black career development and wider Community projects. The aim of the code is to make a practical contribution towards the abolition of apartheid and to promote substantial improvements in the living and working conditions of as large a number as possible of African workers.

The Twelve and the European Community are also providing substantial assistance to South Africa's neighbours. A major priority is the improvement of transport facilities in the region, a programme which is being carried out under the aegis of the Southern Africa Development Co-operation Conference. The SADCC countries also receive development assistance within the framework of the Third Lomé Convention and food assistance from the European Community. In the past few years they have received about \$ 1 billion a year of assistance of all sorts from the European Community and under programmes of bilateral cooperation with its Member States.

As Sir Geoffrey Howe said when speaking on behalf of the Twelve in the general debate on 23 September, time is short. The Twelve earnestly appeal to the South African Government to look to the future and to accept that fundamental change is inevitable. As a first step South Africa's leaders need to make the leap of imagination which will allow a real dialogue to take place. The longer it takes for sincere negotiation to begin the more difficult it will be to achieve change by peaceful means and to avoid a bloodbath, the consequences of which would be with us for many years.

The Twelve will spare no effort to influence South African to put an end to the intolerable system of apartheid and to establish without further delay a society with freedom and justice for all.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/41/PV.59, item 33.

### **86/348. Statement in the Fifth Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Report of the Committee on Contributions on the Scale of Assessment<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 7 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Upton:* Mr Chairman, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community.

The Twelve wish to thank the Committee on Contributions for its report now before us, and for the helpful introductory analysis given at the start of this debate by the Committee's distinguished Chairman Ambassador Amjad Ali. We congratulate him on reaching the milestone of 20 years' service in that onerous position.

Mr Chairman, a scale of assessments for the triennium 1986-88 was approved last year after the customary exhaustive debate. While the Committee's report this year should certainly receive due attention, the Twelve see this year's debate essentially as an opportunity for delegations to offer their reactions to the various suggestions made by the Committee on Contributions. It should not be necessary either to debate the issue at great length or to reach specific and detailed conclusions. In this spirit, the Twelve wish therefore to look forward and focus on a few of the points raised by the report before us. In doing so we have it much in mind that whatever may be decided on the UN scale of assessments will also have repercussions in many other organizations of the UN system.

Mr Chairman, it is relevant to note that on the present scale of assessments, the contributions of the twelve Member States of the European Community now account for 29.8% of the UN regular budget. Thus the European Community collectively is the largest contributor to the budget. We have for a long time had reservations about the way in which the scale of assessments is actually arrived at. Over the years the principle of capacity to pay has progressively been diverged from and diluted. While one discount factor or another may have superficial, temporary or local attractions, the Twelve wish to see a reversal of this trend away from the basic principle of capacity to pay, which, calculated as simply and as objectively as possible, remains the most appropriate basis for sharing out the cost of running the UN.

Mr Chairman, we doubt that many delegations in this room would be prepared to admit to complete satisfaction with either the present methodology for the scale, or with its results. Our objective should be to agree on a durable methodology which is more widely perceived to produce results which are fair, reasonable and which reflect economic reality. Mr Chairman, the present methodology is the result of an accumulation over the years of guidelines and instructions which were intended less to improve technical accuracy and objectivity than to serve the short-term interests of one or another member State or group of States. And we have all of us played a part in this, thereby eroding the authority of the Committee on Contributions. None of us of course can overlook our national interest: but is it really in anyone's national interest for the Fifth Committee to engage annually in an unedifying wrangle over the details of the methodology to be used for sharing out the cost of the UN budget?

Turning to the alternatives suggested in the 1986 report of the Committee on Contributions, Mr Chairman, the Twelve are doubtful that the alternative of assessment by Groups (No 1 in the report) would offer much prospect of improving on the present arrangements. Would it not serve first to polarize opinion in the Fifth Committee, as each of the three Groups identified sought to ensure that it carried as little of the total burden as possible? Might it not lead also to equally difficult regional discussions over the internal distribution of each Group's burden? It is our understanding that the methodology for

arriving at the approximate Group share would be similar to the present. After that process, it is plain that political considerations would determine the final dimensions of the Group shares. We cannot see much that is appealing in this proposal.

Alternative No 2 in the Committee's report would base the scale of assessments on three factors – permanent membership of the Security Council, sovereign equality, and capacity to pay. This alternative represents a qualification of the principle of the capacity to pay, on the basis of considerations other than the technical and economic. We do not consider it as practicable. The same applies to alternative No 3, which proposes what amounts to a membership fee for *all* members of the Security Council.

Alternative No 4 introduces the concept of the two-part budget, the core and non-core parts, each financed in a different way. This alternative, which has a number of interesting aspects, would also represent a move away from the principle of capacity to pay – although we note the Committee's observation that that principle might be retained in some form for the core portion. We would in any case foresee substantial difficulties in reaching agreement on what was a core activity and what was non-core.

The Twelve are grateful to the Committee on Contributions for their continuing efforts to establish a more uniform data base. If we are objectively to compare the capacities to pay of 159 member States, we must have statistics as comparable as possible. Unilateral revision of data used by the Committee or by the Statistical Office gives cause for concern, as does the use of exchange rates whose relationship to the economic realities is questionable. We regret that progress on the international project for the comparison of purchasing power has apparently almost ceased. None the less we encourage the Committee to continue their researches into the admittedly complex area of statistical comparability.

Finally, Mr Chairman, we reiterate our appreciation to the Committee on Contributions for their efforts to achieve the elusive but important goal of a fair, equitable and universally acceptable scale of assessments.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.5/41/SR.22, item 116.

## **86/349. Explanation of Vote at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly on the Resolutions Concerning Apartheid**

Date of Issue: 10 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

The twelve Member States of the European Community have made clear during this debate their utter revulsion at apartheid. We have repeatedly and unequivocally condemned it many times, both here at the United Nations and in many other forums. There should be no doubt about our objective which is quite simply, the eradication of this pernicious system. We therefore regret some of the wording of the report of the Special Committee Against Apartheid (A/41/22). There should be no doubt of our determination to contribute to the abolition of apartheid. The United Nations has a primary role to play in this endeavour.

Mr President, all the speakers in this debate have condemned the practice and principles of apartheid. This is something on which we can all agree. It seems to us that an effort should have been made to reflect this unanimity of view more faithfully in the draft resolutions which are before us today. Some of the draft resolutions also contain elements which have no bearing on the subject at hand.

The Twelve believe that the division of competence between the General Assembly and the Security Council laid down in the Charter must be respected. Only the Security Council is empowered to adopt decisions binding on member States. It is regrettable, therefore, that, as in previous years, some of the draft resolutions stray into this area of competence.

On this occasion we wish to reaffirm once again our commitment to the principle of universality of membership of the United Nations. The universal character of the specialized agencies and the provisions of their rules of procedure must also be respected. Similarly we cannot support calls for the

total isolation of South Africa since this would not in our view further the goal we all share – the abolition of apartheid. Channels of communication with South Africa must remain open in order to enable the outside world to maintain and increase its pressure on the South African Government, for the establishment of a free and democratic society without racial oppression.

As we said in our statement in the debate[.] the last twelve months have seen a deepening of the cycle of violence and repression in South Africa. We remain convinced, however, that a process of peaceful change is still possible and that the United Nations has the obligation to promote change by peaceful means in accordance with the Charter. Although we share the frustration felt by the majority of the people of South Africa at their predicament we cannot agree that resolutions adopted by the General Assembly should endorse the use of force.

The Twelve reject all forms of apartheid in sports. Sports activities are, however, organized in our respective countries at private initiative. Sports organizations within our countries are aware of the opposition of their governments to sports competitions that violate the olympic ideal of non-discrimination. We continue firmly to discourage all sporting contacts that have any implication of racial discrimination as an indication of our respect for the fundamental rights of the people of South Africa.

The Twelve reject all arbitrary, selective and unjustified attacks, whether by name or implicitly, on member States or groups of countries.

Finally, I should like to express our concern at the financial implications of some of the draft resolutions before us today. We should not engage in new commitments lightly, particularly when, as the Secretary-General's annual report makes clear, the United Nations is facing the worst financial crisis in its history. As with any new expenditure in the current circumstances the position will need to be reviewed in the light of resource availability when a clearer picture of the financial situation is available.

Mr President, we regret that, for the reasons I have just stated, we will not be able to vote in favour of all the draft resolutions before us today. I should like, however to repeat our commitment to act both collectively and individually to impress on the South African Government the inescapable need for fundamental reform. The South African Government must be brought to see that the only way forward lies in the abolition of apartheid and the introduction of the basic changes demanded by the international community.

### **86/350. Explanation of Vote in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolution Concerning New Weapons of Mass Destruction<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 10 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Edis:* Mr Chairman, I am speaking now on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community in explanation of our joint vote on the draft resolution L.65, entitled 'Prohibition of the Development and Manufacture of New Weapons of Mass Destruction and New Systems of Such Weapons'.

The subject of new weapons of mass destruction has a long history. Member States of the Twelve took an active part in the consideration of the item in the 1970s, both in the General Assembly and the then CCD. When the subject was considered at that time no such prospective weapons were identified. The item remains on the agenda of the CD with general support, and is considered each year. This regular consideration has reached the same conclusion as in the 1970s, and that remains the situation to date. It therefore continues to be our view that there are at present no indications that new types of weapons of mass destruction are imminent.



The Twelve would naturally regard it as a most serious development if any new kind of weapons of mass destruction were to be invented and deployed. And we believe that the subject *should* continue to be kept under regular review. However, in present circumstances there seems to us no point in elaborate and unnecessary action by the CD, of the sort called for in the draft resolution.

In addition this year's draft resolution suggests in one of its preambular paragraphs an extension of the definition of new weapons of mass destruction which goes beyond that established by the United Nations in 1948, and subsequently endorsed in the Final Document of the First Special Session on Disarmament in 1978. The suggested formulation is also nebulous and imprecise. This therefore seems to us to be unhelpful and confusing, notably in detracting from the main considerations which have formed the basis of our examination of this issue hitherto.

For these reasons, the Twelve will abstain on the draft resolution L.65.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.1/41/PV.37, 38, item 57.

### 86/351. Press Statement on Terrorism

Date of Issue: 10 November 1986

Place of Issue: London

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Foreign Ministers

Status of Document: Press Statement

1. Following on from our discussion on 27 October of Syrian involvement in the Hindawi case<sup>1</sup>, we have all agreed that further joint action is essential to protect our citizens from any possible repetition of such acts of terrorism.

2. No one should be in any doubt about our unanimous condemnation of international terrorism and our resolve to curb terrorism in all its forms. We wish to send Syria the clearest possible message that what has happened is absolutely unacceptable.

3. We stand firmly by the commitments in previous statements and have therefore decided that the following additional action is required. In the present circumstances:

- i) we shall not authorize new arms sales to Syria;
- ii) we shall suspend high-level visits to or from Syria;
- iii) we shall each review the activities of Syrian diplomatic and consular missions accredited in our country and apply appropriate measures;
- iv) we shall each review and tighten security precautions surrounding the operations of Syrianair.

4. Our Embassies in Damascus were instructed to make representations to the Syrian authorities. The Syrian Government have delivered their reply. As far as the facts are concerned, this adds nothing to what was considered by the court which found Hindawi guilty, and to what the Embassies have presented to the Syrian authorities.

5. We shall continue to employ all the political means available to us in order to persuade the Syrian authorities to translate into concrete action their stated condemnation of international terrorism. In particular, we call on them to end all forms of support for those groups which have been clearly involved in terrorist acts and to deny them all facilities.

6. Our actions have a specific purpose. We look to the Syrian authorities for a constructive response. We have close and important links with all the countries of the Middle East which we remain determined to develop and strengthen. In this respect, we recall the proposals the Twelve have made to give a new impetus to the Euro-Arab dialogue, and the importance attached to this in the recent communication dated 6 November from the Secretary-General of the Arab League. We strongly reaffirm our commitment to contribute in every way we can to the search for just and lasting solutions to the region's problems.

7. We shall follow developments closely and shall remain in regular contact on all these issues within the framework of European political cooperation.

<sup>1</sup> Bull. EC 10-1986, point 2.4.4.

### **86/352. Statement on the Philippines**

Date of Issue: 10 November 1986  
Place of Issue: London  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Foreign Ministers  
Status of Document: Declaration

The Foreign Ministers of the Twelve welcomed the significant progress made by President Aquino and her Government towards restoring democratic institutions in the Philippines, notably the completion of work on a new draft constitution, and look forward to the national and local elections to be held in the Philippines in 1987. They emphasized their strong political support for President Aquino and her Government in their efforts to consolidate democracy in the Philippines, revive the economy and bring about national reconciliation. Ministers were confident that this process would continue.

### **86/353. Explanation of Vote in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolution Concerning the World Disarmament Campaign<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 11 November 1986  
Place of Issue: New York  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN  
Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Edis:* I wish to make a statement on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community on resolution L.16 on the World Disarmament Campaign.

The Twelve cannot support the resolution, operative paragraph 5 of which, as did its predecessor, talks of all member States being called on to ensure a flow of 'accurate information' and 'avoiding the dissemination of false and tendentious information'. Such a call for blatant censorship is unacceptable to all member States who share a democratic tradition of a deep-rooted belief in the right to freedom of speech. The Twelve cannot support the suppression of freedom of speech and ideas for which this draft resolution apparently calls.

We also view with concern the idea of involving children for political purposes, no matter how worthwhile these purposes may be.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.1/41/PV.39, item 61[C].

### **86/354. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning Namibia<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 12 November 1986  
Place of Issue: New York  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN  
Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Birch:* Mr President, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community. As you will recall we set out the position of the Twelve on the question of Namibia in our statement to the fourteenth Special Session on 18 September. There have, unfortunately, been no major developments since then. In consequence my remarks on this occasion need only be rather brief.

Mr President, it is the view of the Twelve that the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa must be brought to an end without delay. The only acceptable basis for a peaceful and lasting solution to the problem is the implementation, without preconditions or pretext, of Security Council Resolutions 385

(1976) and 435 (1978). The Settlement Plan endorsed by the second of these resolutions, has been accepted both by the Government of South Africa and by the South West African People's Organization. We firmly believe that the people of Namibia must be permitted to exercise their right to self-determination through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations in accordance with the Settlement Plan. It is essential that South Africa should not subordinate the implementation of the Settlement Plan to the fulfilment of conditions which are extraneous to the independence of the Territory, or inconsistent with Security Council Resolution 435 (1978).

Unfortunately the South African Government has not yet seen fit to move forward towards the implementation of the Settlement Plan. It has on the contrary, chosen to maintain its illegal occupation of Namibia in defiance of international opinion. We urge the South African authorities to reconsider their position and to implement the Settlement Plan without delay. We consider as null and void the establishment by South Africa in 1985 of a so-called 'interim government' in Namibia and we categorically reject any unilateral moves by the South African Government to transfer power in Namibia. There can be no question of circumventing the United Nations or of somehow excluding it from the settlement process.

It is a matter for great concern that over the last twelve months South Africa has continued its armed incursions into Namibia's neighbours, particularly Angola. These acts have taken place in defiance of international law and have created a grave danger to peace and security in the region. We once again repeat our strong condemnation of such activities and urge South Africa to desist from them.

We forcibly condemn the use of violence by South Africa either against neighbouring States or in the maintenance of its illegal presence in Namibia. These developments make even more necessary the maintenance of the general and primary duty of the United Nations to promote peaceful solutions in conformity with the Charter, thus avoiding any encouragement of the use of force.

Mr President, for many years strenuous efforts have been made by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, the front-line States, the South West African People's Organization, the Organization of African Unity and the Contact Group aimed at bringing about a just and peaceful solution to the Namibian question in accordance with Security Council Resolution 435 (1978). We have consistently supported these efforts. We hope that the Secretary-General will be successful in his endeavours to engage the parties in a renewed dialogue thus clearing the way for the early implementation of the Settlement Plan. For our part we will continue to press South Africa to abide by the clearly expressed decisions of the international community by withdrawing the constitutional arrangements put into effect in 1985 and by terminating her illegal occupation of Namibia. Only in this way will Namibians be allowed to exercise the right to self-determination and independence which is their due.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/41/PV.68, item 36.

**86/355. Explanation of Vote in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolution Concerning the Contribution of the Specialized Agencies and Other Organizations and Programmes of the United Nations to the Cause of Arms Limitation and Disarmament<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 12 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Edis:* Mr Chairman, I wish to make an explanation of vote on behalf of the Member States of the European Community. The Twelve will not be able to support this draft resolution. Indeed we question why such a resolution is necessary.

The draft, like similar resolutions on which it is based, ignores the procedures and priorities which have already been agreed upon for pursuing these questions within the United Nations system. Moreover,

the draft resolution cuts across discussions which have been taking place, and are expected to continue, in the Disarmament Commission on the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament on the initiative of a group of African countries.

The Twelve share the view, which has been endorsed by all Member States in a wide range of consensus documents, that the Department for Disarmament Affairs is responsible for coordinating disarmament activities within the United Nations system, including liaison with the relevant governmental and non-governmental organizations and other institutes and bodies.

The Twelve have emphasized on a number of occasions their belief that United Nations activities in this field should contribute to concrete measures of arms control and disarmament. Specific deliberative and negotiating bodies have been established within the United Nations system for this purpose.

Rather than encouraging the Specialized Agencies to engage in activities that are likely to detract from the important tasks for which they have been specifically mandated and which are frequently of particular benefit to developing countries, the General Assembly should in our view concentrate on ways of making maximum use of the United Nation's existing disarmament machinery.

For these reasons, Mr Chairman, the twelve Member States of the European Community will as I said not support draft resolution L.22.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.1/41/PV.42, item 60[A].

### **86/356. Statement in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Apparently Arbitrary 'Cost Saving' Measure of Restricting the Circulation of Certain Documents in the United Nations <sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 12 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

With your permission, Mr Chairman, I should like on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community to raise a point concerning not the cluster we have just heard introduced by the Assistant Secretary-General but the circulation of documents.

We have noted that, as a 'cost-saving measure', a number of reports properly submitted to this Assembly in accordance with resolutions of the Commission on Human Rights by Special Rapporteurs and Special Representatives of the Commission are not being circulated in full in the normal number of copies in all official languages of the United Nations. These important documents will thus be less accessible not only to the delegations of States members of this Organization, but also to the wider community.

No other reports submitted to this Assembly have been treated in this way. We wonder on what basis and on what authority the Secretariat made this apparently arbitrary decision.

The Twelve expect that this procedure will not be used again.

I should like this statement to be reflected in the summary records. Thank you Mr Chairman.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.3/41/SR.43.

### **86/357. Explanation of Vote in the First Committee Concerning Draft Resolution L.37/Rev.1 on the Reduction of Military Budgets <sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 12 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Edis:* Mr Chairman, on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community I should like to make some comments on draft resolution L.37 as revised, entitled 'Reduction of Military Budgets'.

We reaffirmed in the Twelve's statement on this subject on 31 October that all countries have a mutual interest in finding ways to reduce military expenditure, while maintaining undiminished security.

It is because of the priority which the Twelve attach to the search for such reductions that we have participated actively in work related to this at the United Nations – and I have in mind here in particular the work which has been accomplished at the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

It is gratifying to be able to note that at the 1986 session of the Commission it proved possible to make considerable headway on this question. Work remains to be done, however, and the progress made so far remains incomplete until the outstanding issues are fully resolved.

Therefore, Mr Chairman, the Twelve consider that we must not shy away from the final hurdle in front of us. Now is not the time for the United Nations Disarmament Commission to pause in its consideration of this issue. The Commission this year decided, in the light of the progress achieved, to recommend to the Assembly that discussion of the item at the Commission should be continued, and a fully agreed text reached. We consider that the Commission on which all Member States are represented should be firmly supported in this recommendation, which is found in paragraph 28 of document A/41/42.

For this reason the Twelve, in voting in favour of or joining the consensus of Resolution L.37/Rev.1 particularly welcome the recommendation contained in operative paragraph 4 and just introduced by the distinguished representative of Romania, that discussion of the item be continued at the 1987 session of the Disarmament Commission. And we look forward to the opportunity for further useful work there.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.1/41/PV.41, item 58.

## **86/358. Explanation of Vote in the Sixth Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Byelorussian Draft Resolution Concerning the Protection of Diplomats**

Date of Issue: 12 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community.

This item is concerned with consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives. We have in the past adopted one resolution on this item and we were not, therefore, enthusiastic when a second resolution (L.15), seemingly unconnected with the real business of this item, was tabled. We had in mind, amongst other things, the various exercises proceeding in the United Nations concerning the rationalization of our work, including the need to avoid adopting unnecessary resolutions and combining resolutions wherever possible. We would therefore have preferred to support a single resolution which would have contained a suitable preambular paragraph commemorating the 25th anniversary of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

We wish to take this opportunity to emphasize the importance we attach to the strict compliance by persons entitled to diplomatic and consular privileges and immunities with the laws and regulations of the receiving State and to draw attention again to the potential danger of abuses of such privileges and immunities. In the light of the adjustments which have been made to the draft resolution, to reflect these comments, the Twelve were prepared to concur in its adoption without a vote.

**86/359. Statement in the Special Political Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 13 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Status of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Source of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Birch:* Mr Chairman, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States to the European Community.

The Twelve have consistently attached, as a matter of principle, the greatest importance to all matters affecting the rights of the population of the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967. We regard respect for international law and human rights, which are of universal application, as essential for their own sake and for that of the population of the occupied territories. Their observance is required also in order to avoid aggravating tensions which can only have a negative effect on prospects for peace in the Middle East.

The Twelve have taken note of the latest report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, presented by its distinguished Chairman, Ambassador Wijewardane. We have also taken due note of the fact that the Government of Israel continues to deny its cooperation to the Special Committee, despite the request of the Secretary-General on behalf of the General Assembly. The report, therefore, in spite of the efforts made by the Committee to provide information which is as complete and objective as possible, is unable to present a complete picture of the situation. In these circumstances, we have consulted other sources of information and shall take due account also of the views expressed by Israel and by other delegations.

Mr Chairman, there can be no doubt that the provisions of the Fourth Hague Convention of 1907 and the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 are applicable to the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967. We are seriously concerned by the refusal of the occupying power to acknowledge this. Any change in the status and demographic structure of these territories, including the establishment of settlements, are illegal under international law. In this context we reaffirm the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, a principle of international law to which Resolution 242 of the Security Council also refers.

The Twelve therefore continue to be especially concerned at the Israeli practice and policy of creating settlements in the occupied territories, and the expanding of the settlements which have already been established. We take note with grave concern of recent statements by the Israeli Government advocating an intensification of this trend. We note, for example, the growth of the settler population of the West Bank by about 8 000 to 10 000 people in the past year, and that the drive to take over more land continues unabated. The presence of Israeli settlers in the occupied territories has led inevitably to friction with the local inhabitants, who justifiably oppose this policy which results in demographic changes illegal in international law and unacceptable to world public opinion.

We repeat our appeal to Israel to end this damaging and illegal policy in favour of the creation of the atmosphere of trust required for dialogue leading to an overall negotiated settlement.

We continue to be disturbed by reports of harassment and illegal acts committed by the settlers towards the Palestinian population, in spite of efforts made by the military authorities to curb them. We naturally deplore all acts of violence in the occupied territories, from whatever quarter they come. The cycle of violence thus created is unacceptable and gravely endangers the chances of peace in the region.

The Twelve also wish to express our strong concern at continuing reports of arbitrary acts by the Israeli occupation authorities. The measures reintroduced in August 1985 have recently again shown signs of being applied rigorously. Administrative detention is still practiced, some thirty Palestinians being so detained at the end of October. Town arrest has become more common, being also at the end of October applied to at least 48 Palestinians. Deportations continue, contrary to the Fourth Geneva

Convention; at least twelve cases have been recorded in the past year, and six more cases are pending actions in the Israeli High Court. Collective punishment is imposed in an arbitrary fashion by curfews and by restrictions on travel across the Jordan bridges. The unacceptable practice continues of the demolition and sealing of the houses belonging to the families of those detained.

The Twelve are further concerned at the drop in recent years of the annual number of family reunification permits issued by the Israeli authorities.

We note also the frequent protests made about prison conditions, and in particular the report by Amnesty International on the subject published in September. We wish to draw attention also to the refusal of the authorities of the occupying power to permit proper access on a continuing basis by the International Committee of the Red Cross to interrogation centres, including the one at Fara<sup>1</sup>, and to serious questions raised about the treatment of detainees in them.

The Twelve are also bound to restate our view that the policy by which Israel seeks to impose its civil administration on the occupied territories is unacceptable. It is of course the case that a military occupation is regarded as only a temporary situation and cannot confer upon the occupying power rights of annexation or disposal or of extending its law, jurisdiction or administration in the occupied area. Such an extension is tantamount to annexation and thereby, being contrary to international law, is invalid.

The continuation of the state of emergency declared last year by the occupation authorities on the West Bank and in Gaza is only acceptable to the extent that its application is compatible with the Fourth Geneva Convention.

The Twelve are particularly conscious of the importance of the status of Jerusalem, a city which is considered holy by three major religions. We reject any unilateral measure which seeks to modify its status. We regard it as essential that the protection of unimpeded access by all to the holy places must be guaranteed now and in any future agreement on Jerusalem.

The Twelve continue strongly to condemn Israel's decision to extend its law, jurisdiction and administration to the Golan Heights. We consider this decision to be invalid as it is contrary to international law.

Mr Chairman, the question of the human rights of the inhabitants of the occupied territories has implications not only for the welfare of the people concerned, but also for the wider prospects for a just and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict. In the same way, the economic conditions prevailing in the territories have an impact on the search for a settlement. This too is of importance to us. Bearing this in mind, the European Community has been giving aid to the occupied territories since 1981, as well as supporting UNRWA, and has just decided to increase substantially its support for UNRWA's educational programmes. A significant further step was taken on 27 October with the decision to establish a separate programme of aid to Palestinians in the occupied territories which will bring together all existing European Community technological and financial assistance. The Community has also recently adopted arrangements to provide preferential access to the EC market for Palestinian agricultural and manufactured goods originating in the occupied territories.

Mr Chairman, the measures I have just described, favourable though we hope their effect will be, are not intended to be and can never be a substitute for determined efforts to seek a just and comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict.

The position of the Twelve in this respect is well known, having been defined in the Venice Declaration and in numerous subsequent statements. Speaking on 23 September in the general debate on behalf of the European Community and of its twelve Member States, Sir Geoffrey Howe reaffirmed that a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israel dispute can be achieved only through negotiation. All parties should clearly and unambiguously accept two principles: the right to existence and security of all States in the area, including Israel, and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination with all that this implies.

To conclude, Mr Chairman, I should make clear once again that the points we have just made flow from the importance we attach to respect for human rights and humanitarian law in the occupied territories, as elsewhere, and to the need for a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/SPC/41/PV. or SR.27, item 71.

**86/360. Statement in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Refugees<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 14 November 1986  
Place of Issue: New York  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN  
Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

Madam Chairman, with your permission I should like to make a brief comment on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community, about the draft resolution contained in L.47 which has just been introduced.

There is in this Committee a tradition of working by consensus of all refugee questions. The Twelve attach importance to this. It is indeed in the interests of all delegations and, more importantly, of the refugees themselves, that this tradition be maintained. The Twelve are therefore concerned that such a text has been tabled without consultations. In our view, this text introduces subjects which are of great importance, but have already been dealt with elsewhere in this Assembly.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.3/41/SR.46, item 99.

**86/361. Press Statement Concerning Possible Forced Removals of Residents of Oukasie, South Africa**

Date of Issue: 14 November 1986  
Place of Issue: Pretoria, South Africa  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: United Kingdom Embassy  
Status of Document: Press Release

In a meeting today with the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr Ron Miller, the British Ambassador, Sir Patrick Moberly, delivered a *démarche* on behalf of the twelve Members of the European Community to express concern at the possible forced removals from Oukasie township. He made it clear that the European Community would deplore any attempt forcibly to remove the residents of Oukasie from their homes or to treat them in a way which could lead to them losing their South African citizenship as a result of being moved.

**86/362. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Situation in Central America: Threats to International Peace and Security and Peace Initiatives<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 17 November 1986  
Place of Issue: New York  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN  
Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Sir John Thomson:* Mr President, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Community and its twelve Member States.

Mr President, no member State of the United Nations, however distant from the affairs of Central America, can fail to be dismayed that violence and instability still persist in the region. It is particularly saddening that this should be the case because it seems to us that there is a common desire for peaceful solutions.

Mr President, the Central American region is one with which Members of the Twelve are bound by close ties of friendship, culture and history. We share with the people of the region a firm commitment to



the ideals of genuine democracy based on authentic political pluralism, human rights and economic and social justice. It is therefore with a special sense of concern that we view the economic and political difficulties that continue to beset the area.

Mr President, it is a truism but we need to remind ourselves that the causes of these difficulties are many and complex. Long-standing economic imbalances and social injustice have been a major contributory factor. This in turn has impeded the consolidation of soundly-based democratic institutions in the region. With some notable exceptions the long-standing absence of any mechanism whereby views could be freely expressed has further exacerbated the situation. The result has been continued economic and social decline that becomes increasingly difficult to arrest the longer it is allowed to continue unchecked.

Regrettably, Mr President, there is no panacea for the problems of the region. A prerequisite for progress is, however, that all concerned should demonstrate the necessary will to remedy the root causes of their problems, both economic and political. The European Community and its twelve Member States have already demonstrated practically their willingness to help assist the countries of the region in this endeavour. This is why they have given their full support to the Contadora peace process since its inception in 1983 and its efforts aimed at establishing a solid basis on which peace in Central America can be built.

The Member States of the Contadora Group, assisted since last year by the Support Group, have done invaluable work in laying the foundation for an overall peaceful settlement, a settlement that must emerge from and be freely accepted by the region and respected by all countries if it is to endure. As the Secretary-General said in his report on the situation in Central America in July this year, the efforts of the Group have yet to achieve concrete results but, and I quote:

'it is clear that the Contadora Group, with the backing of the Support Group, has served as a means of restraint and has helped to avoid an overall deterioration of the situation in the region'.

In the view of the Twelve, the Contadora process provides the best available framework in which to restore a climate of confidence, and to resume dialogue and cooperation among all the parties concerned.

Much useful work has already been done. As early as September 1983 the Contadora Group secured agreement of the countries of the region to a wide range of objectives, including the need for greater political stability and economic progress, for a limitation on arms, for the ending of cross-border subversion and interference, for observance of the principle of non-intervention and above all for the reinforcement of the democratic process. These elements have been developed through three versions of the Contadora Peace Treaty and in the view of the Twelve constitute fundamental ingredients for lasting peace in the region. The Contadora process has shown the way: it must now be for the countries of the region to give substance to it. The Twelve have consistently urged the countries of the region to negotiate seriously the resolution of the differences that divide them. But a further effort is needed by all concerned, including by countries with links and interests in the region to reduce regional tensions and to show restraint. As the Contadora and Support Group countries stated in their declaration issued on 1 October in New York:

'we urge the countries involved in the conflict to make clear their desire for peace and to translate that desire into unequivocal action'.

The Twelve have greatly welcomed the progress made by the Contadora Group in drawing up a Central American Peace Treaty. In a joint statement issued on 23 May this year following the Esquipulas Summit of the five Central American Presidents, the Twelve confirmed their view that an Act for Peace and Cooperation in Central America, representing a balanced and comprehensive settlement of the conflicts in Central America and subject to verification, would provide the framework for the consolidation of democracy and the growth of prosperity throughout the region.

In that same statement the Twelve reiterated their conviction that the achievement of these objectives would play an essential part in creating the climate of cooperation necessary for a harmonious

development of the countries of Central America. They also recalled that these objectives were central to the political dialogue begun at a historic meeting in San José, Costa Rica, in September 1984 between the European Community and its Member States on the one hand and the States of Central America and the Contadora Group on the other. That meeting laid the basis for a new political and economic relationship between the European Community and Central America.

A second meeting was held in Luxembourg in November 1985. It is highly satisfactory that the meeting concluded with the signature of a Final Act recording all the participants' agreement that the dialogue should be continued and developed. The participants once again urged the Contadora Group to continue in its efforts to find a peaceful solution to the crisis in Central America. The Foreign Ministers reaffirmed their conviction that the political dialogue and economic cooperation would help to achieve a political solution based on independence, non-intervention, self-determination and inviolability of frontiers; reinforce democratic principles and foster national reconciliation in all countries of the region in a framework of pluralist and social systems; develop and guarantee human rights and fundamental freedoms; and establish a reliable system of regional security, including the creation of effective implementation and follow-up machinery.

A cooperation agreement between the European Community and the Central American countries plus Panama was also signed. This provides for closer economic, social and political links, aimed at sustaining economic development and social progress in Central America in the interests of greater political stability. The European Community declared itself willing to ensure that the total volume of its aid to the region was increased and confirmed its intention to build on that agreement by giving assistance to regional projects identified by common agreement; thereby helping to encourage cooperation between the countries of the region. European Community aid to the region has been increasing over the years and, in support of projects with a regional impact, the European Community has agreed to contribute to a project which forms part of the 'Contadora Health Plan' and is designed to improve child health care in the region. A further meeting aimed at consolidating the dialogue begun in San José and Luxembourg is scheduled to take place in Guatemala in February next year.

In conclusion, Mr President, the Twelve wish to reaffirm their belief that the crisis in Central America will not be resolved by armed force but solely by a comprehensive negotiated settlement based on the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Contadora Document of Objectives. We stress in particular the importance we attach to respect for national sovereignty and independence, territorial integrity and non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States and non-recourse to intimidation or force.

But equally important in the view of the Twelve is the need for democratic pluralism in countries of the region. The development of a firmer democratic system would mean a greater assurance of freedom and justice for the people of Central America and would lessen the burden of poverty and oppression which has afflicted them for so long. The Twelve have been encouraged by recent elections held in the region and consider that this testifies to the desire of the peoples of Central America to exercise their democratic choice. They hope that this is a good augury for the political future of the region.

The Twelve also welcomed the decision of the five Central American Presidents at the end of May to establish a Central American Parliament composed of delegates elected freely by universal suffrage. We hope that the Central American Parliament will be established soon and operate in such a way that it can make a major contribution to strengthening the democratic fabric of the region as a whole.

Mr President, as I have already said, the complexities of the situation in Central America are many and varied. Both the causes and the symptoms must be tackled comprehensively, not selectively. This is the approach of the Contadora Group to which we shall continue to give our whole-hearted support. And this is the approach we believe responds most fully to the requirements of a durable and just peace.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.3/41/PV.72, item 42.

## 86/363. Statement in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Report of the ECOSOC<sup>1</sup>

Date of Issue: 18 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Birch:* Mr Chairman, first of all I should like to thank the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights, Professor Ermacora, Professor Pastor Ridruejo and Professor Galindo Pohl for their very useful introduction to our debate.

I have the honour to address the Committee today on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community on the human rights aspects of the report of the Economic and Social Council. My statement will be a long one, longer I know than you have asked that statements should be. But it represents the considered views of the twelve European countries on a subject that is of central importance to the United Nations. And since it is a single statement by twelve countries, I believe it makes an important contribution to rationalize our work.

In the Charter, our Organization has pledged itself to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights and the dignity and worth of the human person. The promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all is one of the fundamental objectives of the United Nations. The International Covenants on Human Rights, whose adoption we celebrated just two weeks ago, give effect to the commitment in the Charter to make the promotion of human rights the legitimate and continuous duty of the world community.

In recent years a number of States have returned to the values of democracy and pluralism. Their representatives have stressed the importance of the involvement of the United Nations in the protection of human rights in their countries during the time in which human rights were grievously violated. The testimony of such countries is further evidence that examination by the UN of the human rights situation in individual countries cannot be regarded as interference in their internal affairs. We regret that not all situations of systematic violations of human rights are examined by the United Nations. The Twelve welcome the commitments made at the last session of the Commission on Human Rights by representatives of Sudan, Uganda, Guatemala and the Philippines to protect human rights. We look forward to hearing from these countries on the progress they have made.

For all the declarations we heard at the commemorative session for the International Covenants on Human Rights, we must not forget that a number of States fail to live up to their obligations under the Charter or the Covenants. There are States with formally democratic constitutions which in practice pay no heed to the rights and fundamental freedoms of the individual. Yet individual rights must be a central purpose of national governments, as of the international community. If they are not, the way is open to totalitarian regimes, where the individual is entirely subservient to the arbitrary power of the State. We salute those, like Andrei Sakharov, who keep alight the flame of the human spirit. Whatever banner they go under, of left or of right, they display contempt for the individual and a denial of the inherent dignity and equality of all human beings. The best defence against totalitarian and other repressive practices which pose a threat to individual rights is scrupulous adherence by States to the provisions of the Universal Declaration and to the obligations they have freely undertaken under the Charter and the Covenants.

The proclamation of universally accepted human rights standards has been a signal achievement for our Organization. Implementation is now the essential task. In accordance with the Charter's explicit provision for its creation, the Commission on Human Rights has a crucial role in carrying out the purposes of the United Nations in the field of human rights. The work of the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities provides essential underpinning to the work of the Commission. The machinery which exists to monitor implementation of the International Covenants on Human Rights, and other human rights instruments, including the various optional procedures provided for in those instruments, also needs to be used to best effect.

The Twelve regard it as essential that the necessary resources should continue to be made available to maintain and strengthen the United Nations' machinery for the protection of human rights. Human rights programmes constitute less than 1% of overall expenditure by the United Nations. Any cut in so small a programme risks causing disproportionate harm to its objectives. The deferral of this year's session of the Sub-Commission is a case in point.

In my delegation's intervention on behalf of the Twelve on 12 November we raised the question of the circulation of certain reports submitted to this Assembly by Special Rapporteurs and Special Representatives of the Commission on Human rights. We welcome the statement which Under-Secretary-General Buffum made yesterday. But it does not answer all our questions since it implies that similar selective measures could be taken again if the financial crisis continues. It is not acceptable to the Twelve that restrictions on the proper circulation of documents should be applied selectively in this area, particularly when there continues to be gross wastage in the production of documents in other areas. As the distinguished representative of Belgium said yesterday, the factual sections of these reports are necessary for delegations to assess the conclusions reached. We are well aware, as Under-Secretary-General Buffum himself pointed out, that there are rules about the length and circulation of documents in the United Nations. But the Secretariat must apply these rules uniformly and must make them known to those who prepare reports and submit other documents.

We shall have these issues closely in mind in the discussions in other forums of future budgetary and administrative matters.

I have referred to the importance the Twelve attach to the elaboration of universally accepted human rights standards. The adoption by this Assembly in 1984 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, was a major advance in the setting of universal human rights standards. Although torture was already prohibited in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, those prohibitions had not proved adequate to counter the continued widespread practice of this particularly abhorrent violation of human rights. The Twelve welcome the fact that twelve States have already become party to the Convention, and we hope that further accessions and ratifications will enable it to enter into force soon. We urge all States to adhere to the Convention.

The system of Special Rapporteurs and Special Representatives of the Commission on Human Rights plays an essential part in making the international community better informed of and thus better equipped to deal with a wide range of both specific situations and of certain particularly gross violations of human rights. It is incumbent upon all governments to extend their full cooperation to the Special Rapporteurs.

The appointment this year of a Special Rapporteur to examine incidents and governmental actions in all parts of the world which are inconsistent with the provisions of the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief and to recommend remedial measures including, as appropriate, the promotion of a dialogue between communities of religion or belief and their Governments adds an important new mechanism to the Commission's thematic approach to its examination of human rights violations.

The appointment by the Commission in 1985 of a Special Rapporteur on Torture, and the extension of his mandate by consensus in 1986 testifies to the will of the Commission to take an active part in efforts to eradicate this evil practice. While torture continues to be practised, it is right that the international community should also take steps to assist its victims. The Twelve therefore appeal again to all governments, non-governmental organizations and individuals to contribute to the Voluntary Fund for the Victims of Torture.

In too many countries there continue to be instances of summary or arbitrary executions in violation of the inherent right to life. The Twelve commend the Special Rapporteur's efforts on behalf of some of those threatened with summary execution. We noted with grave concern the conclusion in his report to the Commission that 'there really has been no respite in the number of such executions'. This is further substantiated in Amnesty International's 1986 Report. We agree with the Special Rapporteur that this question remains one of the most urgent problems on the international human rights agenda, and that the international community should continue to monitor the situation.

The practice of disappearances continues to cause untold suffering in many parts of the world to the victims and their families. The Twelve attach considerable importance to the work of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances. We commend the Working Group's responsible approach to its mandate, and welcome the progress it has made. We urge all governments concerned to respond favourably to the Group's request for visits, so that the effectiveness of its work may increase further.

The Twelve are also aware that the level of technical support made available to the Working Group plays a crucial part in its effectiveness. We therefore welcomed the recommendation of the Commission on Human Rights, endorsed by ECOSOC decision 1986/139, to extend the Working Group's mandate for two years. But we have noted with concern that this year the facilities available for the Working Group's meetings were substantially reduced from the provisions of the ECOSOC decision. We look to the Secretary-General to ensure that the Working Group is enabled to fulfil its important mandate, in accordance with the ECOSOC decision.

In line with their commitment to the promotion of human rights, our governments are all party to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the earliest regional arrangement for the protection of human rights. The European Convention, which brings together the countries of Western Europe, is far-reaching, not only in its scope, but in particular in its enforcement machinery. It is in that framework that complaints of violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the Republic of Cyprus are being dealt with. This machinery, and the optional procedure, to which all the Twelve have acceded, recognizing the right of individual petition, have enabled the European Convention to play an important part in the guaranteeing of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Our experience with the European Convention strengthens our firm conviction that ratification of human rights instruments alone is not enough. Implementation is essential.

In the USSR and the other States of Eastern Europe, although human rights are in theory guaranteed in their constitutions, and although they highlight their adherence to all international human rights instruments, in practice fundamental rights and freedoms are not duly respected. This year, the 25th anniversary of the erection of the Berlin wall, we are starkly reminded of a reality which keeps in by force people who wish to leave, sets neighbours and families apart from each other, is a total negation of the principles enshrined in the Charter and the Universal Declaration, and is irreconcilable with the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. As we mark the 30th anniversary of the uprising in Hungary, and recall the statement issued on 23 October by a group of Hungarian, Czechoslovak, GDR and Polish citizens calling for human rights and true democracy, we look to all governments of that region to respect the rights which they claim to guarantee.

At the follow-up meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in Vienna, which opened earlier this month, the Twelve will press for the sort of steps which everyone in our countries can see and understand: for the right to be reunified with one's family, for freedom of movement within each country, and for freedom to leave and return to one's own country, for the right freely to profess and practise a religion or belief, for the right freely to receive and disseminate information, for the right to exercise and defend human rights without harassment or persecution.

The Twelve also wish to underline the particular importance they attach to the rights to set up free and democratic trade unions. It is of fundamental importance for the establishment and preservation of a democratic society that strong and independent organizations are in a position to defend, without interference, the interests of all those for whom they act and speak. In many countries, trade unionists are perhaps particularly vulnerable because they defend not only their own rights but also those of others. It is our duty as an international community to see to it that they and all others who are seeking to defend these rights, in all countries, whatever their political, economic and social system are protected against harassment, detention or worse.

I should now like to address a number of specific situations. Violations of human rights in South Africa have long been one of the central issues dealt with in the report of the Economic and Social Council. On several occasions at this Assembly the Twelve have expressed their revulsion at apartheid, and their conviction that it must be abolished. We have continually made clear our views to the South African Government, and have worked to promote a genuine national dialogue, conducive to the achievement of liberty and social justice for all in that country. In the absence of progress to that end, the

Twelve have now taken further steps to reinforce the measures we adopted in 1985. I set these out in detail in my statement on behalf of the Twelve on item 89<sup>2</sup>. The Twelve deplore all violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms in South Africa. We are particularly disturbed by arbitrary mass arrests, forced resettlement, the practice of detention without trial under the state of emergency, and by reports of the use of torture. The deepening in the last twelve months of the cycle of violence, from wherever it may come, and of repression in South Africa has tragically worsened the prospects for peaceful change. The Twelve will continue to work for rapid and peaceful change in which all citizens can exercise their human rights.

Fundamental change is inevitable, not only in South Africa but also in Namibia which the Pretoria Government continues to occupy illegally in defiance of international law. The Twelve take this opportunity to reiterate their view that the people of Namibia must be enabled to enjoy the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are the common birthright of us all. In the first instance they must be allowed to exercise their right of self-determination. Until apartheid has been eradicated there and Namibia has achieved independence in accordance with the United Nations plan in Security Council Resolution 435, it will not be possible to secure stability and peace in Southern Africa.

The report of the Economic and Social Council also deals with the question of human rights in the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967. The views of the Twelve on the problems of the Middle East have been set out in other forums at this Assembly. Our views on the specific question of Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the Arab population of those territories were set out in my delegation's intervention on behalf of the Twelve in the Special Political Committee on 13 November.

The Twelve have consistently attached importance to all matters affecting the human rights of the inhabitants of the occupied territories. The Twelve condemn all violence, from whatever source. We continue to be concerned by Israel's policy and practices in this area, by arbitrary acts such as deportations, arbitrary arrests and detentions (including, in some cases, of young persons), town arrests, the imposition of collective punishments such as the demolition and sealing of houses belonging to the families of those detained, and restrictions on freedom of circulation, and by the decline in the number of family reunification permits being issued. While we have noted assurances given by the Israeli authorities that they intend to improve conditions for the inhabitants of the occupied territories, we look for evidence that these are being put into practice. At present, Israeli policy in the occupied territories remains a major obstacle on the path towards a peaceful solution in the Middle East.

For the second time, this Assembly has before it a report on the human rights situation in Afghanistan prepared by the Special Rapporteur and we have just been privileged to hear a most graphic introduction to it by its author. The Twelve deeply regret that the Afghan authorities have so far refused to extend any cooperation to the Special Rapporteur. If they wish to demonstrate to the international community that they are seriously concerned about human rights, they must, as a first step, cooperate with the Commission on Human Rights.

The reduction in the number of civilian deaths referred to in the Special Rapporteur's report does not change the horrifying picture of the continued denial of the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of the Afghan people, both by the authorities in Kabul and by the occupying forces. Over four million Afghans have now fled the country; thousands more flee every month. Over a million are displaced inside the country. All opposition and suspected opposition to the regime and to the Soviet occupation is punished with great severity, with no respect for human rights obligations. Torture continues to be practised systematically on prisoners and brutal reprisals are common against any village suspected even of sympathizing with the Resistance.

The war has brought massive destruction and suffering to Afghanistan. Severe suffering has been caused to the civilian population through the indiscriminate bombardment of villages, aimed at destroying the agriculture infrastructure. There are reports of plans to displace hundreds of thousands of people from the East of Afghanistan against their will. The use of certain chemical weapons, anti-personnel mines, booby-trap toys, are all reported to continue. Nor have the cultural traditions of the country been spared. There are reports of the destruction of cultural property, particularly of mosques, and there is increasing evidence that the educational system is being based on non-traditional ideas and enforced indoctrination, contrary to Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, with children being sent abroad to be educated, against their parents' will.

The scale of human rights violations revealed in this and previous reports leaves no doubt that the General Assembly should retain this question on its agenda, so that the situation is kept under review. Even more urgent is the need for the Soviet occupying forces to withdraw, and for them and the Afghan authorities to stop the abuses. We welcome the fact that the regime has shown some willingness to renew contact with the ICRC. They must now allow ICRC representatives to visit Kabul freely, to have access to political prisoners and to be able to carry out protection work. The regime must also allow the Special Rapporteur to visit Kabul.

The United Nations voted last month by a record majority for the withdrawal of foreign forces from Cambodia and the restoration to the people of that country of the fundamental right to determine their own destiny. The Twelve share the abhorrence felt by the world community at the terrible abuses inflicted in the past by Pol Pot and his *Khmer rouge*. The fact that this Organization took no action against the Pol Pot regime continues to be a blot on its record. But that is no justification for Vietnam's illegal occupation of Cambodia or its imposition of an illegitimate regime. Hundreds of thousands of Cambodians have been forced to flee, and now lead a precarious existence in camps in border areas, totally dependent on whatever international humanitarian relief and protection can be extended to them.

The Twelve are also concerned about human rights violations in Vietnam. Many thousands have been detained without trial in Vietnam since 1975 on an indefinite basis, in flagrant violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which Vietnam has been party since 1982. The Twelve remain disturbed by continuing reports that these detainees are subject to harsh treatment. The thousands of Vietnamese who continue each year to flee oppression in their country are a living reproach to the Vietnamese Government.

This Committee again has before it a report on Iran. The Twelve remain gravely concerned at the human rights situation in that country. We reiterate once again our view that Iran is legally bound to respect the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenants on Human Rights, and the other human rights instruments to which it is party. There can be no justification for failing to live up to these obligations. Unfortunately there continue to be reports of summary and arbitrary executions, the use of torture, and arbitrary detention. Opponents of the regime are subjected to persecution. Such treatment is accorded in particular to minority groups, such as the Baha'is, who are subjected to systematic discrimination solely because of their faith. The situation is further aggravated by the lack of an independent judiciary and the consequent absence of any guarantee of a fair trial. The Twelve are also concerned that children are conscripted and sent into battle. In fact it is much more than just concern. I think all of us as responsible members of the United Nations must be appalled that children anywhere can be used to fight wars that are started by adults.

The new Special Representative has been too recently appointed to prepare a detailed report. Nevertheless there remain specific and detailed allegations of human rights violations, related in particular to the right to life, the right to freedom from torture, the right to liberty and security of person, and the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, and to freedom of expression, which cannot be dismissed. The Twelve therefore urge the Iranian Government to extend its full cooperation to the Special Representative, and in particular to allow him to visit Iran. The international community must be able to continue its consideration of the human rights situation in Iran on the basis of the existing international standards in the field of human rights. Above all we call on the Iranian Government to live up to its obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Twelve have made clear our wish to contribute to the establishment of peace and to the economic development of Central America. At San José in September 1984 and at Luxembourg last November, the European Community and its Member States established a political dialogue with the countries of Central America to underline our support for the Contadora process in the interests of stability and pluralist democracy. The Community also signed a cooperation agreement with them. We hope these links will encourage and strengthen genuine democracy in Central America.

The question of human rights in two countries of that region is on this Committee's agenda today. I should like to express the appreciation of the Twelve for the cooperation which the Government of El Salvador has offered the Special Representative, cooperation to which we attach considerable importance. As regards the situation in El Salvador, the Special Representative's report concludes that

respect for human rights continues to be an important element of the current policy of the constitutional Government of President Duarte, a policy which is achieving results in the crucial area of respect for the life of persons. While the Special Representative also notes that the number of political assassinations is 'significantly lower than in 1985', he states nevertheless that deaths continue to be caused among the civilian population, including non-combat-related political assassinations committed by the Salvadorean armed and security forces; that the number of political prisoners has increased; and that some of these prisoners have been subjected to severe psychological pressure. The Special Representative also states that the criminal justice system continues to be grossly inadequate. The Twelve remain particularly concerned that there is no effective judicial machinery to investigate and punish serious politically motivated human rights violations. We strongly encourage the Government to ensure the proper effectiveness of the judiciary as quickly as possible. The international community will expect a continuing improvement in areas where human rights abuses occur.

It is clear from the Special Representative's report that the guerrilla forces too often conduct themselves with scant regard for basic humanity. The report notes that the guerrillas have continued their systematic attacks against the country's economic infrastructure, and engage in summary executions and abductions of civilians. The report also refers to the large and disturbing numbers killed by the explosion of mines, most of which, in the view of the Special Representative, were placed by FMLN forces. The Twelve call upon both sides to observe scrupulously the relevant international norms of humanitarian treatment as set out in the Geneva Conventions and the Additional Protocols thereto.

The Twelve strongly urge that the measures recommended by the Special Representative with regard to peace and national reconciliation be implemented by the interested parties. In this respect, we consider of the utmost importance the resumption of the dialogue between the Government and opposition forces in order to put an end to the violations of human rights which result from the conflict.

As regards the situation in Guatemala, President Cerezo and his Government have undoubtedly set themselves the objective of improving the human rights situation. There was indeed much to be done when President Cerezo took office. The Special Rapporteur's report to the Commission earlier this year showed how generalized the climate of violence and abuse had been, with large numbers of people disappearing, being tortured, or suffering other violations of their right to life, liberty and security of person. There is no report of the Special Representative before this Committee. Unfortunately there are reports reaching us from other sources that violations of human rights, though reduced in number, continue to occur, and, in particular, that death squads continue to operate. The Twelve express their concern at these violations, although we welcome the abolition of the Police Investigations Unit (the DIT) and the improvements in the police force. We acknowledge the efforts made by the Government so far, but are disturbed that little progress seems to have been made to ensure that participation in civil defence patrols, in which civilians from rural areas have been forced to participate, is strictly voluntary, and at the Government's failure to allow the ICRC to maintain a presence in the country.

The Twelve urge the Guatemalan Government to spare no effort to fulfil the commitments it has made in the field of human rights. We also hope that all sections of Guatemalan society will play their part in this. In the view of the Twelve, the best way forward would be for the Government to implement the recommendations contained in the Special Rapporteur's interim report to this Assembly last year.

In South America the Twelve have been encouraged by the continuing consolidation of democracy in most countries. We hope that this process will be maintained throughout the region. But problems certainly remain. The Twelve have made plain their particular concern about human rights abuses in Chile. We welcome the cooperation which the Chilean Government has extended to the Special Rapporteur, in particular by allowing him to visit Chile. This is a step forward.

Nevertheless, the situation in Chile remains a matter for deep concern. The reimposition of a state of siege following the attempted assassination of President Pinochet on 7 September, is particularly troubling. Significant numbers of democratic opposition leaders, trade unionists and journalists detained under its provisions have not yet been charged. There are reports of torture and ill-treatment of those detained on suspicion of breaking the security laws, and of abductions. The re-emergence of right-wing death squads is an alarming feature of the present situation, the most so since their activities go unpunished.



The Twelve find it difficult to accept the Government's claim that the reimposed state of siege is a necessary response to violence. Indeed, we believe that these measures are being used also to harass and intimidate democratic opponents of the Government. Moreover we consider that these measures will intensify political polarization and increase the risk of further violence.

The Twelve reiterate their hope that the Government will charge or release all those arbitrarily detained. We also call on the Chilean authorities to establish and publish without further delay the full facts about the cases of Sr Rojas and Srta Quintana, who were brutally burned, allegedly at the hands of an army patrol in early July.

The Twelve also hope that the Government will continue to cooperate with the Special Rapporteur, and implement his recommendations. An improvement in the human rights situation would be the first concrete step towards fulfilling the Chilean Government's declared intention to restore Chile to democracy. For thirteen years now the exercise of democratic rights has been denied. The Twelve consider that an unconditional political dialogue between Government and democratic opposition is an essential element in the process of a peaceful and orderly transition to full democracy under which human rights are guaranteed.

I have just reviewed a number of specific situations which are of particular concern to the international community. I would like now to turn briefly to an issue which is regrettably especially topical. Unfortunately, terrorism has now become a world-wide scourge, bringing a new precariousness to public life. This is not the place to discuss this issue in its broader aspect. But we should always remember that terrorist actions are a great evil, often depriving innocent people of their right to life in horrific circumstances. Another form of terrorism which has become all too common is the taking of hostages, which is a deprivation of liberty, and an act of psychological and sometimes physical torture. The Twelve utterly condemn all forms of terrorism, including the taking of any person hostage.

This statement is not a complete catalogue of human rights violations in the world. The reports of non-governmental organizations such as Amnesty International and the International Commission of Jurists and its affiliates which perform an important service for the world community in bringing these issues to public attention, make clear that the number of countries of which serious human rights violations are reported is depressingly long. This Assembly cannot remain indifferent in the face of the systematic violations of individual liberties, of the tyranny, oppression and indiscriminate violence which persist in many countries.

The people of our twelve nations expect more than fine words. They expect the universal observance of universally accepted standards. The Twelve will continue to do their utmost to ensure that our Organization is capable of responding rapidly and effectively to violations of human rights, wherever they may occur.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.3/41/SR.49, item 12.

<sup>2</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/277.

### **86/364. Explanation of Vote in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolution Concerning Alternative Approaches and Ways and Means Within the United Nations System for Improving the Effective Enjoyment of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 19 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Ms Young:* Mr Chairman, I have asked for the floor to make an explanation of vote on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community on the draft resolution in document L.41/Rev.1 which is now before the Committee.

We have listened with care to the explanation of the changes made to the text by the co-sponsors, which have just been introduced by the distinguished representative of Cuba. We are grateful for the efforts the co-sponsors have made to meet some of our difficulties. Nevertheless the Twelve will abstain on the draft resolution. We very much regret this. The Twelve attach particular importance to the question of alternative ways and means for improving the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms. But we doubt whether this draft resolution will be helpful in the search for such alternative ways and means.

We regret in particular that the draft resolution deals with the right to development and the working group established to consider this question at the same time as the Committee is considering ways in which the draft declaration on the right to development could be made acceptable to all delegations, a question to which the Twelve attach great importance.

The draft also deals with issues such as international economic questions and questions concerning disarmament which do not fall within the competence of this Committee and are being dealt with elsewhere in this Assembly.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.3/41/SR.50, item 101.

### **86/365. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Resolutions on Namibia<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 20 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Birch:* I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community to the draft resolutions now before the General Assembly.

A number of familiar but controversial elements remain in the increasingly lengthy draft resolutions before us. In addition, some of these elements are of doubtful relevance to the matter at hand. The introduction of such elements, as we said in our statement on the resolutions during the Special Session in September, makes unanimous approval of the draft resolutions by the General Assembly impossible. Indeed, it risks accentuating divisions among the membership of the United Nations where there is, more than ever, a need to mobilize the full support of the international community in pursuit of the common goal of internationally recognized independence for Namibia.

The Twelve cannot endorse calls for Member States to render increased military assistance to SWAPO as a means of bringing Namibia to independence. Similarly we cannot agree to lend our support to armed struggle as a means to this end, in spite of the impatience and frustration felt by the Namibian people owing to South Africa's continuing occupation of their country. In the view of the Twelve the general primary duty of the United Nations is to promote peaceful solutions in conformity with the Charter, thus avoiding any encouragement of the use of force.

The Twelve consider that under the provisions of the Settlement Plan, the constitution of an independent Namibia must be worked out by a constituent assembly appointed as a result of elections in which all political groups are able to participate. None of these groups should therefore be designated in advance as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

The Twelve wish to reaffirm their commitment to the principle of universality of membership of the United Nations. We cannot accept that it should be called into question or that the autonomy of the international financial institutions should be compromised. The total isolation of South Africa would in our view only hinder efforts to secure the implementation of the United Nations Settlement Plan.

The Twelve reject any arbitrary and selective attack against Member States of the United Nations, or against groups of countries.

Our respect for the division of competence among the main bodies of the Organization remains unchanged. The Security Council alone is authorized to take decisions binding upon Member States.

I must also register our concern at the financial implications of some of the draft resolutions now before us. A more thorough scrutiny of the programme of work of the Council for Namibia would have enabled the financial implications to be reduced, without endangering the goals we seek. As with any new expenditure in the current budgetary crisis the position will need to be carefully monitored in the light of the developing financial situation.

As we have already stated we remain firmly and unequivocally committed to the independence of Namibia. The illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa must be brought to an end. The only acceptable basis for a peaceful and lasting solution to the problem is the implementation without preconditions or pretext of Security Council Resolutions 385(1976) and 435(1978). The Settlement Plan endorsed by the second of these resolutions – which has been accepted by the Government of South Africa and by SWAPO – embodies the only universally accepted framework for a peaceful transition to independence in a manner which is guaranteed to be free and fair. We wish to see the plan implemented without delay and in its entirety, so that the Namibian people can move forward to the internationally recognized independence which is their due.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/41/PV.79, item 36.

### **86/366. Statement in the Fifth Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Programme Planning: Report of the Committee on Programme and Coordination<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 20 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Murray:* Mr Chairman, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community.

We are grateful to the Committee on Programme and Coordination (CPC) for the report now before us (A/41/38) and to the CPC's vice-Chairman, Mr Deryck Murray, for his introductory remarks at the opening of this debate.

As is the case with many other agenda items this year in the Fifth Committee, the financial crisis and the recommendations of the Group of Eighteen directly affect all decisions relating to the CPC. Our comments will therefore be brief. But whatever decisions may be taken on the Report of the Group of Eighteen, the responsibilities presently assigned to CPC remain important if the UN is to operate efficiently: a designated committee must continue to be charged with supervision of planning, programming, monitoring, evaluation, and coordination. It is clear from its own report that CPC itself is not satisfied with the way the present system is operating. The CPC spent considerable time at its session in May this year addressing the question of how to improve its work under its existing mandate and we welcome its decision to take a broader view of its tasks in future. But at various points in the report it is evident that the CPC found unsatisfactory amongst other things, the information (content, format and timeliness) provided by the Secretariat and the attention subsequently paid both by the Secretariat and by intergovernmental bodies to its recommendations. This same point was referred to, Mr Chairman, in the statement on this item made last year on behalf of the Member States of the European Community.

The responsibilities currently entrusted to CPC are important. However, the impact of the CPC's conclusions and recommendations has not matched the importance. The Twelve consider that the proposals for reform made at the 26th session of CPC will improve planning and programming work in the future. The Twelve wish at this stage simply to underline that this function is essential to an efficient and effective UN.

The Twelve do not propose to enter into a lengthy analysis of the CPC's comments on the Programme Performance Report (A/41/318) on the 1984-86 biennium. We note, though, the Secretariat efforts to improve the format of the document, and welcome the additional suggestions in this sense made by

CPC. The statistical information provided in the Programme Performance Report (A/41/318) is well worth examination, and indicates the degree of flexibility which the Secretariat has in the implementation of the approved budget. We note the CPC's critical comments about the performance of certain regional commissions and of DPI and trust that the required action has been taken in those bodies to meet CPC's concerns. Equally we share the CPC's concern about inadequate responses from Secretariat officials and from Member States when it comes to evaluation of programmes. We recognize that resource limitations have slowed the process whereby evaluation posts have been established; we would, however, encourage all managers at all levels to adopt a new critical approach and to undertake self-evaluation on a regular basis. While this sort of exercise may not be as searching as, for example, the evaluation study on the Political Information News Service, self-evaluation ought to be a part of every manager's duties.

We endorse the CPC's recommendations for improvements of the programmatic contents of the programme budget implications statements – an essential element in the taking of informed decisions. And on coordination, we share the concern of CPC at the evident lack of follow-up around the system to the conclusions reached on cross-organizational programme analyses. If such analytical exercises are to be worthwhile and helpful, they must be properly followed up and implemented. The same applies to priority setting. The Twelve regret that the CPC's output in these areas has not been fully utilized. On the wider aspects of coordination, we share the CPC's hope that the functioning of its annual meetings with ACC be improved, and that the potential of this coordination mechanism be fulfilled. What is needed is not just the appearance of coordination but the reality.

The CPC, as we have said, Mr Chairman, in whatever form continues to have an essential role to play – and it is coming forward with valuable and specific recommendations. For example, the Twelve support the proposals in paragraph 15 which suspends, for a trial period, the UN chronicle, and redeploys resources to the production of the yearbook. A serious examination of the utility and timeliness of these publications is indeed necessary – considering the cost of, and problems with, documentation. We hope to see further specific recommendations along these lines in the future. Finally, the Twelve note the CPC's detailed work on the revisions to the medium-term plan, the basic document guiding the whole range of the UN's activities, and we look forward to the preparation of the next plan. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.5/41/SR.29, item 111.

## **86/367. Statement in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning International Security<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 21 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Birch:* Mr Chairman, I have the honour to make a statement on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community in order to speak on items 67, 68, 69 and 141 on our agenda, concerning international security. These items touch directly and intimately on the United Nations Charter, which all of us as Member States of this Organization are pledged to strictly observe.

In the space of less than two generations – a brief 31 years – those who drafted the United Nations Charter had lived through the two most destructive wars the world had ever seen. We are fortunate that today we are more than 40 years remote from their experience of total global warfare. But there is no room for complacency. Many parts of the world have been and continue to be rent by regional conflicts that have inflicted untold death, destruction and suffering. Our joint aim therefore must surely be to preserve and promote a peace which at the same time assures the security of all concerned, and maintains the inherent right of self-defence as provided for in the Charter.

Arms control and disarmament have a central role in the achievement of the goals in the United Nations Charter. Substantial and balanced reductions in the world's nuclear and conventional arsenals to

the lowest possible level are a vital part of this process of course. Consequently, the Twelve fully support multilateral and bilateral endeavours to that end. The Twelve are making a direct contribution, notably through their constructive participation in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). It is with particular satisfaction that we welcome the recent successful adoption of the Stockholm Document by the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. After lengthy and detailed negotiations in Stockholm, agreement was reached on practical measures designed to bring about a greater degree of openness and predictability about military activities in Europe, thus reducing tension, mistrust and the risk of military confrontation.

But in addition to the enhancement of stability and predictability between States which limitations and reductions in armaments can help to bring about, consideration must also be given to other equally important aspects of security. For security is not limited to its well-known military dimension but encompasses non-military aspects as well. Ultimately it is a political and diplomatic as well as a military problem, which requires dialogue and greater understanding. Indeed, it also involves States' behaviour across the board. Security is affected by the way they deal with many aspects of everyday behaviour. Not least this includes the respect they show for the human rights and social and economic aspirations of their own people. The horrifying phenomenon of terrorism also threatens the fabric of international security, and must be tackled collectively and implacably.

Those who drew up the United Nations Charter recognized the interplay between a variety of factors which impinge on the complex issue of international security. They were men of vision who tempered the ideals of their aspirations with realism. They did not attempt to prescribe a cure for every ill. But they did, if I may continue the analogy, make a bold attempt at preventive medicine by elaborating a document which contains the basic elements for a safe, secure and civilized world.

One of the essential principles for such a world is full respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. As I suggested just now, international security is affected not only by the behaviour of governments towards each other, but also by the behaviour of governments towards their own people. Governments alone can assure their citizens the unimpaired enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Governments alone can establish the framework for mutual confidence, and therefore the mutual security which allows people to live their lives in peace and prosperity. Peace will only flourish where the dignity of human beings and their right to freedom is respected both in words and deeds. As the Secretary-General said in his annual report, the persistent infringement of human rights 'casts shame on our era'.

The CSCE process as a whole shows that in a region tragically divided for so long it is possible to establish a framework for building trust and confidence. It demonstrates what is possible at the regional level. The authors of the United Nations Charter placed great emphasis on the role that regional cooperation can play in enhancing international security. But they deliberately did not seek to prescribe rigid formulae. Arrangements have to be adapted to the needs of the local situation. We recognize that measures appropriate for one region may not always be appropriate for another where the circumstances and problems are different.

Mr Chairman, as Sir Geoffrey Howe said on behalf of the Twelve in the General Assembly on 23 September, 'we are firm in our support for the Charter and for a strong and effective UN'. The United Nations may not have always lived up to the hopes of its Founders. None the less, the Charter sets the standards and goals after which we must all strive; and its provisions remain the best basis for maintaining international peace and security — provided member States live up to their obligations. We attach great importance to enhancing and strengthening the authority of the Security Council. This is essential for the effective operation of the security system created by the United Nations. The Organization itself is an indispensable forum in which countries, no matter how large or small, can come together on an equal footing to exchange views, bring their problems and seek to settle disputes peacefully. Moreover, the technical and regional bodies, and Specialized Agencies established under UN auspices, provide a network through which the purposes and principles of the Charter can be realized in the humanitarian, social, economic and developmental spheres, which as I noted earlier are intimately related to the question of security.

An important innovation, and arguably the most practical current manifestation of the United Nations' commitment to preserving international peace and security, is the establishment of peace-keeping forces. We must of course be realistic about what UN peace-keeping operations can achieve. They are neither designed nor equipped to enforce the law against determined transgressors. They are an adjunct to diplomacy; a means of holding the ring while the contestants find their way to the negotiating chamber. The machinery is there. Success depends primarily on the willingness of those involved to use it.

The Twelve wish to express their gratitude and respect to all those who have taken part, and in some cases given their lives, in UN peace-keeping operations.

We should not overlook either other, less visible ways in which the United Nations can be used effectively in promoting international security. There is, for example, the Secretary-General's own brand of 'quiet diplomacy'. His patient shuttling behind the scenes is an important element in the process of trying to resolve disputes peacefully. Of necessity this activity remains confidential and rarely attracts the publicity which is its due. But the Twelve would like to pay tribute to the Secretary-General and his staff for their efforts, which have often borne fruit.

A truly effective United Nations requires, however, far more than brave men and a diligent and successful Secretary-General. No amount of tampering with the words of the Charter or drawing up new documents and declarations will make any difference if member States themselves are not prepared to put into practice what they profess publicly to believe in through their membership of this Organization and their acceptance of its principles.

The rights and privileges of membership of the United Nations thus go hand in hand with obligations to uphold the purposes and principles of the Charter. These obligations are freely entered into and should not be taken lightly. Foremost amongst them is the undertaking not to use, or threaten to use, force in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations, and to settle international disputes peacefully. Without a true commitment to the fundamental norms of behaviour enshrined in the Charter, security becomes meaningless. Instead of mutual recrimination and calls for establishing novel systems of international security *practical deeds* which demonstrate such a commitment will do far more to strengthen international peace and security. This, Mr Chairman, is the fundamental approach of the twelve Member States of the European Community to the issues raised by the items we are currently considering.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.1/41/PV.53, items 67, 68, 69 and 141.

### **86/368. Explanation of Vote in the Second Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Draft Resolution L.29 on a Trade Embargo Against Nicaragua<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 21 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

Mr Chairman, following the adoption of the resolution on the trade embargo against Nicaragua I would like to make the following statement on behalf of the European Community and its twelve Member States.

We have not opposed this resolution. However, we regret the procedures followed in this Committee before the adoption of this resolution, which led the US to decide that there was no point in pressing its attempts to have its amendments considered by the Committee. We believe it is the right of any member State of the United Nations to have its proposals or amendments considered on their merits in this Committee.

Mr Chairman, we have made clear our desire to contribute to the establishment of peace and to the economic development of Central America. At San José in September 1984 and at Luxembourg in

1985 the Twelve established a political dialogue with the countries of Central America to underline their support for the Contadora process. We shall meet again in February 1987 in Guatemala City. The European Community and its Member States have also signed a cooperation agreement with these countries. It is our belief that such links will help these countries to overcome the problems which they face.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.2/41/SR.34, L.29.

### **86/369. Explanation of Vote in the Second Committee of the UN General Assembly on Draft Resolution L.33 Concerning International Economic Security<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 21 November 1986  
 Place of Issue: New York  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN  
 Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Dun:* Mr Chairman, I have the honour to make this statement on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community. We have not been able to support the draft resolution contained in document L.33 concerning International Economic Security. This is consistent with the positions we took on GA Resolution 40/173.

In addition, we do not understand why the sponsors should regard it as necessary to present this draft when the Secretary-General has already been asked in Resolution 40-173 to report through ECOSOC in 1987 to the 42nd Session of the General Assembly.

More generally, we have serious reservations about an approach which consists, in the first instance, of introducing into the work of the United Nations a notion and then requests the United Nations Secretariat to turn it into a concept.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.2/41/SR.34, L.33.

### **86/370. Explanation of Vote in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly on the Draft Resolution Concerning the International Covenants on Human Rights<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 21 November 1986  
 Place of Issue: New York  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN  
 Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

I have asked for the floor to make an explanation of vote on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community on the draft resolution in document L.65/Rev.1.

The Twelve will abstain on the draft resolution, despite the great importance we attach to the implementation of both Covenants, since we have a number of serious reservations about the text. Moreover we very much regret the unwillingness of the co-sponsors to take account of our reservations, of which they have been well aware since the negotiations on the text which was adopted as Resolution 40/114 last year.

Firstly the Twelve cannot accept the assertion made in preambular paragraph 6 and in the title of that draft that all human rights are 'interdependent'. While we agree that certain rights are interrelated, and the enjoyment of some may contribute to the enjoyment of others, we cannot accept any implication that the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights can be a pre-condition for the enjoyment of civil

and political rights. Nor can we accept the implicit claim in preambular paragraph 8 that the principal obstacles to the full realization of human rights are those listed in the paragraph. If there were to be a complete list, other elements, such as totalitarian practices, would certainly have to appear in it.

The Twelve are unable to support preambular paragraph 9 since the language of that paragraph does not correspond to the language of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The Twelve also have difficulties with preambular paragraph 10 which paints an over-simple picture of what is in fact a complex triangular relationship between disarmament, security and development, and with preambular paragraph 11 for the reasons made clear in my explanation of vote on behalf of the Twelve on the draft resolution contained in document L.41/Rev.1. The Twelve find it hard to understand why operative paragraph 1 makes no reference to the International Covenants on Human Rights, which is after all the agenda item under which the text has been tabled. It is particularly puzzling that there is no reference anywhere in the operative part of the text to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. It is after all in acceding to the Covenants that States undertake specific legal obligations to promote and protect economic, social, cultural, civil and political rights.

Finally, the Twelve have very serious difficulties with operative paragraph 2 of the draft which could be interpreted as undermining one of the basic tenets of our Organization, as expressed in the Preamble to both International Covenants, that

recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice, and peace in this world.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.3/41/SR.52, 53, item 97.

### **86/371. Statement in the Fifth Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning Personnel Questions<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 21 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Murray:* Mr Chairman, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community.

In his recent statement to the Fifth Committee, the Secretary-General noted that the agenda item 'Personnel Questions' covers a great variety of subjects – the composition of the Secretariat, privileges and immunities of the staff, the status of women in the Secretariat, the administration of justice. It would be difficult in the time available for the Twelve to cover each and every aspect of personnel in this statement, but this should not be taken to mean indifference to those items not specifically referred to. The Twelve recognize that the United Nations in large part *is* its staff, and personnel questions are accordingly a subject of major importance. We thank Mr Negre for his dedicated work in this field, and we welcome Mr Kofi Annan to this new bed of nails.

The Twelve wish first to address the issue of privileges and immunities of UN staff. We note with regret the marked deterioration in the situation as reported in the document A/C.5/41/12. We emphatically hope to see an early and satisfactory conclusion to all of the cases reported on, especially those in which the Secretary-General has intervened personally. The Twelve wish particularly to express their concern over the cases of Mr Alec Collett, kidnapped in Lebanon in March 1985; and Mr Liviu Bota, the director of UNIDIR, who for nearly a year has been unable to return to his post in Geneva. This in no way detracts from the importance of the other cases reported on (A/C.5/41/12). We appeal to those responsible for the arbitrary detention of international civil servants to put an end to such detentions and we hope to see in next year's report an overall improvement.

Turning to the composition of the Secretariat, the Twelve note that the separation of UNIDO and the 1986 recruitment freeze have not assisted progress towards the achievement of a more equitable



distribution of staff by nationality and gender. Achievement of equitable geographical distribution should remain an important goal for the Secretary-General, bearing in mind always the Charter requirement that the paramount consideration in the employment of staff be efficiency, competence and integrity. On the system of desirable ranges for the geographical distribution of staff, which the General Assembly is called upon to review at the forty-first Session, we note the various statistical exercises which have produced a number of alternative bases for the calculation of desirable ranges. The Twelve see no need at this time for a change in the basis for that calculation, although careful regard must continue to be paid to the methods and factors involved in such calculations.

The Twelve note from the comprehensive report (A/C.5/41/11) that the financial crisis has had an impact on the status of women in the Secretariat: although the percentage of women in posts subject to geographical distribution has increased since 1985, a change in the data base applied to the statistics obscures the considerable net loss of women in the profession categories, and we recognize the efforts being made to improve the present imperfect structure. While noting the proposals of the Secretary-General, however, the Twelve believe that the Secretariat, despite its best efforts, cannot fully realize its objective of improving the status of women in the Secretariat, unless member States identify and nominate sufficient numbers of qualified women candidates.

The Twelve welcome the submission this year of the report in the situation of the staff in the General Service category. (A/C.5/41/29). Constituting 70% of the total of UN staff and with a great variety of skills, the General Service are no less deserving of attention by the General Assembly than the professional and higher categories. While the subject falls somewhat outside the present agenda item, the Twelve note the long-standing issue of the General Service job classification exercise in New York before this Committee.

On the administration of justice in the UN, the Twelve welcome the Secretary-General's report on the possible establishment of an Ombudsman, and in particular the new measures to streamline appeals procedures. The Twelve can see certain merits in the proposal for an Ombudsman: but they would wish to be sure that such an institution would be an improvement and not just an addition to the many layers of administration already existing in the area of administration of justice.

Mr Chairman, even in a brief statement, we cannot fail to mention factors which this year exert a major influence over the personnel area and indeed over almost all other areas of UN endeavour, namely the financial crisis, the freeze on recruitment and the proposals of the Group of Eighteen. Any substantial reductions in staff must inevitably affect the environment in which the Office of Personnel Services seeks to implement the various legislative instructions in the personnel field. In the circumstances now prevailing, the task of implementing those instructions and achieving the goals set out will be still more difficult. None the less increased emphasis is rightly being placed on training, career development, rotation and mobility of staff. The Twelve support all of these activities as they do the need for improved methods of performance evaluation and recruitment (and through competitive examination where possible). The Twelve consider that the pressures upon the Secretary-General are very real, and member States should be more than usually aware of his prerogatives as Chief Administrative Officer while legislative mandates must of course remain as his guide. In this respect we recognize that the freeze on recruitment must, as soon as conditions allow, give way to the hiring of some new blood without which the Organization will surely stagnate. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.5/41/PV.32, item 117.

## **86/372. Statement in the Sixth Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Development and Strengthening of Good-Neighbourliness Between States<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 21 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Edwards:* Mr Chairman, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community.

The Twelve would like to take this opportunity to reaffirm their belief that the strengthening and development of relations between neighbouring States can make a substantial contribution to the cause of international peace and security. Their own wide and close cooperation within the framework of the Community and its institutions is testimony to what can be achieved and the benefits it brings.

However, while the Twelve recognize that the concept of good-neighbourliness can imply respect for and implementation of important principles and rules of international law, which are already well established, they continue to question whether the notion itself corresponds to any separate principle of international law. They believe that there would be little practical use in continuing attempts to identify a concept that could somehow be considered as the basis for a new legal principle when we already have all the laws we need.

At this session several versions of a working paper were prepared by the Romanian and Polish delegations. The discussion in the Sub-Committee consisted largely of a debate on the classification and arrangement of the numerous elements and areas of cooperation identified in this working paper. As recognized in the report of the Sub-Committee, the task of identifying the elements of good-neighbourliness has not been completed and in the view of the Twelve, it is clear that many delegations are unhappy with the elements listed in the working paper and are concerned at the repetition it contains. This is also confirmed by the general reservations made by various delegations during meetings of the Sub-Committee. Moreover, the list as it now stands (though as yet incomplete and not agreed) raises doubts as to whether this kind of approach can provide any kind of basis for the preparation of an international document: or, indeed, as to whether such a document is the appropriate objective to pursue on this item.

The Twelve believe that discussion in the Sub-Committee at this session has highlighted the elusive nature of the subject and, in particular, the risk of duplication carried with it. As pointed out in the report of the Sub-Committee, a great deal of work remains to be done.

As they said last year, the Twelve consider it important that efforts be made to rationalize the work of our Organization so that better use can be made of its rapidly dwindling resources. The Twelve believe that the exercise should not consist of repeating or reformulating existing principles and rules already adequately reflected in the Charter of the United Nations and in the 1970 Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

They consider that discussion in the Sub-Committee, both this year and last, has shown quite clearly that most aspects of this topic have already been dealt with elsewhere and that what is important is the fulfilment by States of their international obligations, particularly those contained in the UN Charter.

In view of the Twelve, the decision as to what should be done in order to complete consideration of this item requires further reflection in the light of the discussion of the elements of good-neighbourliness. Such reflection should occur within the framework of an overall consideration as to the best use of the resources of the Sixth Committee.

A draft resolution on this subject, prepared by the delegation of Romania, is being circulated informally. The Twelve take the view that all that is needed is a short decision, similar to last year's, that discussion of this agenda item should continue and be completed next year in a Sub-Committee. We hope that it will be possible during the next day or two for such a decision to be agreed upon. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.6/41/SR.50, item 133.

### **86/373. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Question of Palestine<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 25 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Sir John Thomson:* Mr President, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community.

The Question of Palestine remains not only one of the longest-lasting items on the agenda of the General Assembly, but one of the central preoccupations of the United Nations in its efforts to ensure peace and stability in the Middle East region. The year that has passed since the item was last debated has shown, despite efforts made on various sides, disappointingly little progress towards a solution. We continue to place hope in the willingness of the parties directly involved to renew their attempts to reach a peaceful, just and comprehensive settlement, since it is they who have the chief responsibility and means for doing so.

That the search for a solution should be carried out without recourse to violence, and in particular terrorism, goes without saying. Such activities can only make matters worse and impede the achievement of a peaceful solution. What is required, on the contrary, is the creation of an atmosphere of trust and understanding which would allow a fruitful dialogue to take place. One contribution the General Assembly can make directly to creating such an atmosphere is the avoidance in our debates of harsh and divisive language.

Mr President, the Twelve have made clear the principles which we consider apply to any solution of the Question of Palestine. Such a solution will have to be based on Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, and include the right to existence and to security of all States in the region, including Israel, and justice for all peoples of the region and the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people, with all that this implies. These principles apply to all the parties concerned, including the Palestinian people and the Palestine Liberation Organization, which will have to be associated with negotiations.

We have repeatedly stressed our conviction that Israel will only obtain the security and recognition to which it has a right by seeking a negotiated settlement and in particular by satisfying the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people. The Twelve wish to see the Palestinian people in a position to pursue their demands by political means, and consider that the achievement of these should take account of the need to recognize and respect the existence and security of all. We continue to believe that it is neither wise nor just for one party to seek to deny the other the rights that it claims for itself.

The resolution of the problems between Israel and its neighbours should be based on the Charter principles of non-recourse to the use of force and of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war. In accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 and 338, Israel must put an end to the territorial occupation it has maintained since the conflict of 1967.

The Twelve have repeatedly indicated the principles on which we base our position concerning these territories, to which the provisions of the Fourth Hague Convention of 1907 and the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 are applicable until such a time as an end is put, within the framework of a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement, to the territorial occupation which Israel has maintained since 1967. We are deeply concerned that the excessively severe application of some Israeli policies in the area continues to cause tension and unrest. We wish to make clear also our real and grave concern about recent Israeli statements indicating an intention to extend settlements in the occupied territories. We reaffirm our position that these settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, as well as any change in the status and demographic structure of these territories are illegal under international law and constitute a serious obstacle to peace efforts. The continuation of these policies can only undermine the basis of dialogue and trust which is essential for any constructive negotiation aimed at achieving a comprehensive peace settlement. We furthermore reiterate that the Israeli annexation of East Jerusalem, and its decision to extend its law, jurisdiction and administration to the Golan Heights, are contrary to international law and therefore invalid.

Mr President, we in the Twelve have long sought to give practical expression to our commitment to assisting in the achievement of a peaceful solution to the Arab/Israeli conflict. An example of this is the aid the European Community has provided to the occupied territories since 1981. Furthermore, the Community and its Member States continue to play a major part in supporting UNRWA. We have recently decided to increase substantially our support for UNRWA's educational programmes. More significantly, the Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the European Community held in Luxembourg on 27 October approved new measures to help the Palestinian populations in the West

Bank and Gaza. These comprise a separate programme of aid worth 3 million ECU which will bring together all existing European Community technical and financial assistance. They also give preferential access to the European Community market for Palestinian industrial exports originating in the occupied territories, which will enter free of tariff, and for their main agricultural exports, which will enjoy tariff reductions of between 40 and 80%.

Mr President, the measures I have just described, being essentially humanitarian in their purpose and economic in their nature, are not intended to be and can never be a substitute for determined efforts to seek a political solution to the Question of Palestine. It remains our firm belief that this can only be found, in accordance with the principles set out in the Venice Declaration and in subsequent statements by the Twelve, in a comprehensive, just and lasting peace achieved through peaceful negotiations. We recognize the urgency of this task, and we stand ready to do all within our power to contribute to such a settlement.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/41/PV.85, item 35.

### **86/374. Statement in the Special Political Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning International Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 25 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Godson:* Mr Chairman, I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community, in order to make some comments on agenda item 72.

The Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space has made a valuable contribution to the process of exchanging ideas and information on the peaceful exploration of space, and to the corpus of international law relevant to outer space. Delegations will recall the significant role played by the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, (COPUOS), in the elaboration of treaties on principles governing the activities of States in the exploration and use of outer space: the rescue and return of astronauts: the registration of space objects: and the question of international liability for damage caused by space objects. More recently, the Committee reached agreement on a set of draft principles on the remote sensing of the earth from space. These encouraging successes resulted from patient negotiations. It is our hope that COPUOS will be able to build on these important achievements in the future.

There is no doubt that greater cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space will lead to a better understanding and mutual trust between States, thus contributing to a more constructive international atmosphere. In order to achieve this, however, it is important that COPUOS should keep to the course charted for it when it was established.

COPUOS is unproductive when it is side-tracked by issues outside its mandate. For example, the Twelve see no advantage in discussing in COPUOS, as some delegations persistently seek to do, questions relating to arms control in outer space. The Twelve acknowledge that there is genuine and general concern about the dangers that an arms race in outer space would pose. We fully share those concerns and we have supported numerous UN resolutions to that effect. But the issue is complex and must be set in its proper context. Carrying the debate into forums not properly concerned with disarmament is likely to lead only to confusion and a blurring of the real issues. These are already under discussion in United Nations bodies specifically created to deal with arms control and disarmament matters.

It is also important to understand that there are already a number of constraints on what can and cannot be done legitimately in outer space. It has long been established, for example, that international law including the Charter of the United Nations, applies to the exploration and use of outer space. Moreover, there are several international agreements that contain specific provisions relating to arms control in outer space. Thus a framework of international obligations designed to prevent an arms race in outer space already exists.

It is up to the relevant forums to see if and how that framework can be improved. The Twelve accordingly welcomed the re-establishment of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Outer Space in the Conference on Disarmament, which has done some useful work in this area. In addition, we hope that the US/Soviet bilateral negotiations in Geneva, which address many of these interrelated issues, will also be successful.

Returning now to the work of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, we are encouraged by signs of a growing recognition amongst its members of the need to enhance the scientific and technical content of the work of COPUOS. In addition, the successful conclusion of draft principles on remote sensing, to which I referred earlier, is a practical illustration of how patient and energetic cooperation can pay dividends. Worthwhile results are possible provided the Committee works from a mutually acceptable basis. The Twelve therefore welcome the agreement reached by the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space with regard to the identification of a new agenda item for the Legal Sub-Committee. Member States of the Twelve have put forward to discussing these, together with other proposals, at the Sub-Committee's next session.

Mr Chairman, turning now to a more general but equally important matter, the financial crisis confronting the United Nations has been very much at the forefront of discussions during this session of the General Assembly. And understandably so. Speaking in the General Assembly on 23 September on behalf of the European Community and its twelve Member States, the British Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Sir Geoffrey Howe, said (and I quote:)

Greater budgetary discipline, improved coordination and vigorous adherence to priorities can only strengthen the Organization.

The Twelve delegations on whose behalf I am speaking wish to emphasize that it is incumbent upon each and every member State to ensure that existing facilities are used properly, fully and effectively before thinking about the creation of new and costly bureaucratic machinery. This is all the more important where there is no convincing need for new institutions.

COPUOS itself can make an important contribution to a healthier, more effective United Nations. There is room for improving the manner in which the Committee functions, including using the time allotted to it more efficiently. Some suggestions for achieving this have been put forward, including those contained in working paper A/AC.105/L.163, and the Twelve recommend that this issue be given further consideration.

The commitment of the Twelve to international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space speaks for itself. Sponsored training programmes in remote sensing principles, of particular benefit to developing countries; the promotion of cooperation in civil space sciences between Eastern and Western countries, the encounter of the spacecraft Giotto with Halley's Comet earlier this year, which involved cooperation between the European Space Agency, the Soviet Union and Japan; progress in telecommunications including European Community/European Space Agency cooperation on a prospective satellite-centred telecommunications system for Africa. These are but a few examples of the way in which Member States of the Twelve are engaged in developing and pooling their knowledge and expertise with other countries.

The advent of the space age has opened up exciting prospects of rewards, and challenges, hitherto unknown. Shared experience, knowledge and true cooperation will become increasingly important as the technical and scientific problems encountered assume even greater complexity and diversity. The Twelve will continue to promote actively collaboration between nations in these and related areas as the frontiers of outer space are gradually rolled back. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/SPC/41/PV. or SR.36, item 72.

### **86/375. Statement in the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Programme of Work of the Third Committee<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 25 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

I have asked for the floor to make an explanation of vote before the vote on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community on the draft decision in document L.80.

The Twelve agree that there is a need for considerable rationalization in the Assembly's work. We are active in this Committee as elsewhere in seeking ways of achieving this. Biennial consideration of certain items certainly has an important part to play, and we would strongly support any balanced and rational proposals to that end.

But any measures aimed at rationalization must be seen in the context of the whole of the Committee's work. The Twelve find that the draft decision does not meet this criterion. The items suggested for biennial consideration do not represent a balance of the different sorts of issues considered by the Third Committee. Moreover, they create procedural problems and may even be defective in terms of the legislative authority on which the consideration of items by the Committee needs to be based. Nor does the proposal go far enough to meet the avowed objectives of the sponsors to make substantial economies of time.

We think a better way to proceed would be to have an item on our agenda next year to consider biennialization of issues in the Third Committee. This should be done in a general and systematic way in order to achieve a balanced agenda and avoid mandate and procedural difficulties.

If, nevertheless, the text is put to the vote, the Twelve will abstain.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/C.3/41/SR.56, 57, L.80.

### **86/376. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Situation in the Middle East<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 28 November 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Gore-Booth:* Mr President, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community.

A few days ago, in the debate under item 35 of the agenda on the Question of Palestine, we had occasion to set out in detail the views of the Twelve on the Arab-Israeli dispute, which traditionally has been regarded as the conflict central to the problems of the Middle East. Without wishing to understate the importance we attach to the solution of that conflict, I shall confine myself today only to a summary of our well-established position, which has been set out in the Venice Declaration and in subsequent statements. Speaking on the 23rd of September in the General Debate on behalf of the European Community and of its twelve Member States, my Foreign Minister Sir Geoffrey Howe reaffirmed that a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute can be achieved only through negotiation. He appealed on behalf of the Twelve to the parties concerned, the Arab States, Israel and the Palestinian people, to open the door to peace by recognizing each other's rights.

It has consistently been our view, Mr President, that any solution to the dispute should be based upon Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, and include the right to existence and to security of all States in the region, including Israel, and justice for all peoples of the region and the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people, with all that this implies. These principles should be clearly and unambiguously accepted by all. They apply to all the parties concerned, including the Palestinian people and the Palestine Liberation Organization, which will have to be associated with negotiations.

In accordance with Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, we believe that Israel must put an end to the occupation of Arab territories it has maintained since 1967. The resolution of the problems between Israel and its neighbours should be based on the principles of non-recourse to the use of force and the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. As we have made clear in previous debates, we consider that the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention are applicable to the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967. Any change in the status and demographic structure of these territories,

including the establishment of settlements, are illegal under international law. We furthermore reiterate that the Israeli annexation of East Jerusalem, and its decision to extend its law, jurisdiction and administration to the Golan Heights, are contrary to international law and therefore invalid.

The cycle of violence engendered by the continuing failure to find political solutions to the conflict has made the search for peace even more difficult. We deplore such violence, from whatever quarter it may come. Where it takes the form of terrorism, as we have also made clear in recent statements, we firmly believe that such acts are never justified, and do not serve whatever political cause the perpetrators claim to be furthering.

Mr President, the situation between Israel and her Arab neighbours is not the only focus of tension in the Middle East. The continuing violence and fighting in Lebanon, and the lack of progress in achieving a political solution to Lebanon's problems, remain a matter of grave concern to us. The Foreign Ministers of the Twelve meeting in The Hague made this clear in their statement on 27 June, and referred in particular to the escalation of violence involving the civilian population in Beirut, especially the Palestinians in refugee camps, and leading to the heavy loss of life and property on all sides. Fighting of this nature there and in Tyre and Sidon has continued. We reaffirm the need for the parties concerned to exercise restraint, to make efforts to end the present bloodshed and to allow organizations such as UNRWA and the International Committee of the Red Cross to operate freely.

Another source of tension in Lebanon is the continuing occupation of a part of Lebanese soil by Israeli forces. Not only is this unacceptable in itself, but it leads to continuing friction and violence, and prevents UNIFIL's deployment to the border and the fulfilment of its mandate from the Security Council. A solution to the problems confronting UNIFIL and Southern Lebanon will not be possible without a complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory in accordance with the resolutions of the Security Council. The continuing support for the Force given by the Twelve, three of whose Members are among the troop-contributors, remains as strong as ever. We reaffirm that the sovereignty, unity, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon must be respected. We share the serious view taken by the Secretary-General in his report on the Situation in the Middle East for this year (A/41/768 and S/18427) of the dangers inherent in the continuing instability in Lebanon, with the risk of an outbreak of serious hostilities.

In speaking of Lebanon, Mr President, we should once again express our grave concern for the fate of all hostages, both Lebanese nationals and foreigners, held in that country, and appeal strongly on humanitarian grounds for their release as soon as possible. Several of these are nationals of Community countries, including my own. I should like, if I may, to add, on a personal note, my feelings of sympathy for the families of Alec Collett, whose brave wife lives here in New York, and of John McCarthy.

Mr President, another conflict in the Middle East region about which the Twelve are seriously concerned is that between Iran and Iraq, now in its seventh year. The appalling human suffering it has brought, together with the material harm done to the well-being of people on both sides, has rightly caused horror and dismay in every country in the world. The continuing attacks on civilians are evidence of a disturbing tendency by both sides to ignore the provisions of humanitarian law in armed conflict, including the Geneva Conventions of 1949. The Twelve urge each Government to exercise maximum restraint, and to honour the undertakings given to the Secretary-General in June 1984 to cause deliberate attacks on civilian targets. We join in the strong condemnation of the use of chemical weapons in the fighting, evidence of which was accepted by the Security Council in its statement of 21 March, and which constitutes a contravention of the 1925 Geneva Protocol. We are in addition gravely concerned by the continuing occurrence of attacks on vessels flying the flag of States, including our own, which are not involved in the hostilities. We furthermore stress the importance we attach to the freedom of navigation and commerce in international waters, and to respect for the relevant international conventions and law, especially those dealing with the safety of civil aviation and maritime traffic.

The suffering and destruction caused by the war has gone on far too long. We appeal for the observance of an immediate cease-fire, a cessation of all hostilities, and withdrawal of all forces to the internationally recognized boundaries without delay, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 582 of February this year. We urge the parties to reflect urgently upon the opportunity this resolution offers for peace, and to comply with its provisions. We draw encouragement from the confidence

expressed by both sides in the Secretary-General, and we furthermore urge them to take advantage of his good offices. We reiterate our complete confidence in him and our full support for his efforts in this regard.

We are especially conscious of the danger posed to neighbouring countries of any escalation of the conflict. We call upon both sides to exercise restraint and to respect the territorial integrity of all States.

Mr President, the Twelve are fully aware of the wider dangers posed to international peace by the different points of tension and conflict in the region. We take due note of the observations in this regard contained in the Secretary-General's report this year on the situation in the Middle East. We renew our support for all the efforts he is making to assist in finding peaceful solutions, and we reaffirm our readiness to do all in our power to help bring such solutions about.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/41/PV.89, item 37.

### **86/377. Statement on Syria – the Hasi and Salameh Trials in Berlin**

Date of Issue: 29 November 1986

Place of Issue: London

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: The Twelve

Status of Document: Declaration

1. The Twelve have noted with serious concern the involvement of Syrian officials with Mr Ahmad Hasi and Mr Faruk Salameh who were convicted in Berlin (West) on 26 November 1986 on charges in connection with the explosion in the Berlin premises of the German-Arab Society on 29 March 1986. They note that a Berlin criminal court accepted as true the defendants' statements that the explosives used were provided by a Syrian office in Damascus and handed over to them by an official in the Syrian Embassy in Berlin (East).

2. They have all agreed that further joint action is essential to protect our citizens from any possible repetition of acts of terrorism. The Twelve reaffirm their strong condemnation of international terrorism and they are resolved to curb terrorism in all its forms. Terrorist attacks can never be justified and are a disservice to any political cause.

3. The Twelve stand firmly by the commitments in their previous statements, as well as their appeal for progress in the Euro-Arab Dialogue, and consider the measures taken by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany as consistent with these commitments.

4. The Twelve are maintaining close contact on the security implications of this case, in particular as regards the abuse of diplomatic immunity.

### **86/378. Press Release at the Occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People**

Date of Issue: 1 December 1986

Place of Issue: Unknown

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: The Twelve

Status of Document: Press Release

The twelve Member States of the European Community wish to reaffirm their commitment to the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

Speaking on 23 September in the General Debate on behalf of the European Community and of its twelve Member States, Sir Geoffrey Howe reaffirmed that a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement of the Arab/Israeli dispute can be achieved only through negotiation. All parties should clearly and unambiguously accept two principles: the right to existence and security of all States in the area,



including Israel, and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination with all that this implies. These principles apply to all the parties concerned, including the Palestinian people and the Palestine Liberation Organization, which will have to be associated with negotiations.

It has consistently been our view that any solution to the dispute should be based upon Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. In accordance with these, we believe that Israel must put an end to the occupation of Arab territories it has maintained since 1967. The resolution of the problems between Israel and its neighbours should be based on the principles of non-recourse to the use of force and the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. As we have made clear in several debates during this Session, we consider that the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention are applicable to the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967. Any change in the status and demographic structure of these territories, including the establishment of settlements, are illegal under international law. We furthermore reiterate that the Israeli annexation of East Jerusalem, and its decision to extend its law, jurisdiction and administration to the Golan Heights, are contrary to international law and therefore invalid.

### **86/379. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Resolutions on the Question of Palestine<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 2 December 1986

Place of Issue: New York

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Birch:* Mr President, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community.

Our views on the subject of this debate were set out in full in our statement made on 25 November. In that statement we reaffirmed that we stand ready to do all within our power to contribute to a comprehensive, just and lasting peace achieved through peaceful negotiations.

The Twelve recognize that an International Peace Conference on the Middle East could make a major contribution to the achievement of a negotiated settlement. We believe that the principle and nature of such a conference need first to be agreed upon by the parties concerned. For this to happen, the present gap between the parties would also clearly need to be narrowed. The same considerations apply to any form of Preparatory Committee. The Twelve wish to see all possible efforts made to bring the parties to negotiations, and stand ready to provide assistance, in their collective or national capacities, in whatever way they can.

The Twelve welcome the fact that the draft resolution in document A/41/L.41 no longer contains a number of elements which we considered objectionable in the resolution on this subject last year. We appreciate the efforts that have been made. However there are still a number of elements which cause us difficulties. A particular difficulty concerns the call made in the draft for the convening of a pre-determined form of International Conference. For negotiations to have any chance of success it is essential to avoid prejudging the form in which they may be held, which should be agreed upon by the parties directly concerned.

Finally, Mr President, with regard to the draft resolutions contained in documents A/41/L.38-40, which remain largely unchanged from last year, the Twelve have previously made their positions known. In addition we would prefer as a matter of principle that due account be taken of the financial difficulties currently facing the Organization in determining the tasks of the bodies concerned.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/41/PV.93, item 35.

**86/380. Statement at the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Resolutions on the Situation in the Middle East<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 4 December 1986  
Place of Issue: New York  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN  
Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Huxter:* Mr President, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community.

Our views on the principles which need to be applied to solving the conflicts of the Middle East were set out in full in our statement in this debate on 28 November.

Clearly we have serious reservations about the first two of the draft resolutions before the Assembly under this item. We are concerned by their lack of balance, and by the fact that they do not reflect basic principles which we consider essential for a solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Furthermore, we cannot accept language criticizing a Permanent Member of the Security Council for having exercised its rights in accordance with the Charter.

We are, however, glad to support the third draft resolution under this item, and in this regard wish to recall the importance we attach to Security Council Resolution 478 (1980).

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/41/PV.97, item 37.

**86/381. Explanation of Vote in the Plenary Session of the UN General Assembly Concerning the Draft Resolution on a Trade Embargo Against Nicaragua<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 5 December 1986  
Place of Issue: New York  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: British Delegation to the UN  
Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Field:* Mr President, before action is taken on draft resolution II on the trade embargo against Nicaragua I would like to make the following statement on behalf of the European Community and its twelve Member States.

Mr President, we shall not oppose this resolution.

However, we deeply regret the procedures followed in the Second Committee before the adoption of this resolution, which led the US to decide that there was no point in pressing its attempts to have its amendments considered by the Committee. We believe it is the right of any member State of the United Nations to have its proposals or amendments considered on their merits. I should add that the Community was disappointed that we were not able to take action on the US proposal that this resolution should be dealt with under item 42, 'Situation in Central America'.

Furthermore, there are numerous aspects to the complex situation in Central America, as emerged in the debate in the plenary under item 42. Many of the US proposed amendments to the present resolution are relevant in this regard. In this sense too the Second Committee ought to have been afforded the opportunity to consider these amendments.

Mr President, we have made clear our desire to contribute to the establishment of peace and to the economic development of Central America. At San José in September 1984 and at Luxembourg in 1985 the Twelve established a political dialogue with the countries of Central America to underline their support for the Contadora process. We shall meet again in February 1987 in Guatemala City. The

European Community and its Member States have also signed a cooperation agreement with these countries. It is our belief that such links will help these countries to overcome the problems which they face. Thank you Mr President.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A/41/PV.98, item 79 [A].

## **86/382. Conclusions of the European Council (Abstract)**

Date of Issue: 6 December 1986

Place of Issue: London

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: European Council

Status of Document: Conclusions of the European Council

### *Safeguarding the open society*

The European Council had a detailed discussion of how further to intensify their cooperation to combat terrorism, illegal immigration and drug trafficking. They agreed that concerted policies to deal with these problems were essential to the goal of achieving free movement within the Community as set out in the Single European Act.

### *Terrorism*

They agreed that the following principles must govern their common fight and alliance against terrorism and those who sponsor terrorist acts:

- a) no concessions under duress to terrorists or their sponsor;
- b) solidarity between the Member States in their efforts to prevent terrorist crimes and to bring the guilty to justice;
- c) concerted action in response to terrorist attacks on the territory of a Member State and to evidence of external involvement in such attacks.

The Heads of Government confirmed the decisions taken by the Twelve in April and November 1986 in response to evidence of State-sponsored terrorism. The Heads of Government welcomed the intention of the Governments of France, Greece and Ireland to ratify the European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism.

### *Cooperation between security authorities*

Heads of State and Government agreed that they must pool their resources to maximize their ability to prevent terrorist acts and to bring those responsible to justice. They agreed also to intensify their cooperation with like-minded countries.

### *Asylum seekers*

The Heads of State and Government expressed concern at the recent increase in the abuse of appeals for asylum. While they underlined their continued willingness to give asylum where there was genuine humanitarian justification for doing so, they agreed that asylum should not be sought for economic and financial reasons and that steps must be taken to counter abuse. They invited Interior and Justice Ministers to concert action with a view to ensuring that the right of asylum is not abused.

### *Action by the relevant Ministers*

The European Council asked relevant Ministers to concert:

- a) arrangements for extradition. They welcomed the changes being made by the United Kingdom to its extradition laws which will enable it to adhere to the European Convention on Extradition;
- b) measures to deal with the theft and forgery of passports;
- c) consideration of the role of coordination and possible harmonization of visa regimes in tightening controls at the Community's external frontiers;
- d) intensified cooperation on measures to prevent illegal immigration;

e) firm action on the exclusion of suspects so that a suspect excluded from one Community country will be excluded from all.

At the same time, the Community and the Member States will be examining what further action they can take to simplify frontier procedures within the Community, for the benefit of all their citizens.

In order to strengthen their defences against terrorism while making travel easier for the Community tourist and businessman, they endorsed the action of Interior Ministers in setting in hand a study of how to strengthen controls at the Community's external frontiers. Heads of Government agreed to examine the progress made at their next meeting, determined that their solidarity in the face of the terrorist threat to the safety of their citizens should be put into practice at every level of cooperation.

#### *Drugs*

Heads of Government decided that the Community and the Member States must continue to contribute to the fight against drug abuse. They endorsed the Seven Point Action Programme of work agreed by Interior Ministers and noted that agreement had been reached for the Community to participate as an observer in the UN Conference on Drugs.

They agreed on the need to work in close cooperation with the Council of Europe's Pompidou Group to:

- a) cooperate to thwart and to prosecute those who criminally traffic in illegal drugs;
- b) coordinate legal action and, in particular, ensure that the assets of someone convicted of illicit trafficking in one Community country will be liable to confiscation throughout the Community;
- c) exchange Drugs Liaison Officers between EC countries and continue posting such officers to other countries;
- d) intensify cooperation between police and customs authorities;
- e) seek recommendations from EC ambassadors in drug-producing countries on further ways in which the EC can help, including possible use of bilateral and Community aid to bolster those countries' own efforts to end drug production and trafficking;
- f) concert their contributions to the 1987 UN Conference;
- g) work closely with other friendly countries;
- h) draw on each other's expertise in the treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts and work together to educate teachers, parents and children about the dangers of drug abuse.

Each Member State has its own problems and ways of dealing with them but there are lessons which will apply to all. The European Council called for a report to be made to the next European Council with recommendations for actions by the Community and its Member States.

#### *Public health*

The European Council recalled that at their meeting in The Hague they had requested the Council of Ministers to reach agreement on an action programme against cancer, and agreed that 1989 should be designated European Cancer Information Year. The aim will be to develop a sustained and concerted information campaign in all Member States on the prevention, early warning and treatment of cancer.

The European Council expressed its concern about the rising incidence of AIDS. They stressed the importance of coordinating national campaigns to improve public awareness about the disease and prevent its spread.

They asked the Council of Ministers and the Commission to ensure the effective Community-wide exchange of information about the spread of the disease, prevention and treatment and to consider what further cooperative measures should be taken by all the Member States. They agreed to consider also the scope for further cooperation in research.

### **86/383. Statement by the European Council on Afghanistan**

Date of Issue: 6 December 1986

Place of Issue: London

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: European Council

Status of Document: Conclusions of European Council

As the seventh year of Soviet occupation comes to a close, the European Council again draws attention to the very serious situation facing the people of Afghanistan and neighbouring countries.

Over 110 000 Soviet troops remain in Afghanistan to prosecute a bitter and repressive war. Their presence violates international peace and security and endangers the stability of the region. Five million Afghans have been forced to flee their country. The Afghan people are still denied their freedom and independence. Large scale violations of human rights in Afghanistan continue to engender massive suffering.

The European Council supports the United Nations Secretary-General's search for a political settlement based on principles overwhelmingly endorsed by the international community. The Council again calls on the Soviet Union to agree to a rapid and complete withdrawal of its forces.

### **86/384. Statement on the Results of the London European Council Meeting of 5 and 6 December 1986<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 9 December 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Report on European Council

*Ms Thatcher, President-in-Office of the European Council:* Mr President, I was privileged in 1981 to be the first Head of Government holding the Presidency of the Community to report to you on the outcome of a European Council. Since then the tradition of such reports has become well established and it is no less a privilege today, five years later, to be the first Head of Government to deliver the report for the second time.[...]

As is traditional, Heads of Governments and Foreign Ministers discussed a number of issues in political cooperation. We had a thorough discussion of East-West relations and arms control. Those of us whose countries are members of the NATO Alliance have recently set out our views in the *communiqué* of the NATO Defence Ministers meeting. We all agreed that East-West relations are not just a matter of arms control. In particular, human rights are an essential factor in building confidence between East and West.

At the Vienna Conference, reviewing compliance with the Helsinki Final Act, we are insisting on a thorough review of how each country has respected its commitments to human rights. In some cases it is a sad story. We know the plight of those in the Soviet Union who argue not to overthrow the system but simply for the implementation of what was agreed in Helsinki. Yuri Orlov has emerged from nine years's imprisonment to tell us himself of his bitter experiences. People like Mr Orlov cannot speak out in the Soviet Union. But the Twelve can speak up for them, and we must do so in Vienna during the coming weeks.

We also recalled the Soviet Union's shameful occupation of Afghanistan, now reaching the end of its seventh year. We once more called on the Soviet Union to end the agony of the Afghan people, including the four million Afghans who have been forced to flee their country, by a rapid and complete withdrawal of Soviet forces.

Mr President, within the institutions of the European Community there may be an inclination to see relations with the United States through the prism of commercial disputes. Certainly, they are important, and we must stand up strongly for Europe's interests when they are threatened.

But Europe must also take a wider view. There are new hopes and prospects for reducing nuclear weapons. But we must ensure that they are realized without damage to Europe's security. The shared American-European experience of the war years is moving steadily further into the past. The new generations on both sides of the Atlantic are less influenced by the memory of wartime cooperation. Yet the habit of working together across the Atlantic has never been more necessary that it is now.

Over the past few years we have seen the United States regain its confidence and pride and offer once again strong leadership in defence of our democratic values. We should never fail to give thanks for the outstanding generosity which leads the United States to keep 330 000 servicemen and their families in Europe.

We must not forget either that anything which weakens America weakens Europe and the whole free world.

My conclusion is that in building the European Community we must not only look inwards to our own institutions and policies but also outwards to building up the Atlantic relationship. And let us never forget that the aftermath of war produced two great ideas which have shaped our destiny ever since. One was the NATO Alliance, the other the European Community.

Mr President, I shall conclude by quoting some words from a remarkable speech by President von Weizsäcker to both Houses of Parliament in London earlier this year. Speaking of our European Community he said:

We have still not fulfilled the expectations, nor have we exhausted our potentialities. But they exist. The Americans urge the Europeans to use their weight and act in cohesion. The people of central and eastern Europe place their hopes in us. The Third World depends on us Europeans meeting our share of the responsibility for their well-being.

Yet he went on:

We still seem to lack the courage of our own convictions. But if we really take our convictions seriously and think of our children's future, why shouldn't that courage come?

Mr President, it is a mark of how far we have come within Europe that a British Prime Minister should stand before the European Parliament and use the words of a German President.

I would like to see us find that courage, courage to face up not only to the challenges *within* our societies, such as unemployment, and the challenges to our societies from outside, such as terrorism and drugs, but also the challenge of realizing our common European strength to ensure the further spread of democracy and freedom and justice in the wider world.

I hope that the British Presidency and the London European Council have taken us a further step down that road.

[*Upon the ensuing debate, Ms Thatcher stated, moreover:*] There has been a great deal said about matters like terrorism and drugs, and I think pretty nearly all the things that we did have really been very widely welcomed from all parts of this Chamber. It has been suggested that we did not discuss the Middle East, Central America, South Africa. We discussed some of these matters and the Foreign Ministers discussed others. There was a discussion on South Africa. There is nothing further to report on that from the position which we took up at The Hague.

We are very anxious that there is no progress being made in the Arab-Israel position in the Middle East. We are all very conscious of that fact, it does not augur well, and we are all very anxious that there should be some fresh impetus and fresh progress from the beginning of next year. The problems are the same: to define which Palestinians shall negotiate, because to many of us the PLO would not be acceptable, and to define those countries which would provide a kind of international background for the negotiations to take place.

Central America, I understand, was discussed by the Foreign Ministers. Doubtless there were different viewpoints as there were in the UN Assembly itself when we were one of the 47 countries who abstained on the motion before the Assembly on Nicaragua.

There have been comments about the twin pillars of the alliance. To me it is important that both should be strong. If you are going to have a bridge you have got to have two strong pillars to hold it up. And I must be absolutely frank: I am always very, very disturbed at any signs of anti-Americanism I find anywhere.

Yes, it is easy to speak in favour of peace. It is also easy to undermine that very peace which we all need for our future. Any suggestion of anti-Americanism, I think, is very, very ill-founded when they have 330 000 troops on the frontier of freedom which goes across our continent and their families are here as well.[...]

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *OJ* No 2-346 of 9 December 1986, pp. 41-68.

## 86/385. Question No H-409/86 by Mr Mavros Concerning the Implementation of European Parliament Resolutions on Cyprus

Date of Issue: 9 December 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

What is the attitude of the twelve Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation towards the European Parliament's successive resolutions on Cyprus and what practical measures do they intend to take in response to continually increasing Turkish provocation, which is producing an explosive situation in a country that has an association agreement with the EEC and is, at the same time, seriously jeopardizing Greek-Turkish relations?

*Ms Chalker, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers:* The Twelve have repeatedly stated that the problem of Cyprus remains an important matter of international concern. The Twelve have made clear in the European Parliament and elsewhere that they unconditionally support the independent sovereignty, territorial integrity and the unity of Cyprus in accordance with the relevant UN resolutions. They support the Secretary-General of the United Nations in his mission of good offices for a just and viable solution of the problem and continue to stress the need for all concerned to cooperate with him and to avoid actions that might make his task more difficult.

*Mr Mavros (S):* What response are the twelve Foreign Ministers considering to Turkish provocations like the unprecedented visit to occupied Cyprus by the Turkish Prime Minister Ozal, and the frequent Turkish air and sea violations in the Aegean? Is not the EEC-Turkey Association Council a green light to Turkey for further provocations? Does it not make progress more difficult?

*Ms Chalker:* As I have made clear on previous occasions in this House, we shall continue to support the United Nations' initiative. I have to say also that provocation from wheresoever it may come will do nothing to help the problems of Cyprus. We know that one side may see actions by the other as provocative – this occurs in two directions – and I can only say to the honourable gentleman that we all have to bring as much influence as we can to bear on all sides to resolve this unsatisfactory situation.

*Mr Marshall (ED):* Would the Minister accept that all Members of this House welcome her statement in view of the human rights involved, the impact that the Cypriot problem has on the Western alliance and the great tragedy that the problem of missing persons in Cyprus still exists? Would the Minister agree that a solution to the Cypriot problem must be a precondition of Turkey joining the European Community?

*Ms Chalker:* Of course, where human rights are violated and people go missing and there is no information concerning their whereabouts, this is a situation to be deprecated wherever it occurs in any country. But I must also say to the honourable gentleman that there has to be improvement of human rights in all countries and that includes Turkey and steps have now been taken, although probably insufficient ones, throughout the country. There is no question of an application from Turkey for membership of the European Community and I certainly cannot speculate on when or if such an application might be made. I would only say to the honourable gentleman that any application from any country outside the Twelve would have to be judged in the light of the criteria in Article 28 of the Association Agreement and indeed also, in Turkey's case, of the circumstances there and in the European Communities at that time. Article 28 of the Association Agreement states:

When operation of the Agreement has made it possible to envisage the full acceptance, by Turkey in this case, of the obligations arising out of the Treaty setting up the Community the contracting parties shall consider the possibility of Turkey's accession to the Community.

I think that makes it quite clear that what the honourable gentleman was in fact asking for will indeed happen, should an application ever be received.

*Mr Alavanos (COM):* I must say first of all that it really surprised me to hear the Minister, in her reply to Mr Mavros, talk of provocations from both sides, equating Turkey with Greece, and either ignoring or

pretending to ignore the fact that 40% of the territory of the Cypriot Republic is occupied not by the Greek army or other armies but by the Turkish army. I find this way of looking at things unacceptable, and it is at variance with what the Minister said earlier about the Council's positions.

Even though the talk sounds fine and the positions relayed to us by the Minister are in order, I would like to ask, in connection with Mr Marshall's question, to what degree this talk is only a guise for another policy, to what degree it really reflects the European Community's policy? And I would like to know why the Council is rejecting the European Parliament's amendments for the blocking of aid to Turkey, and why, though it could, it does not link this with the question of the Turkish army's occupation of part of Cyprus so as to make a practical contribution to establishing the preconditions for a settlement of this critical and explosive issue?

*Ms Chalker:* I do understand the concern of the Honourable Member, but I have to say to him in reply to the latter part of his question that I do not believe in any way that we have moved away from the position which we have always taken on this matter. Article 28 of the Association Agreement which I read out to the House just now, is no different from other similar articles in other association agreements which need to be there to cover these situations. I would further say to him that I did not equate Turkey with Greece. I simply said that provocation from wheresoever it comes is likely to meet with an opposite reaction and therefore it cannot help to solve a problem which is fundamentally one of disagreement. The only effect is simply to stir the matter up even further. What we are seeking through the United Nations is to find an acceptable solution to the situation in Cyprus and one where people can live peacefully alongside one another without these repeated incursions into one another's areas which cause so much trouble.

*President of the European Parliament:* Before calling the other supplementary questions I would point out to the House that there will be a debate tomorrow specifically on the problem of relations with Turkey. I would therefore ask Mr Hindley and Mr Lambrias to confine their questions to the problem of Cyprus.

*Mr Hindley (S):* Could I probe a little further the line taken by Mr Marshall? The President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers says there is no question of a Turkish application. Now we know that Turkey has been actively lobbying for entry to the EEC and that right-wing members of the Community have been sympathetic. Indeed, it has been said that Ms Chalker herself is sympathetic, so perhaps she would take the opportunity of confirming or denying that. When she says there is no question of Turkish application, could it be that Turkey has been dissuaded from making an application because representatives of the Community and representatives of the Presidency have pointed out to Turkey that it is out of the question for Turkey to apply as long as the Cyprus situation remains unsolved? Could she please confirm that? [...]

*Ms Chalker:* Could I point out to the honourable gentleman that I have never said I was sympathetic to anybody's application, particularly when an application has not been made. What I said in answer to an earlier question was that we had received no application from the country concerned. That is the current situation. One only faces these questions when and if they arise.

I do not think this links particularly with what Mr Marshall was saying earlier. It may be that in the future there will be some application by some country which has associations with Cyprus. But I suggest to the House that the European Community must first absorb Spain and Portugal who are very welcome members. At a time when we are going through the transitional period with Spain and Portugal, I don't believe that there is any question of other applications being right for consideration by the European Council.

Where the Honourable Member, Mr Hindley, got his ideas from I really do not know. But I can assure him that what I've said to him now is the exact situation.

*Mr Lambrias (PPE):* The reply the honourable lady gave to Mr Mavros, though she did afterwards try to soften the impression when answering Mr Alavanos's supplementary, obliges me to put the question more clearly: has Greece engaged in any provocative action which would warrant saying that the Council deplores provocation from wheresoever it comes? Even taking the remark as suppositional, talk like that after the one side has suffered twelve continuous years of occupation and injustice, and without there being the slightest evidence of provocation by that side, is unfortunate to say the least. And I would like



to say that bearing in mind the twelve-year occupation of Cyprus the Council's strictures on the avoidance of provocation look like a watering-down of its position, because the substantive actions which would come from the operation of a correct policy towards the perpetrators of the injustice and those on the sharp end of it, and indicate a sincere desire to do something, are just not there.

*Ms Chalker:* I can well understand why Mr Lambrias finds twelve years occupation of part of Cyprus unsatisfactory. When I spoke about provocation from whichever quarter the provocation comes, I was referring to the situation where you have a major disagreement – in this case, on Cyprus.

On Cyprus, which is what this question is about, the United Nations have put forward proposals. The Greek Government has not found it possible to accept the proposals put forward, and that is why the Twelve have always said that the Secretary-General of the United Nations should seek to find proposals acceptable to both sides in order to resolve what is an unsatisfactory situation, about which the Honourable Member is rightly concerned.

### **86/386. Question No H-284/86 by Ms Castle Concerning South Africa**

Date of Issue: 9 December 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Will the Ministers give a report on what action has been agreed to increase EEC pressure on the South African Government to bring about an end to apartheid following their deliberations on the report on possible measures to take concerning the present situation in South Africa which was discussed at the European Council on 26 and 27 June?

*Ms Chalker, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers:* At their meeting at The Hague on 27 June, the twelve Heads of State and Government reaffirmed that the main goal of their policy towards South Africa is the total abolition of apartheid. The Twelve believe that the commencement without delay of a national dialogue involving the authentic leaders of the black population is essential to halt a further escalation of violence and to allow negotiations leading to a truly democratic and non-racial South Africa.

In this context the Twelve have repeatedly called on the South African Government to release unconditionally Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners and to lift the ban on the African National Congress, the Pan-African Congress of Anzania and other political parties.

In a further effort to establish conditions in which the necessary dialogue can commence, the United Kingdom Foreign Minister visited Southern Africa on behalf of the Twelve in July. In the absence of a positive response from the South African Government, the Twelve agreed in Brussels on 16 September to adopt a package of restrictive measures designed to impress upon the South African Government the need for urgent change. The measures were: a ban on new investment in South Africa, a ban on the import of iron and steel, and a ban on the import of gold coins. All these bans have been implemented.

On the question of a ban on imports of coal from South Africa, the Presidency undertook to continue to seek consensus on the basis of the statement made by the Hague European Council. The Foreign Ministers also undertook to work towards a programme of political action designed to promote the achievement of their objectives. They agreed on the importance of strengthening and improving the coordination of positive measures designed to help the victims of apartheid.

*Ms Castle (S):* In view of the humiliating treatment of the British Foreign Minister by the South African Government when he tried to carry out the remit of the Hague Summit, is it not time we moved from pious words to real action? Of all the measures listed at the Hague Summit, is not the most effective action that could be taken the ban on the importation of coal, since the value of these coal imports into the EEC is twice the value of all the other Hague measures put together? What has the UK Presidency been doing to try to get this effective action taken?

Also, what steps has the UK Presidency taken to carry out the recommendations of the European Parliament in its resolution of 10 July when it called for further measures, including, in particular, a ban on the import of agricultural products which would have a real effect on the Government of South Africa?

*Ms Chalker:* I thank the Honourable Member for her question. Like her, we were all appalled at the treatment by the President of South Africa of the UK Foreign Minister when he was seeking to bring people together in his tour of southern Africa in July of this year.

She talks about real action and asks what action is most effective. She believes it to be a ban on the import of coal. I repeat that the Presidency will continue to seek consensus on the basis of the Hague *communiqué*. However, we have to have unanimity in this matter. The United Kingdom is fully prepared to go along with the eleven other Member States on this issue.

I did note very carefully the steps recommended by the European Parliament in its 10 July resolution. But the problem has always been that the measures, particularly on agricultural produce, would hit hardest those who are already disadvantaged. I have in the course of my work had a very large number of representations from all colours, creeds and groups in South Africa, and I have been left in no doubt that a ban on agricultural produce would hard hit black and coloured workers in South Africa, whilst not getting at those people who are the perpetrators of apartheid and whose minds we wish to change.

We have to combine with industry in South Africa, which is seeking to change minds. We have to encourage the process of *indaba* and it is regrettable that the Natal *indaba* seems to have fallen on stony ground. I can only hope that all sides will come together in future *indabas* which may well lead the way to the sort of negotiation which must take place between all parties if we are to get the non-racial South Africa which not only this House but each and every single one of the Twelve is determined to achieve.

*Mr Seligman (ED):* I was going to ask about the views of the Twelve on the proposal for an *indaba* and I am sorry to hear the President-in-Office announce its failure. Is there any chance of resuscitating it by persuading the South African Government to do something to bring something like that back into being?

My second question is: are the front-line States, like Zimbabwe and Zambia, themselves carrying out the sanctions on trade with South Africa which they want us all to enforce? Are they following their own recommendations?

*Ms Chalker:* The Twelve have not fully discussed the Natal *indaba* in European political cooperation as yet. There have been discussions amongst certain members on an informal basis. Speaking for the UK, we have followed the progress of this *indaba* with interest.

There has in fact been no final rejection, but there have been many comments in the press to the effect that it was not welcomed by Mr Stefan Botha of Natal after very great efforts by all sides in the process leading up to *indaba*.

I believe that the Twelve will welcome joint efforts, such as this one in Natal, to reach agreement amongst all groups in South Africa. We shall certainly go on trying to find means of resuscitation, as the Honourable Member put it. Negotiations and compromise are clearly required if we are to see a solution to the awful problems of apartheid.

The Honourable Member then went on to ask about action taken by some of the front-line States in terms of their economic measures against South Africa. The two countries he mentioned, Zimbabwe and Zambia, have committed themselves to the Marlborough House package, but it is for each Commonwealth country to decide for itself which specific measures to take. Of course, in the case of the front-line States, their economic dependence on South Africa is clearly a major factor in deciding what they can reasonably do. If they should be very vulnerable to South African retaliation, that might explain why Zambia and Zimbabwe have not yet fully implemented the Marlborough House package.

One of the best ways that we can help, and indeed are seeking to help, these front-line States to withstand any possible retaliation which might occur is to aid the transport routes out of landlocked countries through Mozambique, so that these front-line States which are landlocked are not so dependent on the South African routes by which, if they are denied these routes, their trade can be effectively strangled.

*Mr Stewart (S):* The President-in-Office mentioned the possible release of Nelson Mandela. Is she aware of the plight of Oscar Metta, a human rights campaigner rotting in a South African prison? He was prevented from attending his wife's funeral. He is 77 years of age, suffers from severe diabetes and has had one leg amputated. Would she use her office to help secure the immediate release of Oscar Metta and to help bring about an end to such inhuman treatment by this pernicious regime?

*Ms Chalker:* Yes.

*Ms Ewing (RDE):* Is the President-in-Office aware of claims in today's *Independent* that 'a large-scale undercover operation has been launched to send arms to South Africa from the USA and Europe in defiance of US and international law?' While realizing that comment in detail may be difficult at this point, may I have an assurance that the Foreign Ministers will look into these claims?

*Ms Chalker:* No, I was not aware and, yes, the Foreign Ministers no doubt will look into such claims, but I haven't in fact yet had time to read them myself in the *Independent* today.

*Ms Simons (S):* The President-in-Office has just said that all twelve Governments are united in the fight against apartheid. What, then, does she think about the German Federal Government's allowing submarine plans to be sold to South Africa? Does she not see this as a flagrant violation of the measures jointly agreed on by the Community?

*Ms Chalker:* I am aware of press reports to this effect. I am not aware that the fact has been established. If the fact were to be established then the Twelve would deal with it in the ways that the honourable lady describes.

### **86/387. Question No H-341/86 by Sir Peter Vanneck Concerning the Secretariat for European Political Cooperation**

Date of Issue: 10 December 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

By what means will the Secretariat for European political cooperation, which is due to be established under Article 30 (10) (g) of the Single European Act, prepare and implement the activities of political cooperation?

And with what administrative matters will it be concerned?

*Answer:*

The Secretariat will work under the authority of the Presidency and will in addition to its head, consist of five officials seconded from Foreign Ministers and additional support staff. Its office will be in the Charlemagne Building and will include a meeting room specifically for EPC. The Secretariat will have its own connection to the Coreu telegram network.

The tasks of the European Political Cooperation Secretariat, as agreed by Ministers, will be the following:

- to assist the Presidency in preparing and implementing European political cooperation activities and in administrative matters;
- to assist the Presidency in ensuring the continuity of European political cooperation and its consistency with Community positions;
- to assist the Presidency in the organization of European political cooperation meetings, including the preparation and circulation of documents and the drawing up of minutes;
- to work with the European Correspondents Group in the preparation of conclusions and guidelines and in carrying out any task entrusted to the Group by the Political Committee;
- to assist the chairmen of Working Groups as regards procedures and precedents and the drafting of oral reports and studies;

- to assist the Presidency in the preparation of texts to be published on behalf of the Member States, including replies to Parliamentary questions and resolutions;
- to maintain the European political cooperation archives and assist the Presidency in preparing the six-monthly compilation of European political cooperation texts;
- to keep to date the body of European political cooperation working practices;
- to assist the Presidency, where appropriate, in contacts with third countries;
- to make the necessary arrangements to provide interpretation into all the official languages of the Community at meetings of Heads of State and Government as well as ministerial meetings;
- to ensure that all European political cooperation texts submitted to or adopted at these meetings are immediately translated into all the official Community languages.

As the Honourable Member will be aware, the Single European Act will only come into force once it has been ratified by all Member States.

**86/388. Question No H-366/86 by Mr Marshall Concerning the Plight of Mr Zalmon Aptermann and Ms Rimma Shmukler**

Date of Issue: 10 December 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Have the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation discussed the plight of Mr Zalmon Aptermann, a nonagenarian *refusenik*, and Ms Rimma Shmukler, who is a pensioner *refusenik*?

*Answer:*

The Twelve attach great importance to respect for the Provision in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights (1948) that every person has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country. The provisions in the Helsinki Final Act as well as those contained in the Madrid Concluding Document also pertain to the right to emigrate. This issue was raised specifically at the Ottawa Experts Meeting on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, as well as at the Berne Experts Meeting on Human Contacts. However the specific cases mentioned by the Honourable Member of Parliament have not been discussed within European political cooperation.

**86/389. Question No H-416/86 by Mr Pranchère Concerning the Conditions of Mr Turki, a Political Prisoner in Israel**

Date of Issue: 10 December 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

The health of Mr Turki, aged 73, who has been a political prisoner in Israel for twelve years, is deteriorating and it is vital that he receive treatment in France, for which the Israeli authorities have refused permission. Will the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation intervene to enable Mr Turki to receive the treatment he needs?

*Answer:*

Mr Turki, who had been in detention on terrorist charges, was released in 1985. Medical treatment is available to him in Israel. The Twelve have underlined their concern at abuses of human rights on numerous occasions and the Israeli authorities are well aware of this. One partner has made a bilateral *démarche* about the specific case of Mr Turki.

**86/390. Question No H-534/86 by Mr Bandrés Molet Concerning the EEC's Role in Promoting a Peaceful Solution to the Conflict in the Western Sahara**

Date of Issue: 10 December 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

The war which continues to rage in the Western Sahara is creating severe hardships for the peoples of Morocco and the Sahara. It involves mass mobilization of military equipment and troops and threatens the peace and stability of the whole region.

Do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation not feel that they should encourage the two parties to negotiate a peaceful and lasting solution to the conflict in the Western Sahara in accordance with OAU resolution HAG 104 and UN resolution 40/50?

*Answer:*

The Twelve fully support the UN Secretary-General's efforts to find a peaceful solution to the conflict. They have appealed to the parties to respond to these efforts.

**86/391. Question No H-544/86 by Ms Lizin Concerning the Fate of Prisoners of War Taken in the Conflict Between the Democratic Saharan Arab Republic and Morocco**

Date of Issue: 10 December 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Are the Foreign Ministers aware of the tragic situation of prisoners of war taken during the conflict between Morocco and the Democratic Saharan Arab Republic (DSAR) and have they raised this issue with the Moroccan authorities in an effort to find a human solution to the fate of these people, whom everyone has forgotten?

*Answer:*

The Twelve are aware of reports of the detention of personnel from both sides involved in the conflict between Morocco and [the] Saharan Arab Democratic Republic. The Twelve have made known on several occasions their concern over human rights violations. As to the Western Sahara conflict the Twelve appeal to the parties to respond positively to the UN Secretary-General's efforts to find a peaceful solution.

**86/392. Question No H-553/86 by Mr Campinos Concerning the Situation in southern Africa**

Date of Issue: 10 December 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

On 7 October, according to the international press, the Minister of Defence in the Botha Government, General Magnus Malan, delivered the following 'ultimatum' to Mozambique:

If President Samora Machel chooses terrorism and revolution, he will collide head-on with South Africa (...) which will react accordingly.

In view of the threatening nature of this statement, what action do the Ministers of Foreign Affairs meeting in political cooperation intend to take either as a preventive measure or in the event of renewed South African aggression against Mozambique or any other country in the area?

*Answer:*

The Twelve have repeatedly made clear their total condemnation of South Africa's armed incursions into neighbouring States. In a statement issued on 17 October 1986, the Twelve expressed their particular concern at reports that South Africa might be contemplating military action against Mozambique and urged the South African Government

to show full respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of their neighbours and to do nothing to worsen relations with those neighbours or to add to suffering in southern Africa.

The Twelve have frequently stressed the need for South Africa to resolve its problems with other countries in the region through peaceful means.

### **86/393. Question No H-561/86 by Ms Fontaine Concerning the Organization of an International Conference on the Middle East**

Date of Issue: 10 December 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

The European Parliament has declared itself in favour of the organization of an international conference at which all the countries involved in the Middle East peace process would be represented. Many Arab and European States have endorsed this initiative. What action do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation propose to take to further such a conference?

*Answer:*

The Twelve have repeatedly stated that the Middle East Conflict can only be settled through negotiation. They believe that an international conference would make a major contribution, if the gap between the parties can be narrowed and if they can agree on the principle and nature of such a conference.

The Twelve remain in close touch with all the parties concerned looking for ways to make progress towards a negotiated settlement.

### **86/394. Question No H-570/86 by Sir James Scott-Hopkins Concerning the Occupation of Afghanistan**

Date of Issue: 10 December 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

What representations has it made recently to the Soviet Government concerning the continuing occupation of Afghanistan by the Russian army? What pressure is it exerting on the Soviets designed to encourage the withdrawal of these forces?

*Answer:*

The Twelve have repeatedly made clear, most recently in the joint *communiqué* of the EC/ASEAN ministerial meeting, their view that the continuing Soviet occupation of Afghanistan is a matter for grave concern, and a major source of international instability. Equally, at the recent UNGA, the Twelve called on the Soviet Union to implement the UNGA Resolutions on Afghanistan, to withdraw all its troops and to agree without delay to an acceptable timetable for this withdrawal. Moreover, in bilateral representations with the Soviet Union, Member States of the Twelve never fail to impress upon the Soviet Union their strong disapproval of this continuing occupation.

### **86/395. Question No H-590/86 by Mr Arbeola Muru Concerning Nationalizations in the Republic of Burundi**

Date of Issue: 10 December 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Following the nationalization of Catholic schools seven years ago, the Government of the Republic of Burundi has recently abolished the 'Yaga Mukama' Catholic teaching programme for children in remote rural areas. Furthermore, by means of a circular from the Ministry of Education of 13 September, the Government of Burundi has nationalized Catholic seminaries, the only case of this kind in the whole of Africa.

Can the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation take steps to persuade the Government of Burundi to withdraw these recent measures or at least enter into discussions with the leaders of the Catholic church in that country?

*Answer:*

This question has not been discussed in European political cooperation.

### **86/396. Question No H-604/86 by Mr Ephremidis Concerning the Extension of the Moratorium on Nuclear Tests**

Date of Issue: 10 December 1986  
 Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

In answer to my Question H-390/86<sup>1</sup> on the extension of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests by the Soviet Union, the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation stated that they had not adopted a position on the matter. Meanwhile, despite the fact that the Soviet Union has renewed for the third time its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests extending it until 1 January 1987, the USA is continuing to hold nuclear tests.

Do the Foreign Ministers intend to adopt a position on this extremely crucial issue particularly with a view to ensuring that the American leadership responds positively to this moratorium?

*Answer:*

The Honourable Member of Parliament is referred to the answer given to his question H-390/86.

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Doc. 86/287.

**86/397. Question No H-608/86 by Mr Adamou Concerning Sanctions Against South Africa**

Date of Issue: 10 December 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Following the hanging of the South African freedom fighter Moloize, the Pretoria regime has provocatively carried out three more hangings of ANC members. At the same time, there are daily reports of murders in the streets, the schools and workplaces by the perpetrated regime's forces or repression.

In response to this blatant violation of human rights in South Africa, will the Foreign Minister at long last impose sanctions – irrespective of what the USA intends to do – that will really hurt the dictatorial regime of South Africa? What form will such sanctions take?

*Answer:*

On 16 September Foreign Ministers issued a statement in which they set out the Twelve's policy towards South Africa. They have made very clear their concern at human rights abuse in South Africa and have called in particular for the state of emergency to be lifted. The Twelve's embassies in Pretoria monitor the human rights situation in South Africa closely.

**86/398. Question No H-624/86 by Mr Baillot Concerning the Position of the Twelve with Regard to the Vote by the UN General Assembly on Respect for the Ruling of the International Court of Justice in The Hague Concerning the Dispute Between the United States and Nicaragua**

Date of Issue: 10 December 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

The EEC Member States abstained from voting on this text. Can the Ministers say whether this position was the result of a concerned approach adopted by the Twelve at the UN?

Do they consider that such a position respects the spirit and the letter of the agreement concluded in Luxembourg in September 1985 between the EEC and the countries of Central America? Does it mean that the Member States no longer recognize the rulings of the International Court of Justice in The Hague which was set up by all the Members of the UN?

*Answer:*

The Twelve have not adopted a joint position on the judgement of the International Court of Justice either in the UN General Assembly, where some partners voted in favour and others abstained when the issue was considered, or in any other forum. The Twelve have, however, repeatedly made clear their view



that the problems of Central America cannot be resolved by armed force and have urged restraint on all sides. They will continue to support the efforts of the Contadora Group to achieve a comprehensive and verifiable settlement on the basis of the objectives agreed by the Central American States in September 1983.

Recognition of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice is, of course, a matter for individual member States of the United Nations.

### **86/399. Question No H-632/86 by Mr MacSharry Concerning the Libyan Crisis**

Date of Issue: 10 December 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Can the Foreign Affairs Ministers clarify whether Britain's actions prior to the American bombing of Tripoli and Benghazi were in breach of the procedures governing European political cooperation, and can they make a statement on the implications for European political cooperation of Britain's role in the Libyan crisis?

*Answer:*

The Honourable Member is referred to the answer given to Oral Question No H-96/86 by Mr Alavanos and Written Question No H-350/86 by Mr Balfé.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *EPC Bulletin*, Docs 86/149 and 86/224.

### **86/400. Question No H-660/86 by Mr Alavanos Concerning the Principle of Unanimity in Matters of Political Cooperation**

Date of Issue: 10 December 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Following the Foreign Ministers' meeting of 27 October 1986 in Luxembourg, the President-in-Office, Sir Geoffrey Howe, Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom, made statements on the subject of Syria on behalf of the 'Eleven', as Greece had disagreed with the text in question.

Can the Foreign Ministers state whether this measure is consistent with the principles of political cooperation or whether, on the contrary, joint opinions issued on behalf of the 'Eleven' or the 'Ten', etc. following Foreign Ministers' meetings, fundamentally undermine the rule of unanimity, present the President-in-Office as representative not of the whole Community, but of a group of Community countries and are used as a form of pressure against dissenting countries?

Finally, is it not the case that statements by the President-in-Office should be made only when there is *unanimity* among the Twelve on the relevant texts?

*Answer:*

As the Honourable Member rightly points out, statements on issues discussed in political cooperation are made on behalf of all twelve Member States of the European Community. Similarly the principle of

consensus remains the basis of decision making in EPC. Sir Geoffrey Howe's remarks to the press on 27 October<sup>1</sup> were simply an accurate reflection of the Ministerial discussion which had taken place on Syria earlier in the day.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Bull. EC* 10-1986, point 2.4.4.

**86/401. Question No H-696/86 by Mr Wedekind Concerning the Declaration of Friendship, Good Neighbourly Relations and Cooperation Signed Between the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Republic of Greece**

Date of Issue: 10 December 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Question

Are the Ministers aware that the above-mentioned declaration signed by Greece, a member of the EC and NATO, and Bulgaria, a member of the Warsaw Pact, constitutes a breach of Article 5 of the NATO Treaty, to which other EC members are also parties?

Have the Ministers discussed the implications of this act for the common defence strategies of the EC, since Article 10, which states

its content is not directed against third countries and it does not violate the rights and obligations stemming from existing international agreements and treaties to which Bulgaria and Greece are parties,

is clearly incompatible with the political strategy Greece has adopted, as clearly expressed by Mr Papandreu at the meeting of the Pasok Central Committee on 30 August 1986?

*Answer:*

The issue raised by the Honourable Member of Parliament has not been discussed within European political cooperation.

**86/402. Statement on the Term-of-Office of the British Presidency<sup>1</sup>**

Date of Issue: 10 December 1986  
Place of Issue: Strasbourg  
Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
Source of Document: Presidency  
Status of Document: Balance Speech to European Parliament

*Sir Geoffrey Howe, President-in-Office of the Council and the Foreign Ministers:* [...] It is my experience that the rest of the world pays attention to us as Europeans not simply because we are twelve of the world's leading democracies, which we are, but also because we are potentially the most powerful economic grouping in the world. The need is for us to fulfil that potential. The Community, we must all acknowledge, still spends too much time making life difficult for itself. We spend far too much energy defending narrow sectoral interests. We still examine too many of our economic problems through the distorting prism of national interest.[...]

In this mutually interdependent age the progress we make in strengthening our internal unity and developing our internal market is crucial to our ability to make Europe's full influence felt outside throughout the rest of the world. That influence is growing, Presidency by Presidency, Council by Council. There is scarcely a region of the world with which we have not been concerned, whether in

European political cooperation or through the Community's external policies, during the last six months. There is no region of the world that has not sought to make its views and interests known to us in turn.

During the last six months I have given particular priority to East-West relations. We are Europeans in the broadest sense of that word. Our European family remains divided by walls of concrete and by barbed wire. It is these artificial divisions which oblige us to look for the means of reconciliation. So we welcomed the meeting between President Reagan and Mr Gorbachev in Reykjavik. We want that meeting to lead on to practical agreements. There *are* real opportunities.

President Reagan and Ms Thatcher, when they met at Camp David a few weeks ago, identified certain priorities: the removal of all long-range INF missiles in Europe with constraints on shorter-range forces, a halving of strategic arms on both sides and a total ban on chemical weapons; those are now the priorities of the Western alliance. If they are to be achieved, then we have to recognize that arms limitation requires mutual confidence and there will not be that necessary degree of mutual confidence unless the Soviet Union is prepared seriously to address humanitarian issues.

On 27 November I had the chance of meeting in London Professor Orlov. I know that many of you have met him as well. As everybody knows, he has just emerged from over nine years of imprisonment and exile. Why was he imprisoned and exiled? For the simple offence – if it can be called an offence – of seeking to monitor his Government's compliance with the commitments which the Soviet Union freely entered into at Helsinki.

That is the context in which the Twelve are fighting vigorously at the Vienna CSCE Follow-up Meeting for a thorough review of how those commitments have actually been complied with, because we are determined to uphold respect of both national and individual rights.

Our concern for human rights in the same sense underlines the policy of the Twelve towards South Africa. We cannot accept that the rights of blacks in South Africa should be subordinated to those of the whites, least of all in the name of civilization, Western values and even Christianity.

My first task on assuming the Presidency was, at the request of the Hague European Council, to undertake a mission to southern Africa. My mandate was to see whether the Twelve could build on the work of the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group to help create the conditions in which genuine dialogue could begin between the South African Government and authentic leaders of the black population. It must be said that the response of the South African Government to the Community as to the Commonwealth was less than encouraging. But the Twelve are not and cannot be indifferent to what happens in South Africa. We have to take every opportunity to reaffirm our conviction that the genuine dialogue that is necessary cannot begin while the recognized leaders of the black community are detained and while their organizations are proscribed. We have got to continue to take every opportunity to press, as I did during that mission, for the release of Mr Nelson Mandela, for the release of other political prisoners and for the lifting of the ban on the ANC, the PAC and other political parties.

Whether or not the South African Government sees it, the writing is on the wall. Apartheid has no place in human society. Even if the South African Government cannot bring itself to promote change in South Africa, change will prove itself inevitable. And in all this we have a sober responsibility. Our task is not to build bandwagons but to build bridges. Our task is not to foment revolution but to promote reform.

It is for that very reason that we have, over the years, taken a series of carefully chosen measures designed to give impetus to reform, culminating in the recent ban on new investment and the ban on the import of gold coins, iron and steel. Some people have said that these are a slap on the wrist. Not so. They are a warning hand on the shoulder of South Africa. A symbol and a plain symbol of the Twelve's commitment to encourage an end to apartheid. That commitment is shown as well in the help we are giving to training, to education and to legal aid to the black people of South Africa, through our national and Community programmes of positive measures. It is far better to light a beacon than a bushfire. It is a beacon that will stay alight until morning finally comes to South Africa.

Yesterday Ms Thatcher told you that the European Council last week reaffirmed its determination to face up to the insidious attack on our democratic society that is represented by terrorism. There, there can be no half-measures. We have to work together relentlessly to stamp out terrorism. It is a matter of

principle and of practice. The principles are those that were agreed by Heads of State or Government last week: no concessions under duress; solidarity between Member States; concerted action in response to terrorist attacks.

The practice is in the agreements reached by Interior Ministers to improve coordination between police and intelligence services, to strengthen the Community's external frontiers and to coordinate our policies on visas and on passport abuse. None of that contradicts our aim to make it easier for citizens to travel from one Community country to another. On the contrary, we have coordinated the measures which will make it easier for the traveller and harder for the terrorist.

Community solidarity has been strengthened. France was not left alone in the fact of the appalling terrorist attacks in Paris. It was not just an airliner at London Airport that was under threat. It was not just a night club in Berlin that was under threat. It was not just Britain or West Germany that responded. On 10 November we sent a clear message to Syria that what had happened in the Hindawi case was totally unacceptable to all twelve Member States of the Community. On 29 November we sent a further message about the Hasi case to reaffirm that stance again on behalf of all Twelve. We shall all be the safer when the message gets through that an attack on one of us invites the wrath of all of us. We free Europeans must make a reality of *tous pour un et un pour tous*. The action we have taken has been in response to specific outrages. Syria and Libya say that they condemn terrorism. It is time they showed the world that they mean what they say.

I turn now to the Single European Act. Last month the British Parliament approved that act. It has already been ratified by three Member States, including the United Kingdom. Now Spain and Luxembourg are also ready to ratify. The European Council, of course, reaffirmed the aim of all Member States to ratify by the end of the year.

I am proud, if I may say so, that the Treaty provisions covering cooperation in foreign policy stem from a British initiative in 1985; to strengthen the commitment to consult and coordinate that is at the heart of European political cooperation; to strengthen the existing commitment; to consult on the political and economic aspects of security questions; to promote greater consistency between external policies decided in the Community framework on matters such as aid and trade and the foreign policy objectives identified by the Twelve on political cooperation.

In addition, the Twelve have agreed to set up a small secretariat in Brussels to help the Presidency of the day and to improve continuity between Presidencies. That, I think, will be an important practical step forward. With the help of the Council secretariat we are now ready to set up the new secretariat so that it can get to work under the Belgian Presidency.

I think that our Presidency has had considerable success in ensuring consistency between EPC and Community activity in the spirit of the Single European Act.

Arbitrary distinctions in the external relations of the Community make no sense, least of all of course for the countries with which we are dealing. With Japan and with ASEAN we want to talk about foreign policy as well as about trade. With the United States we want to prevent bitter battles over Community steel exports to the States or United States exports of cereals to the Community breaking up the common ground of shared political interest. The economic problems that we seek to resolve, if we do not resolve them, can threaten the political coherence that we also need.

What happens in the rest of the world effects what happens within the boundaries of Europe. What happens here within the boundaries of Europe is anxiously watched by the many countries who maintain delegations to the Community and by those who seek to do so. This is particularly true of two areas: agriculture and trade policy.(...)

During our Presidency the Community has been engaged in improving relations with practically every region. In our immediate neighbourhood we have agreed the terms to put to our Mediterranean trading partners to guarantee the preservation of their trade access following enlargement.

In recognition of Turkish progress on human rights and the restoration of democracy – and I recognize that this is a topic on which it is possible to form different views and where it is very important to keep the balance properly in mind – we have been able to hold the first Community-Turkey Association Council at ministerial level since 1980.

We have responded to the interest now expressed by the CMEA and the States of Eastern Europe in normalizing relations with the Community. We have already agreed a mandate for negotiating a trade agreement with Czechoslovakia. We have been working on mandates for Romania and Hungary. We have agreed special trade and aid provisions for the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza – an important Community political initiative. Further afield, we have held a most successful EEC-ASEAN ministerial meeting in Djakarta where we were able to record a great deal of common ground on political and economic issues(...)

So there is a record of step-by-step achievement. Somebody said that a week may be a long time in politics. But in the life of the Community six months is a short time. Of course we would have liked to achieve more than we have. It is not our way to duck difficult questions. The Community as a whole cannot duck difficult questions. If the Community is to remain, as it must, the driving force of European prosperity and political unity, we have to be the same driving force in the 1980s that we were in the 1960s. The conditions are there to make that possible. The major democracies of Europe are now all members of the Community. We have trade and aid relations with most of the world. We are listened to in Moscow as in Washington as in Tokyo.

Most *communiqués*, it must be said sadly, are declarations of intent rather than declarations for achievement. The conclusions of the London European Council do represent solid and specific achievement. That document can be given to any of our electors with confidence that they will find in it decisions which matter to them on topics that range from terrorism to transport, from cancer to drugs, from the internal market to external trade.

Those conclusions are not British conclusions, they are conclusions which were agreed by all the Heads of Government. What we have to do is to put those conclusions into practice. It is a task not of one Presidency but of more than one. We have made a special effort to consult closely our Dutch predecessors as well as our Belgian successors. We believe that it has been important to carry forward that process of passing the baton effectively from one Presidency to another. It is of crucial importance when we have the Presidency for so short a time.

We have had an unprecedented number of contacts with this Parliament. We have now got the new cooperation procedure. But the truth is that cooperation should not depend on treaty change. Cooperation is something which grows as a habit. Cooperation is something that should grow because it depends on common interest. We have different institutional responsibilities, but *au fond* we have the same fundamental obligations, the same fundamental interests and the same responsibilities to our electorate.

European Unity is being built day by day, action by action, policy by policy. We may not be building as fast as you would like, as fast as I would like, but we are building and we have built strongly and must go on doing so.

[*Upon the ensuing debate Ms Chalker stated moreover:*] Proposals on cooperation in foreign policy will be enshrined in treaty law for the first time since the Single Act is ratified. May I remind Parliament that this too stemmed from a British initiative.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *OJ* No 2-346 of 10 December 1986, pp. 135-139, and p. 157.

## 86/403. Questions Concerning Turkey<sup>1</sup>

Date of Issue: 10 December 1986

Place of Issue: Strasbourg

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: Presidency (on behalf of the Foreign Ministers and the Council)

Status of Document: Answer to oral Parliamentary Questions

*Question No O-97/86 by Ms Heinrich on behalf of the Rainbow Group concerning the convening of a meeting of the EEC-Turkey Association Council for 16 September 1986:*

The previous President-in-Office of the Council, Foreign Minister van den Broek of the Netherlands, convened for 16 September a meeting of the EEC-Turkey Association Council, which is to set in train the normalization of relations, the Association Agreement having been suspended following the 1980 military take-over.

In this connection, it is planned to make available over 600 m ECU in financial aid which was provided for in the Fourth Financial Protocol but was blocked after the take-over. At the time, the Council and Commission called for full respect of human rights in Turkey and for the restoration of democracy.

1. Is the Council aware that the number of death sentences imposed rose to 600 in March 1986 and that, in 83 of these cases, virtually all channels of judicial review have been exhausted?

2. Is the Council aware that members of the Executive of the Turkish Medical Council have been charged for having expressed their opposition to capital punishment?

3. Is the Council aware that new cases of torture and other human rights violations were exposed very recently and that prison conditions have not changed?

4. Is the Council familiar with the report of the Political Affairs Committee on the human rights situation in Turkey (Doc. A 2-117/85)?

5. How does the Council view the possibility that, by convening this meeting of the EEC-Turkey Association Council, it will be judged by the European public to be dissociating itself from the earlier call for full respect for human rights?

*Question No O-144/86 by Mr Glinne and others concerning EEC-Turkey cooperation:*

With regard to the EEC-Turkey Association Council meeting held in Brussels on 16 September 1986 after a six-year break and the comments made by a Belgian Minister, shortly before the Belgian presidency of the Council in favour of Turkey's accession to the Community, and in view of the maintenance in Turkey of a political situation characterized by severe restrictions on the freedom of association and of expression and by the repression of ethnic, religious and cultural minorities:

— what is the political 'justification' for the Association Council meeting? How does the Council view the 'democratic' nature of the by-elections held in Turkey on 28 September? Are the 600 million ECU of aid, provided for in the fourth financial protocol and blocked for political reasons put forward by Parliament, about to be released? What stage has been reached in establishing the free movement of workers scheduled in the Association Agreement for 1 December 1986? Is the opening of discussions on an associated country's accession to the Community still conditional upon evidence that its internal regime is genuinely democratic?

*Question No O-188/86 by Ms Veil on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Reformist Group on the compatibility of a democratic regime in Turkey with the Treaty of Association:*

There is not yet full respect for human rights in Turkey, in spite of the gradual improvement regarding respect for democratic principles, particularly as a result of free elections being organized. Can the Ministers say what measures they intend to take to encourage the re-establishment of a democratic regime compatible with the Treaty of Association between Turkey and the Community?

Since the absence of a solution to the division of Cyprus and the consequences for the population are a further cause for concern, can the Ministers say what approaches have been made to the Turkish Government to urge it to make an effective contribution to finding a solution which will enable the country to be independent and the rights of its citizens to be respected?

*Question No O-192/86 by Mr Adamou and others concerning the relations between the EEC and Turkey:*

— Having regard to the EEC-Turkey Association Agreement,  
 — whereas under the laws and regulations in force in Turkey democratic freedoms are severely restricted by the security forces, whereas many political parties, trade unions and mass organizations are still banned and whereas, finally, thousands of political detainees are still imprisoned and torture is still practised,

- recalling that the European Parliament, having noted the violation of fundamental democratic rights in Turkey, expressed its opposition to any thaw in relations between the EEC and Turkey and decided that the relevant delegation should remain inactive,
- concerned at the continuing occupation by Turkish forces of 40% of the territory of the Republic of Cyprus, a country linked to the EEC by an Association Agreement, and recalling that the European Parliament has called for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the island (in the resolution by Lady Elles) and for a just and viable solution to the problem of Cyprus on the basis of the UN resolutions,

Would the Council state:

Why it ignored the European Parliament's resolutions and convoked the EEC-Turkey Association Council on 16 September 1986?

Does it not believe that Turkey is continuing to violate human rights and restrict democratic freedoms?

Does it not believe that any thaw in relations between the EEC and Turkey is tantamount to a pat on the back for Ankara and will strengthen a tyrannical regime in a country linked to the EEC by an Association Agreement?

Does it intend to reinstate in the Community budget for 1987 the appropriations provided under the Third and Fourth Financial Protocols and the special aid deleted by the European Parliament, as it did in the 1986 budget?

*Ms Chalcker, President-in-Office of the Council and of the Foreign Ministers:(...)* I turn now to the question put by the Honourable Members. Since the questions put by Ms Heinrich, on behalf of the Rainbow Group, by Mr Glinne and several members of the Socialist Group, by Mr Adamou and others, on behalf of the Communist Group, and by Ms Veil, on behalf of the Liberal Group, all concern the Community's relations with Turkey, I should like to give a joint reply.

In February of this year the Council decided to embark upon an examination of the outstanding questions with a view to holding a EC-Turkey Association Council meeting in the early autumn of 1986. Further to that decision a meeting of the Association Council was held on 16 September. In reply to Ms Heinrich and Mr Adamou I really must stress that the holding of that Association Council meeting did not – I repeat it – in any way imply that the Council disassociated itself from those calling for full respect for human rights in Turkey.

On the contrary, when the Twelve decided to embark on this policy of gradual normalization of relations, they emphasized at every meeting that they would continue to follow with close attention the situation with regard to human rights and fundamental freedoms in Turkey and that they would consider carefully the progress being made towards the restoration of democracy there. I was present when the President-in-Office made clear the Community's concern that even with the present slightly improved situation on human rights there was more to be done. It was Sir Geoffrey Howe himself speaking as President-in-Office who left nobody in any doubt of the concern of the Community as a whole for respect for human rights in Turkey. It was raised in his introductory remarks to the Turkish delegation, when he welcomed the progress that Turkey had made in restoring democracy but added that he remained convinced that further progress on restoring democracy and protecting individual human rights was an absolutely essential part of the normalization of relations between the EEC and Turkey of which that meeting on 16 September marked the beginning.

I should like to say to Mr Glinne that first of all the Council does not usually comment on public statements made by the members of a Member State's government. In any case the question of Turkey's accession to the Community has not been raised in the Council. However, there can be no doubt that the existence of a democratic system is an essential prerequisite for any country which wishes to become a member of our Community. The Heads of State and Government declared way back in April 1978 in Copenhagen that respect for and the maintenance of representative democracy and human rights in each and every Member State are essential elements of membership of the European Community. We all know that Spain and Portugal waited years until they had restored their democracies before they were in a position to apply and before we in the Community were in a position even to entertain their application for membership. That will be true for each and every country which may apply in the future.

In their questions both Mr Glinne and Mr Adamou also mentioned the Fourth and Third Financial Protocols with Turkey. As far as the Fourth Protocol is concerned, whilst the Council decided at its second reading of the budget to re-establish a token entry *pour mémoire* on the relevant line and to put 10 million ECU in Chapter 100 as commitment appropriations and 4 million ECU as payment appropriations, I must tell Parliament that no decision has been taken on the signing of this protocol. As for the Third Financial Protocol, the Council has provided for payment appropriations sufficient to allow the Community to fulfil its obligations, in particular *vis-à-vis* European companies which have already carried out work under the protocol.

As far as the arrangements to be adopted by the EEC-Turkey Association Council are concerned, the Council has adopted a common position on the movement of workers – another subject over which we have had much debate. That common position takes due account of the concerns of all Member States and the changes in economic and social positions in the Community. The Commission has been instructed to convey this position to the Turkish authorities.

In her question Ms Veil expresses her concern about Cyprus. All of us in this House are very aware that the Twelve remain deeply concerned about the situation in Cyprus. The Twelve unconditionally support the independence, the sovereignty, the territorial integrity and the unity of Cyprus, in accordance with the relevant UN resolutions, as I said several times during Question Time yesterday. The Twelve continue not to recognize the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus nor constitutional developments which have taken place in Northern Cyprus. Perhaps I should say 'so-called constitutional developments' to make it absolutely clear beyond peradventure. But the Twelve strongly support the efforts by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to find a peaceful, just and lasting settlement. And they urge all parties concerned to cooperate with the United Nations Secretary-General. If we can avoid any action which might make this task more difficult, I hope that in due course we will not need to continue to have this debate in this House and elsewhere. Like all Honourable Members here, we want to see a resolution of this particular problem which has bedevilled Cyprus for far too long.

*[After the ensuing debate Ms Chalker stated furthermore:]* Several Members made reference to Turkey. I did, of course, speak about the question tabled on Turkey earlier in the day. I have listened carefully to all the points that have been made, and they will be drawn to the attention of my colleagues. But I noticed also particularly what Mr Dankert said a few moments ago. In reply to him I would say that I side with nobody. We try to take a balanced view of the facts of the situation, whether it be on Turkey or on any other issues.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *OJ* No 2-346 of 10 December 1986, pp. 131-132 and 158.

#### **86/404. Statement on the Death of Anatoly Marchenko**

Date of Issue: 12 December 1986

Place of Issue: London

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: The Twelve

Status of Document: Declaration

The Twelve express their sadness and concern at the tragic death of Anatoly Marchenko in Chistopol prison in the USSR. They offer their sympathy to the widow of this brave man.

Marchenko had spent most of the last 30 years in prison or camp, in suffering and hardship. Despite poor health, he was sentenced in 1981 to a further ten years in a labour camp. His life was an example of unquestionable spirit and courage.

At a time when the CSCE Follow-up Meeting is taking place in Vienna, the Twelve recall that Marchenko was a member of the group of courageous Soviet citizens set up to monitor their Government's compliance with the Helsinki Final Act. They also draw attention to the fact that other members of this group are still in prison, and call upon the Soviet Government to honour its Helsinki commitments in the field of human rights and fundamental freedoms.



## 86/405. Statement at the CSCE Vienna Follow-up Meeting

Date of Issue: 19 December 1986

Place of Issue: Vienna, Austria

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: British Delegation

Status of Document: Statement in International Forum

*Mr Eggar:* As we reach the Christmas break we look back on the intensive discussions that have taken place in this magnificent palace so far. My first task this afternoon is to express our appreciation for the warm hospitality and impeccable organization of our Austrian hosts. They have spared no effort. They have overlooked no detail which might contribute to the success of this meeting. On behalf of the twelve Members of the European Community, of which Britain has the honour to hold the Presidency, I would like to thank all who have helped to produce such an excellent setting for the task in hand.

Mr Chairman, we are nearing the end of the review of what each of us has accomplished, and we have to say failed to accomplish, in fulfilling our commitments under the Helsinki Final Act and the Madrid Concluding Document. It is time to take stock; to see what we have learned in the course of the past five weeks of hard, sometimes bitter, debate.

Some, including the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union just now, believe that on the contrary it is time to look forward, to put the review of the past behind us. To get on with the job of defining new tasks. The Twelve do not take so simple a view. I should like to remind you of Sir Geoffrey Howe's speech, on behalf of the Presidency, at the outset of this meeting. He said then that we must ensure that each level of the Helsinki Edifice is solid when building another. 'We must', he added, 'check what has been done and is being done to realize the process before devising ambitious plans for the future'. Individual Member States of the European Community will have very clear, bold and imaginative ideas on ways for advancing further the Helsinki Process. But it is not my task today to dwell on them at any length. I need to turn to what lessons we draw from the review so far.

First the positive side. And I must say straight away how warmly Britain and its partners in the Twelve welcome today's news about Dr Andrei Sakharov and his wife Ms Yelena Bonner. We naturally hope that this is the first of many such moves by the authorities in Moscow to ease the plight of those who have suffered in one way or another for their views. I shall return to this subject in a moment but first I intend to look at freedom of information, commercial working conditions and freedom of movement.

We believe we detect some, admittedly limited, improvement in the way in which the Soviet media reflect the problems of society. Attention has rightly been drawn to an increased awareness in the Soviet press and on television of the need to address some very real concerns of the Soviet people. For example their need to know what laws and administrative decrees they live under. The Twelve hope that this will develop and that the Government, in the unforgettable words of Karl Marx, will not continue hearing its own voice in the press, strengthened in the self-deception that it is hearing the voice of the people.

We have observed that the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries have listened with care to the points that have been made here on ways to improve commercial and industrial exchanges between us. Perhaps, too, some hints were dropped, hints which encourage us to believe there is now recognition of the need to improve the conditions of businessmen seeking to foster trading links. There seems to be recognition, at least by some, of the need to produce adequate, timely and comparable trade statistics and other economic information. These would certainly help and we look for early signs of progress here. The Twelve for their part have taken due note of the attempts now being made to introduce a greater flexibility in commercial matters which, if they continue, offer promise for the future.

On humanitarian issues, Britain and her partners have heard of the release of a few innocent citizens whose only so-called 'crime' was to believe in the right to freedom of opinion. Andrei Sakharov was one such individual. There is new legislation on exit formalities in one country — the Soviet Union — just about to come into force. The Twelve, like other participating States, have heard the voice of scepticism about the real value of this, not least from those who would be affected by it. They none the less must hope that it will lead to practical benefit to those concerned. It is welcome that some marriage and other

family reunification cases have been solved. There has been a marked improvement in family visits and family reunification cases between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic. The right of foreign journalists to have multiple entry visas is now more widely recognized.

All good signs, Mr Chairman, all welcome signs. Although it is depressing in itself that such small steps call for comment and welcome. It is when we come to fundamental human rights that the picture quickly darkens.

During this implementation review Anatoly Marchenko, one of the founders of the Moscow-Helsinki watch group, died in prison. A few weeks before he died he addressed a haunting letter to the delegates of this Conference describing his sufferings and appealing for help. We do not know how he died or under what circumstances. But I would be less than candid if I were not to draw attention to his fate. We recognize the sufferings of those who have sought, in the words of the Final Act, 'to know and act upon their rights'. They cast the darkest possible shadows on this hall, which even the splendour of its chandeliers cannot dispel.

The catalogue of others who suffer similar hardships is long. Members of the European Community have taken the opportunity of the review to probe as far as we could. We recognize that the human rights record varies somewhat from country to country. There has been improvement in some respects in some countries. In others the record is, if anything, worse than it was during the last review in Madrid several years ago. But over all we still find too many families who remain divided, too many religious believers living lives of harassment and menace. Too many who continue to be denied the right to emigrate from countries where they do not wish to live, be they Jewish or German or those of other ethnic origins. This is all despite the legal obligation of those countries to let them go. Too often years of deprivation and harassment follow from the very fact that they have applied to leave. Even some of those suffering from cancer who have hoped to join their families in the West are still denied this surely basic humanitarian right.

We know of too many instances where there is, within the meaning of the Helsinki Act, no freedom of association; little freedom for trade unions, little freedom of religion and belief; little or no freedom of movement or expression. The mail continues to be interfered with and the jamming of Western broadcasts continues. A potent reminder that the free flow of ideas still arouses fear on our continent in the latter part of the twentieth century.

As long as these injustices persist, Mr Chairman, the Member States of the European Community will continue to speak out. No States are more attached to the ideal of a safer Europe where security and cooperation can flourish. To this extent we agree with those who argue that these are indispensable requirements for all the people of the continent. An essential element for the building of confidence between us – and therefore of security – will be missing unless there are real and substantial changes in human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Thus it is not, as some have suggested, irresponsible of us to raise these tragic realities here in Vienna. We believe rather that ours is the truly responsible attitude, responsible that is to the Helsinki process to which we all committed ourselves in 1975. Implementation of the promises of the Final Act is the life blood of that process. Without implementation it will wither away.

Mr Chairman, we now have five weeks pause for reflection. Britain and her Community partners will continue to look for signs of real improvement in the matters I have mentioned. We have tried to put our message across here at the Vienna meeting. We hope it has been heard in other capitals. Past experience has been one of disappointment but we have not lost hope. We have been patient but after eleven years it is surely right to know whether there is to be a wholly improved treatment of the people by their governments. The argument that Helsinki is a long and continuous process surely cannot apply to the urgent humanitarian cases of which we can cite many examples.

The Twelve will thus reflect on the implementation as a whole when this period of review comes to an end early next year. We shall draw our own conclusions and bring forward appropriate new proposals. Our objective is that all the States attending this meeting should honour *all* the promises they made in Helsinki eleven years ago. I can assure you that these new proposals will take account of the concept of balance enshrined in the Act. The Twelve fully accept this concept. We continue to regard all of the subjects covered by the Act as intrinsically important.

The ideas of Member States of the Community for new ways forward will be directly relevant to the main purposes of the Helsinki Act. The Twelve are interested in the implementation of the civilized standards which Helsinki proclaims. These standards should determine the behaviour of all our Governments and the lives of all our people. Some of our ideas will be designed to ensure that we genuinely accept all our commitments to human rights and fundamental freedoms. Others are intended to find ways to improve the commercial and industrial climate on our continent and, of course, the environment. There will be proposals on human contacts, family reunions and other essential humanitarian issues.

Mr Chairman, in his speech on 4 November, Sir Geoffrey Howe welcomed the recent Stockholm Agreement which he described as the first success for the long, patient task of building confidence begun at Helsinki. A measure, in short, to improve security, to prevent war. As he stated too, we remain interested in more ambitious methods to strengthen peace and security in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals and the establishment of a comprehensive and stable balance of conventional forces at the lowest possible level.

All this is for the future. I would like to conclude today with a simple plea for realism and tolerance. Let us not forget that Helsinki is about people. It is about giving them scope to develop fully and freely as individuals: improving their lives benefits them and benefits all our societies as a whole.

The right to form opinions, and to voice those opinions freely, is essential if our societies are to flourish and progress. It is a basic principle for the conduct of public life. We ignore it at our peril.

Many of the restrictions reviewed at this meeting are long established – a matter of routine. Some may say this gives them authority. We challenge this. Further we have a duty to look for ways to develop and ways to impress. The European Community appeals to all for a serious and truly responsible approach: one which reduces suffering and inhumanity alike so that security and cooperation can truly flourish on our continent.

#### **86/406. Statement on the Violation of Human Rights in South Africa**

Date of Issue: 19 December 1986  
 Place of Issue: Pretoria, South Africa  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: The Twelve  
 Status of Document: Declaration

The Twelve are gravely concerned at growing evidence of serious abuses of human rights in South Africa. In particular they deplore:

- (i) the apparent continuation of forced removals from black townships: such action is contrary to assurances previously given by the South African Government that such removals had stopped;
- (ii) the continuing and indefinite detention without charge of large numbers of people and especially of many young people and children;
- (iii) the imposition of Draconian new restrictions on press freedom which run counter to the principles of democracy and freedom of information.

Taken together these various infringements and abuses of human rights bring into question the South African Government's claim to be committed to Western values.

#### **86/407. Report of the European Council on European Union: European Political Cooperation**

Date of Issue: 19 December 1986  
 Place of Issue: London  
 Country of Presidency: United Kingdom  
 Source of Document: Presidency  
 Status of Document: Report on European Union

##### *East/West relations*

1. East/West relations have remained a central concern of European Political Cooperation. Sir Geoffrey Howe said, in his speech on behalf of the Twelve at the UN General Assembly on 23 September,

that the man-made divisions between East and West 'oblige us, as Europeans, to search for reconciliation and rebuilding of trust between nations'. And he reiterated that for the countries of Europe, better relations between the two superpowers are of the greatest importance.

2. In the Presidency's opening speech at the Vienna CSCE Follow-up Meeting on 4 November, the Reykjavik meeting between President Reagan and Mr Gorbachev was welcomed as valuable exercise in exploring ways forward towards balanced and verifiable agreements on arms reductions. The Twelve hoped that the two sides would follow up these possibilities with energy and vigour, and make progress not only in the field of security, but also in other areas, in particular in respect for human rights and in regional issues.

3. On arms control and disarmament the Twelve attach the highest importance to progress towards substantial and balanced reductions in the global level of nuclear weapons beginning with those of the two superpowers, to achieving balance in conventional forces at the lowest possible level and to the elimination of chemical weapons.

4. The Twelve attach great importance to the CSCE and have worked together for positive results at the Berne CSCE Experts Meeting on Human Contacts, and at the Stockholm Conference. They have welcomed the Document agreed in Stockholm as a significant step forward, in conformity with the mandate agreed in Madrid, from the somewhat modest Confidence-Building Measures in the Helsinki Final Act.

5. At the Vienna Follow-up Meeting the Twelve will seek a thorough review of compliance with existing commitments before moving on to consider ways in which they might enhance the vitality of the process. They attach importance to maintaining balance between the different baskets covered by the CSCE process and particularly to the balance which ought to exist between the questions concerning security and human rights and will seek genuine practical steps forward in all of them in order to contribute to the improvement of East-West relations, and in particular for the benefit of individual citizens throughout Europe. The general approach of the Twelve is set out more fully in Sir Geoffrey Howe's Presidency speech of 4 November at the opening of the Vienna Follow-up Meeting.

6. In contacts with the Governments of the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe, the Twelve have underlined their collective voice in international affairs by conveying joint statements of position, and making joint *démarches*, e.g. on human rights. As part of this process Ambassadors of the Twelve have invited Eastern European Foreign Ministers to attend working lunches and several have already accepted.

7. The Twelve have devoted particular attention to the developing situation in Poland. They welcomed the release of political prisoners in September and expressed the hope that they would prove to be an important step towards national reconciliation in Poland and would be followed by further measures to promote dialogue and democratic reform.

8. The Twelve have been concerned by the imposition of new restrictions in Romania on travel abroad, contacts with foreigners, and access by Western businessmen to Romanian enterprises. Restrictions on the locally-engaged staff of foreign Embassies in Bucharest are a further cause for concern. These developments are not helping the cause of improved relations between the Twelve and Romania at the time when the negotiation of a new agreement between the Community and Romania is planned.

9. The Twelve have evaluated the consequences of the Chernobyl accident and they have taken joint action in Moscow.

#### *International terrorism*

10. The rash of terrorist incidents over the past year, and the disturbing evidence of State involvement in terrorism, have been a major preoccupation for the Twelve. They have taken a number of measures over the past year to improve cooperation to combat terrorism and to make clear their determination to curb terrorism in all its forms.

11. On 27 January, in the wake of the appalling attacks on the Rome and Vienna airports, the Twelve adopted an important statement on their collective stand against terrorism. They decided to intensify their cooperation in a number of areas including security at airports, ports and railway stations,

the control by Member States of persons entering or leaving the Community and circulating in it, on visa policies with respect to the problem of terrorism, and on the abuse of diplomatic immunity. They made it clear that States which favour or protect terrorists cannot expect indulgence nor to have normal relations with the Twelve. They decided not to export arms or other military equipment to countries which are clearly implicated in supporting terrorism. They set up a permanent working body within EPC to monitor and give impetus to work in this field.

12. In April the Twelve adopted a further statement on international terrorism and the crisis in the Mediterranean. They stated that States clearly implicated in supporting terrorism should be induced to renounce such support and to respect the rules of international law and they called on Libya to act accordingly. They rejected unacceptable threats made by Libyan leaders against Member States. They also decided on a number of further measures regarding Libya, including restrictions on the freedom of movement of diplomatic and consular missions, review of the size of other official bodies, stricter visa requirements and procedures, and a ban on arms sales. On 4 October the Twelve issued a statement about involvement in terrorism by Libyan Arab Airlines, following the trial and conviction in the UK of Mr Rasmi Awad.

13. More recently the Twelve have had to consider the question of Syrian involvement in the Hindawi case. On 10 November, a clear message went to Syria that what had happened in this case was absolutely unacceptable. The Presidency, in a press statement to which Greece reserved her position, announced that in present circumstances there would be no new arms sales to Syria, high level visits should be suspended, the activities of Syrian diplomatic and consular missions should be reviewed and appropriate measures applied, and that the security precautions surrounding the activities of Syrianair would be reviewed and tightened.

14. Several demarches were also carried out by the Twelve in third countries stressing the need for cooperation among States on this matter.

#### *Middle East peace process*

15. The Twelve have continued to follow developments in the Middle East peace process with the closest attention. They have maintained active contacts with the parties to the conflict, looking for ways in which to help them to make progress towards negotiations for a comprehensive, just and lasting solution. In this context, the Twelve consider that an international conference could make a major contribution in this peace process, if the gap between the parties can be narrowed and if they can agree on the principle and nature of such a conference. At the same time they have underlined the need for practical measures to alleviate the hardships suffered by many in the region. Mr van den Broek undertook an important series of contacts with the region during the first half of the year exploring the prospects for further European support for the peace process. These have been followed up by further meetings in London and New York, as well as contacts in the region.

16. The Twelve have welcomed the important measures adopted by the Community for improved aid to the Occupied Territories and for preferential access for industrial and some agricultural products to the Community market, as well as the increase in Community support for the work of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian refugees.

17. The Twelve remain keen to promote new movement in the Euro-Arab dialogue. Mr van den Broek wrote to the Secretary-General of the Arab League in June to convey positive new ideas for reactivating the dialogue. A reply from the Arab League is still awaited. We hope for an early response to enable us to carry this important work forward.

#### *Lebanon*

18. The Twelve have followed closely UNIFIL's security and ability to fulfil its mandate. The statement by EC Foreign Ministers at The Hague on 27 June reflected their grave concern about developments in Lebanon.

#### *Iran/Iraq*

19. The Twelve have continued to pay close attention to the Iran/Iraq conflict and to support moves towards a negotiated settlement. On 25 February Foreign Ministers issued a declaration calling on both

sides to comply with Security Council Resolution 582 and supporting the efforts of the UN Secretary-General towards a negotiated settlement of the conflict. On 16 April the Twelve issued a declaration condemning unreservedly the use of chemical weapons by Iraq in the conflict, in terms of the UN Security Council's declaration of 21 March.

20. On 6 August the Twelve issued a statement calling on both sides to respect their undertakings to the UN Secretary-General not to attack targets in civilian areas. The Twelve welcomed the adoption of United Nations Security Council Resolution 588 on 8 October calling for immediate implementation of Security Council Resolution 582, and on the UNSG to renew his efforts. The Twelve have also been concerned at the escalating attacks on shipping in the Gulf and supported a *démarche*, initiated by Norway, in Tehran and Baghdad on 27 September.

21. The Twelve also maintained their interest in the human rights situation in Iran, and made a *démarche* on the treatment of minorities including Baha'is, on 26 August.

22. A joint *démarche* was made by the Twelve to the Iranian authorities on 10 October to protest against the attack on the German Embassy in Tehran.

23. Foreign Ministers of the Twelve and of the Gulf Cooperation Council countries has a useful meeting over lunch in New York on 26 September.

#### *Cyprus*

24. The Twelve remain concerned by the tragic divide in Cyprus. In the course of the year they have continued to make clear the support for the UN Secretary-General's efforts to find a peaceful, just and lasting settlement in accordance with UN resolutions, and their support for the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity of Cyprus. They have continued to take a firm stand against recognizing the self-styled 'Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus', and any 'constitutional developments' in Northern Cyprus. They have emphasized the need for all concerned to cooperate with the UN Secretary-General and to avoid any action which might make his task more difficult.

#### *Southern Africa*

25. On 3 and 4 February the Twelve held a ministerial meeting with the front-line States on the situation in southern Africa. The talks were useful and fruitful, and led to a joint declaration calling on the South African Government to announce the total abolition of apartheid, to end the state of emergency and to initiate a national dialogue with the genuine representatives of the South African people excluded from the existing structure of Government. The Presidency subsequently met the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs in Geneva at the latter's request, and explained the results of the Lusaka meeting.

26. At the European Council on 26-27 June, Heads of State and Government of the Twelve expressed their grave concern at the rapid deterioration of the situation in South Africa and the restrictions imposed under the South African state of emergency. They called again for the unconditional release of all political prisoners, including Nelson Mandela, and the lifting of the ban on the African National Congress, the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania and other political parties. They reaffirmed that the main goal of the Twelve's policy was the total abolition of apartheid and they agreed that in the three months following the meeting the Twelve would consult with other industrialized countries on further restrictive measures which might be needed, covering in particular a ban on new investment in South Africa and the import of coal, iron, steel and gold coins from South Africa.

27. At the request of the European Council Sir Geoffrey Howe visited southern Africa in late July, in an attempt to build on the work of the Commonwealth Group of Eminent Persons, to help create conditions in which genuine dialogue could begin in South Africa and to explain the Twelve's policy to the leaders of neighbouring States. Although his mission secured no major breakthrough, it was by no means a wasted effort. Sir Geoffrey Howe had meetings with several South African Ministers, as well as two with State President Botha. He also met leaders of various front-line States and was able to get across to the many people he met in South Africa the concern felt by the Member States of the Community at the situation there.

28. At their meeting on 15/16 September, Foreign Ministers of the Twelve called on the South African Government to take the necessary steps to facilitate national dialogue and undertook to work

towards a programme of political action designed to promote the achievement of this objective. The Twelve emphasized the importance of strengthened and more effective coordination of positive measures to assist the victims of apartheid. They also adopted a new package of restrictive measures consisting of bans on new investment and the import of iron, steel and gold coins from South Africa. Agreement has since been reached on the coverage and means of implementation of these measures. On the question of a ban on coal imports from South Africa, the Presidency continues to seek consensus on the basis of the statement made by the Hague European Council.

29. On 22 May the Twelve issued a statement strongly condemning the South African military actions on 19 May against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe, which seriously violated their sovereignty as well as threats, officially expressed, to strike again.

30. On 17 October the Twelve issued a further statement urging the South African Government to show full respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of their neighbours and to do nothing to worsen relations with those neighbours or add to suffering in southern Africa. The Statement also deplored the decision to declare the UDF an affected organization. They sent a joint message of condolence on the tragic death of President Samora Machel of Mozambique.

31. As regards Namibia, at the UN Special Session on Namibia, 17-20 September, the Twelve reaffirmed their commitment to bringing about a peaceful and lasting solution to the problem through the early implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 435.

32. Following the review and strengthening of the European Code of Conduct in November 1985, the Partners reached agreement on a revised reporting format to be adopted by companies of the Twelve with interests in South Africa.

#### *Horn of Africa*

33. The Twelve have reviewed their policy towards the Horn of Africa and as a result Ministers issued a joint statement on 21 July. They agreed that they should continue to play a constructive role in the area and to pursue an active dialogue with the countries of the region. The statement also called on Governments to pursue negotiated settlements to regional tensions, and the peaceful settlement of internal conflicts, and covered concerns among the Twelve about human rights, food shortages and the resettlement and villagization programmes. In their declaration of 4 June the Twelve welcomed the holding of elections in Sudan and declared their willingness to support economic recovery in this country.

#### *Central America*

34. The Twelve have continued to support the Contadora initiative. The Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, as President-in-Office of the Twelve, attended as an observer the 5-7 April meeting of the Contadora and Contadora Support Groups held in Panama City. Following this meeting, and again on the eve of the summit of Central American Presidents at Esquipulas (24-25 May), the Twelve publicly urged the Central American States to conclude negotiations, sign and implement an agreement on the basis of the Contadora objectives. No agreement has yet been signed due to differences between the Central American States. However, the Twelve are currently preparing for the third EC/Central America/Contadora meeting to be held next year in Guatemala. This will be a further demonstration of the Twelve's support for peace, stability, democracy, non-intervention and economic development in the region.

#### *Chile*

35. The Twelve have continued to press the Chilean Government throughout the year over their poor rights record and slow progress towards the restoration of democracy. Member States joined a consensus resolution criticizing human rights in Chile at the 1986 UN Commission on Human Rights, and the Twelve have issued a series of statements calling on the Chilean Government to open a dialogue with the democratic opposition and to restore fundamental human rights. The statement on 16 September by the Twelve's Foreign Ministers which was reaffirmed in the Presidency statement to the UN General Assembly, was especially critical on the re-imposition of the state of siege on 7 September

and repressive measures which followed the attempted assassination of the President. The Twelve are exploring ways of helping the Chilean democratic opposition to increase their solidarity and credibility.

#### *Afghanistan*

36. The Twelve have continued to make their views clear over the continued Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. In the United Nations General Assembly they have supported the UN Secretary-General's efforts to resolve the conflict and called on the Soviet Union to withdraw all its troops without delay. A meeting on 5 November in New York between representatives of the Twelve and a delegation of Afghan resistance leaders also enabled the Twelve to reiterate their support for the efforts of the resistance alliance formed last year to inform the international community of the situation in Afghanistan. At the European Council on 5/6 December a statement on Afghanistan was issued which again drew attention to the very serious situation facing the people of Afghanistan and neighbouring countries.

#### *Philippines*

37. In a statement on 25 February Foreign Ministers recognized Ms Aquino's consistent stand in defence of democratic principles and pledged their continued support for the forces of democracy in the Philippines. Foreign Ministers of the Twelve issued a statement on 10 November welcoming the completion of the draft constitution, looking forward to the elections due in 1987, and expressing strong political support for Ms Aquino's Government.

#### *EC-ASEAN*

38. At the sixth meeting of EC and ASEAN Foreign Ministers in Jakarta on 20 and 21 October 1986, Portugal being represented by the Presidency, Ministers had wide-ranging discussions which enabled both sides to gain a clear insight into each other's concerns, for example over the continuing Vietnamese occupation of Cambodia. The two sides agreed to cooperate closely in combating international terrorism and in tackling all aspects of drugs production, trafficking and misuse. The success of the meeting demonstrated the continuing strength and value of the EC-ASEAN dialogue.

#### *Cambodia*

39. The Twelve have continued to promote the search for a negotiated settlement to the conflict in Cambodia in accordance with the resolutions adopted by the UN and the International Conference on Kampuchea. The Twelve supported the resolution on Cambodia tabled at the United Nations General Assembly which was passed on 21 October by a record 115 votes.

#### *Korea*

40. As the Presidency made clear in its statement at the 41st United Nations General Assembly, the Twelve continue to hope that the problem posed by the continued division of the Korean peninsula can be solved peacefully by means of direct dialogue between South and North, and that to this end the contacts broken off by the North earlier this year will be resumed soon. They also hope that the people of Korea will be represented at the General Assembly of the United Nations in the near future.

#### *Political dialogue with third countries*

41. The Twelve have continued to develop political dialogue with third countries. There have been valuable exchanges at Ministerial level and on the occasion of Association Councils with a number of Mediterranean partners, including Egypt, Turkey, Malta and Yugoslavia. At official level regular contacts in the Troika format have been maintained with Turkey.

42. The Twelve have also given attention to strengthening the political dialogue with their major Western interlocutors. The pattern of contacts with the United States has been discussed and improved. The Twelve have developed and strengthened the dialogue with Japan on political matters. Troika meetings have taken place at senior official and ministerial level. The dialogue with Japan is now substantive and well established.

#### *Human rights*

43. On 21 July Foreign Ministers of the Community adopted an important statement, prepared under the Netherlands Presidency, on the place which human rights occupy in relations between the



Twelve and the world at large. The Twelve have continued to pay the closest attention to human rights issues both in international forums and in their contacts with Governments in countries where human rights are a problem.

#### *UN*

44. There is very active cooperation among the delegations of the Twelve to the UN. In particular the Twelve make every effort to vote together on resolutions presented to the General Assembly.

45. The Twelve remain committed to support for a strong and effective United Nations operating on the basis of the Principles laid down in the Charter. They believe that greater budgetary discipline, improved coordination and rigorous adherence to priorities can only strengthen the Organization and ensure its future stability and vigour. The Twelve are making a constructive contribution to discussion of the useful Report by the Group of 18 Intergovernmental Experts set up by the United Nations to suggest improvements to its administrative and financial function.

#### *Drugs*

46. At the European Council on 26-27 June, Heads of State and Government of the Twelve expressed their grave concern about the serious problem of drug misuse and called for an examination of the possible role of the Community in drugs issues. Ministers of the Interior and Justice of the Twelve, meeting on 20 October, agreed that, in collaboration with the Pompidou Group, Member States, in conjunction with the Community, had an important role to play in the international effort to combat drug production, trafficking and misuse. They drew up a Seven Point Plan suggesting a range of measures designed, *inter alia*, to reduce demand of drugs, improve the treatment of addicts, ensure that bilateral and Community aid supports a recipient country's efforts to combat drug abuse, ensure that legislation helps effectively to control trafficking and enhance cooperation between law enforcement agencies. They also proposed that Ambassadors of the Twelve in major drug-producing countries should prepare joint assessments and recommendations for action by the Twelve. Heads of Mission of the Twelve in several capitals in Africa and Asia have already been instructed accordingly and similar actions in Latin America and the Middle East are under consideration within the EPC framework.

#### *Practical cooperation*

47. The Twelve have continued to cooperate in a number of more practical fields, for example over judicial cooperation and in the field of consular affairs. The evacuation from Aden was an example of successful joint action to help EC citizens. Missions of the Twelve in third countries have continued to work together to project the image of political cooperation abroad.

#### *Working of European political cooperation*

48. Finally, 1986 has seen important developments in the workings of EC. The year began with the accession of Spain and Portugal who have made a valuable contribution to the work of the Twelve, bringing with them fresh historical and cultural ties with the world at large. The Single European Act was signed in February. It concludes the new Treaty Provisions on European Cooperation in the sphere of foreign policy which should shortly come into force. On 28 February Foreign Ministers of the Twelve adopted a separate Decision on the implementation of certain aspects of the Treaty Provisions. Mr Giovanni Jannuzzi of Italy has been chosen to be head of the new EPC Secretariat when it comes into operation.

### **86/408. Statement on the Deportation of Mr Akram Haniyya**

Date of Issue: 28 December 1986

Place of Issue: London

Country of Presidency: United Kingdom

Source of Document: The Twelve

Status of Document: Declaration

The Twelve deplore the decision of the Israeli authorities to deport Mr Akram Haniyya. They recall their long-standing opposition to such actions, which they regard as contrary to international law.



## UN Voting

This section contains:

- a voting-chart of resolutions adopted by the EN General Assembly, displaying information from the electronic score-board in the General Assembly hall (this excludes corrections to the scoreboard votes which may have been submitted by the countries concerned and which should be gathered from the verbatim records of the plenary meetings).
- a list of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly without having resort to voting.
- a voting chart of resolutions adopted by the EN Security Council, displaying votes as indicated in the provisional verbatim records of the Security Council.

For resolutions adopted by resort to voting the charts report first of all the attitudes of the Member States of the Community. In case of the Security Council it reports the attitudes of those member States which are represented in that organ in the period under consideration. The charts report also the attitudes of the United States and the Soviet Union and, for resolutions adopted by vote, the 'total vote' indicating the distribution of the votes cast by all members of the organ on the resolution in question.

The symbols Y, N, A indicate respectively a positive vote, a negative vote and an abstention. The asterisk (\*) means that no vote has been recorded for a particular country.

### Voting chart of resolutions adopted during the 41th Session of the UN General Assembly

A/RES/40	Subject	Date	Total vote			B	D	K	F	D	G	R	I	R	L	I	L	N	L	P	S	P	U	K	U	S	S	R
			Yes	No	Ab.																							
2	El Salvador – Emergency Assistance	10.10	unanimous			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4	Arab League – EN Cooperation	17.10	106	2	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
6	Kampuchea – Situation	21.10	115	21	13	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
10	Peace – Right of Peoples	24.10	104	0	33	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	Y	
11	South Atlantic – Zone of Peace	27.10	124	1	8	A	Y	A	A	Y	Y	A	A	A	A	A	Y	Y	N	Y								
12	Israel – Iraqi Nuclear Installations	26.10	86	5	55	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	Y		
13	Non-Selfgov. Territories	31.10	149	0	3	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y		
14	Southern Africa – Colonialism – Apartheid	31.10	125	11	15	N	A	N	N	A	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	Y							
15	Independence – Implementation of Declaration	31.10	123	4	27	A	A	A	A	Y	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	N	Y								
16	Western Sahara – Question	31.10	98	0	44	A	A	A	A	Y	A	A	A	A	A	A	Y	A	A	Y								
30	Comores – Island of Mayotte – Question	03.11	122	1	22	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	Y	Y		
31	Nicaragua – ICJ – Compliance	03.11	94	3	47	A	Y	A	A	Y	Y	A	Y	A	Y	A	Y	A	Y	A	Y	A	Y	A	N	Y		
33	Afghanistan – Situation – Security	05.11	122	20	11	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		
34	Law of the Sea	05.11	145	2	5	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y						
35[A]	South Africa – Liberation Movements	10.11	130	8	18	N	A	N	N	A	A	N	N	A	N	A	N	A	N	N	Y							
35[B]	South Africa – Comprehensive Sanctions	10.11	126	16	13	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y		
35[C]	South Africa-Israel – Relations	10.11	102	29	26	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y		
35[D]	Special Committee Against Apartheid	10.11	142	2	10	A	Y	A	A	Y	Y	A	A	A	A	A	Y	N	N	Y								
35[E]	Apartheid – Sports – Convention	10.11	131	0	24	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	Y		
35[F]	South Africa – Oil Embargo	10.11	136	5	15	A	Y	N	N	A	Y	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	N	Y						
35[H]	Apartheid – Concerted Action	10.11	149	2	5	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y						

UN Voting

A/RES/40	Subject	Date	Total vote			B	D K	F	D	G R	I R L	I	L	N L	P	S P	U K	U S A	U S S R
			Yes	No	Ab.														
38	US – Libya – Declaration OAU	20.11	79	28	33	N	N	N	N	A	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
39[A]	Namibia – Situation – Occupation	20.11	130	0	26	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	Y
39[B]	Namibia – Resolution 435 (1978)	20.11	133	0	25	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	Y
39[C]	EN Council for Namibia																		
	– Programme	20.11	151	0	7	Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y
39[D]	Namibia – Public Information	20.11	135	0	23	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	Y
39[E]	Namibia – EN Fund	20.11	152	0	6	Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y
40	Falkland Islands (Malvinas)																		
	– Question	25.11	116	4	34	A	A	Y	A	Y	A	Y	A	Y	A	Y	N	Y	Y
41[A]	Independence – Implementation of Declaration	02.12	89	24	34	N	A	N	N	A	A	N	N	N	N	N	A	A	Y
41[B]	Independence – Implementation of Declaration	02.12	144	3	9	A	Y	N	A	Y	Y	A	A	A	A	Y	N	N	Y
42	Decolonization – Information	02.12	148	2	7	A	Y	A	A	Y	Y	A	A	A	Y	Y	N	N	Y
43[A]	Palestinian People – EN Committee	02.12	121	2	21	A	A	A	A	Y	A	A	A	A	A	Y	A	N	Y
43[B]	Palestinian Rights Division																		
	– Programme	02.12	125	3	18	A	A	A	A	Y	A	A	A	A	A	Y	A	N	Y
43[C]	Palestine Question – Information	02.12	124	3	19	A	A	A	A	Y	A	A	A	A	A	Y	A	N	Y
43[D]	Middle East – Peace Conference	02.12	123	3	19	A	A	A	A	Y	A	A	A	A	A	Y	A	N	Y
44[A]	ENDOF – Financing	03.12	110	3	21	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A
44[B]	ENDOF – Financing	03.12	115	1	22	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A
45	Nuclear Arms – Latin America	03.12	145	0	7	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
46[A]	Nuclear Tests	03.12	135	3	14	A	Y	N	A	Y	Y	A	A	A	A	A	N	N	Y
46[B]	Nuclear Tests	03.12	127	3	21	A	A	N	A	Y	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	N	Y
47	Nuclear Test Ban Treaty																		
	– Urgent Need	03.12	137	1	15	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	A	A	Y
49	Nuclear Weapon Free Zone																		
	– S. Asia	03.12	107	3	41	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A
51	Non-Nuclear States – Security	03.12	105	18	25	N	N	N	N	A	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
52	Non-Nuclear States – Security	03.12	149	0	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y
53	Militarization of Space	03.12	154	0	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y
54	Nuclear Tests – Resolution 40/88	03.12	123	3	26	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	N	Y
55[A]	Denuclearization of Africa																		
	– Declaration	03.12	150	0		Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y
55[B]	South Africa – Nuclear Capability	03.12	139	4	13	A	Y	N	A	Y	Y	A	A	A	A	Y	N	N	Y
56	Mass Destruction Weapons																		
	– Prohibition	03.12	128	1	25	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	Y
58[B]	Chemical and Biological Weapons																		
	– Ban	03.12	100	11	43	N	A	N	N	A	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
58[C]	Chemical and Biological Weapons	03.12	137	0	14	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
59[B]	Military Matters – Objective																		
	Information	03.12	116	0	26	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A
59[D]	Arms Control – EN Role	03.12	117	16	19	N	A	N	N	A	A	A	N	N	N	A	N	N	Y
59[E]	Conventional Arms – CBMs	03.12	129	0	21	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
59[G]	Conventional Disarmament	03.12	150	0	2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
59[H]	Military Use of Science	03.12	137	1	17	Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	A
59[I]	Radiological Weapons	03.12	111	3	38	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	Y
59[K]	Naval Arms	03.12	153	1	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
59[L]	Fissionable Material – Weapons	03.12	148	1	6	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y
59[M]	Disarmament – Conventional																		
	– Regional	03.12	137	0	7	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
59[N]	Nuclear Tests – Notification	03.12	130	1	22	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	A
60[A]	Disarmament – World Campaign																		
	– Actions	03.12	114	3	36	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	N	Y
60[B]	Disarmament – World Campaign	03.12	144	0	9	A	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	A	A	A	Y	A	A	Y
60[C]	Disarmament – CBMs – Guidelines	03.12	155	0	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
60[E]	Nuclear Weapons – Freeze	03.12	136	12	5	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	Y

A/RES/40	Subject	Date	Total vote			B	D K	F	D	G R	I R L	I	L	N L	P	S P	U K	U S A	U S S R
			Yes	No	Ab.														
60[F]	Nuclear Weapons – Non-Use – Convention	03.12	132	17	4	N	N	N	N	A	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
60[H]	Disarmament – EN Fellowships	03.12	154	1	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
60[I]	Nuclear Arms – Freeze	03.12	139	12	4	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	A	N	A	N	N	Y
63[A]	Israel – Detention Palestinians	03.12	108	2	34	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	Y
63[B]	Israel – Geneva Convention – Civilians	03.12	145	1	6	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y
63[C]	Israel – Occupied Territories	03.12	145	1	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y
63[D]	Israel – Occupation – Human Rights	03.12	114	2	36	A	A	A	Y	A	A	A	A	A	A	Y	A	N	Y
63[E]	Expelled Palestinian Leaders	03.12	131	1	21	A	A	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	A	A	Y
63[F]	Israeli Laws Passed on Syrian Golan	03.12	142	1	11	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y
63[G]	Israel – Palestinian Educational Institutions	03.12	119	2	32	A	A	Y	A	Y	A	Y	A	A	A	Y	A	N	Y
68[A]	Information	03.12	148	1	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y
68[B]	Information	03.12	143	2	7	Y	A	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N	N	Y	
68[E]	ENESCO – Anniversary	03.12	134	10	9	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	A	N	A	Y	N	N	Y	
69[A]	Palestinian Refugees – Assistance	03.12	150	0	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*
69[D]	Palestinian Refugees – Scholarships	03.12	153	0	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
69[E]	Palestinian Refugees – Gaza Strip	03.12	146	2	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
69[F]	Palestinian Refugees – Ration Distribution	03.12	130	20	4	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	Y
69[G]	Persons Displaced Since 1967	03.12	126	2	25	A	A	A	A	Y	A	A	A	A	Y	Y	A	N	Y
69[H]	Palestinian Refugees – Revenues Property	03.12	124	2	28	A	A	A	A	Y	A	A	A	A	Y	Y	A	N	Y
69[I]	Palestinian Refugees – Protection	03.12	121	2	29	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	Y
69[J]	Palestinian Refugees – West Bank	03.12	145	2	6	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
69[K]	Palestinian Refugees – University Al Quds	03.12	152	2	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
71	Liberation Movements – Observer Status	03.12	125	10	17	N	A	N	N	Y	A	N	N	N	A	A	N	N	Y
73	NIEO – International Law	03.12	131	0	23	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	Y
75	Offences Against Peace – Draft Code	03.12	141	5	8	A	Y	N	N	Y	Y	A	A	A	A	Y	N	N	Y
86[A]	Nuclear Arms – Bilateral Negot.	04.12	88	0	56	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A
86[B]	Nuclear Weapons – Non-Use – Nuclear War	04.12	118	17	10	N	N	N	N	Y	A	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
86[D]	Disarmament Week	04.12	123	1	23	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	Y
86[F]	Nuclear Arms Control	04.12	130	15	5	N	A	N	N	A	Y	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	Y
86[G]	Nuclear War – Prevention	04.12	134	3	14	A	A	N	A	Y	Y	A	A	A	A	A	N	N	Y
86[H]	Nuclear War – Effects	04.12	140	1	10	A	Y	A	A	Y	Y	A	A	A	A	Y	A	N	Y
86[I]	ENGA – 10th Special Session	04.12	138	1	11	A	Y	A	A	Y	Y	A	A	A	A	Y	A	N	Y
86[J]	ENGA – 10th Special Session	04.12	128	0	18	A	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	A	A	A	A	Y	A	A	Y
86[K]	Disarmament – Cooperation	04.12	118	19	9	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
86[M]	Disarmament Conference – Report	04.12	133	3	17	A	A	N	A	Y	Y	A	A	A	A	A	N	N	Y
86[N]	Nuclear Arms – Bilateral Negot.	04.12	140	0	13	A	Y	A	A	Y	Y	A	A	A	A	Y	A	A	Y
86[O]	ENGA – 10th Special Session	04.12	135	13	5	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	Y
86[P]	Disarmament Conference – Report	04.12	101	0	50	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A
88[A]	Antarctica – Question – Information	04.12	94	0	12	*	*	*	*	*	A	*	A	*	A	*	*	*	*
88[B]	Antarctic Mineral Resources	04.12	96	0	12	*	*	*	*	*	A	*	A	*	A	*	*	*	*
88[C]	Antarctic Treaty – South Africa	04.12	119	0	8	*	*	*	*	*	A	*	A	*	A	*	*	*	Y
90	Security – Declaration – Implementation	04.12	126	1	24	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	Y
91	Dialogue	04.12	117	1	33	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	Y
92	Peace – Security	04.12	102	2	46	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	Y
93	Israel – Nuclear Arms	04.12	95	2	56	A	A	A	A	Y	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	Y
95	South Africa – Human Rights – Aid	04.12	126	10	17	N	A	N	N	A	A	N	N	N	A	A	N	N	Y

UN Voting

A/RES/40	Subject	Date	Total vote			B	D	K	F	D	G	R	I	L	N	L	P	S	P	U	K	U	S	A	U	S	R
			Yes	No	Ab.																						
101	Human Rights – Independence	04.12	126	18	12	N	N	N	N	N	A	A	N	N	N	A	A	N	N	N	Y						
102	Mercenaries	04.12	120	11	23	N	A	N	N	A	A	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	Y						
103	Apartheid – Convention	04.12	128	1	27	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	Y						
113	Human Rights – Use of Science	04.12	129	10	15	N	A	N	N	A	A	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	Y							
115	Human Rights – Use of Science	04.12	131	0	24	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	Y							
117	Human Rights – Indivisible	04.12	129	1	25	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	Y							
123	South Africa – Refugee Women and Children	04.12	147	1	8	A	Y	A	A	Y	Y	A	A	A	Y	Y	A	N	Y								
128	Right to Development – Declaration	04.12	146	1	8	Y	A	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y							
131	Human Rights – EN System	04.12	134	1	21	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	Y							
132	Right to Own Property	04.12	109	0	41	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A							
133	Right to Development	04.12	133	11	12	N	A	N	N	A	A	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	Y							
141	Ethiopia – Displaced Persons – Aid	04.12	150	1	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y							
143	Minorities – Subcommission	04.12	135	1	19	A	A	A	A	Y	A	A	A	Y	A	A	A	N	Y								
146	Right to Housing	04.12	153	0	2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y							
151	Migrant Workers	04.12	148	1	4	A	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y							
155	Human Rights – Cooperation	04.12	154	0	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y							
156	Human Rights – Guatemala	04.12	134	0	21	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y							
157	Human Rights – El Salvador	04.12	110	0	40	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y							
158	Human Rights – Afghanistan	04.12	89	24	36	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N								
159	Human Rights – Iran	04.12	61	32	42	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*								
161	Human Rights – Chile	04.12	94	5	52	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y							
162[A]	Middle East – Conditions for Peace	04.12	104	19	32	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	Y							
162[B]	Israeli Practices Occupied Territories	04.12	90	29	34	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	Y							
162[C]	Jerusalem – Status	04.12	141	3	11	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y							
164	Nicaragua – Trade Embargo	05.12	83	2	44	A	Y	A	A	Y	Y	A	A	A	A	Y	A	N	Y								
165	Economic Coercion Against DCs	05.12	115	23	3	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y								
179[A]	ENDOF – Financing	05.12	125	2	9	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y							
179[B]	ENDOF – Financing	05.12	116	2	19	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A								
180	Development – Debt	08.12	125	10	10	N	A	N	N	A	A	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	Y								
181	Palestinians – Assistance	08.12	142	2	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y							
184	Resolution 40/173																										
	– Implementation	08.12	117	16	11	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	A	Y							
187	Cultural Development Decade	08.12	146	1	2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y							
195	Uganda – Assistance	08.12	150	1	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y								
197	Mozambique – Assistance	08.12	152	1	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y								
199	Front-Line States – Special Aid	08.12	152	0	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y								
200	Benin a.o. – Assistance	01.12	152	0	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y								
209	Questions Relating to the Programme Budget																										
	Biennium 86/87																										
209[3]	Health insurance	11.12	132	10	3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*							
209[5]	News Service – Department of Political and Security Council Affairs	11.12	124	11	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*							
209[6]	Loan ENIDO	11.12	124	13	9	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*							
209[8]	Judgement No 370 Administrative Tribunal	11.12	135	10	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*							
209[9]	Job Classification	11.12	101	19	24	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*							
211[A]	EN – Revised Budget Biennium 86/87	11.12	122	13	10	A	Y	A	A	Y	Y	A	A	A	A	A	N	N	N								
211[B]	EN – Revised Income Estimates Biennium 86/87	11.12	132	11	2	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	N								
211[C]	Financing Appropriations 1987	11.12	123	14	9	A	Y	A	A	Y	Y	A	A	A	A	A	N	N	N								
212[B]	Nuclear Energy – Conference	11.12	119	0	28	A	Y	A	A	Y	Y	A	Y	A	A	A	A	A	Y								

Source: Index to Proceedings of the General Assembly (ST/LIB/Ser.B/A.41, Part 1).

## Resolutions adopted without resort to voting

A/RES/40/	Subject
1 (10.10.86)	Appointment of the Secretary-General of the EN
2 (14.10.86)	El Salvador – Emergency Assistance
3 (16.10.86)	EN/Organization of the Islamic Conference – Cooperation
5 (17.10.86)	EN/Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee – Cooperation
7/Rev. 1[A] (21.10.86)	Credentials Committee – First Report
7/Rev. 1[B] (11.12.86)	Credentials Committee – Second Report
8 (23.10.86)	EN/OAU – Cooperation
9 (24.10.86)	International Year of Peace
17 (31.10.86)	Anguilla – Question
18 (31.10.86)	Bermuda – Question
19 (31.10.86)	British Virgin Islands – Question
20 (31.10.86)	Cayman Islands – Question
21 (31.10.86)	Montserrat – Question
22 (31.10.86)	Turks and Caicos Islands – Question
23 (31.10.86)	American Samoa – Question
24 (31.10.86)	United States Virgin Islands – Question
25 (31.10.86)	Guam – Question
26 (31.10.86)	Tokelau – Question
27 (31.10.86)	Southern Africa – EN Educational and Training Programme
28 (31.10.86)	Non-Selfgoverning Territories – Study and Training
29 (31.10.86)	Africa – Emergency Situation
32 (03.11.86)	Human Rights – 20th Anniversary of International Covenants
36 (11.11.86)	IAEA Report
37 (18.11.86)	Central America – Situation
48 (03.12.86)	Nuclear Weapons – Treaty of Tlatelolco – Signature and Ratification
50 (03.12.86)	Conventional Weapons – Convention
57 (03.12.86)	Military Budgets Reduction
58[A] (03.12.86)	Bacteriological Weapons Convention – 2nd Review Conference
58[D] (03.12.86)	Chemical and Bacteriological Weapons
59[A] (03.12.86)	Radiological Weapons – Prohibition
59[C] (03.12.86)	Conventional Disarmament
59[F] (03.12.86)	Nuclear Disarmament
59[J] (03.12.86)	Arms Limitation and Disarmament Agreements – Compliance
59[O] (03.12.86)	Disarmament – EN – Role
60[D] (03.12.86)	Africa – EN Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament
60[G] (03.12.86)	Disarmament – 3rd Special Session General Assembly
60[J] (03.12.86)	Latin America – EN Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development
61 (03.12.86)	Disarmament – World Conference
62[A] (03.12.86)	Atomic Radiation Effects
62[B] (03.12.86)	Atomic Radiation Effects – Membership EN Scientific Committee
64 (03.12.86)	Outer Space – Cooperation – Peaceful Use
65 (03.12.86)	Remote Sensing – Principles
66 (03.12.86)	Convention on the Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space – Review
67 (03.12.86)	Peace-Keeping Operations – All Aspects
68[C] (03.12.86)	Information

A/RES/40/	Subject
68[D] (03.12.86)	Information
69[B] (03.12.86)	ENRWA – Financing – Working Group
69[C] (03.12.86)	Persons Displaced Since 1967 – Aid
70 (03.12.86)	Refugees – Cooperation
72 (03.12.86)	Armed Conflict – Status of Protocol
74 (03.12.86)	Peaceful Settlement of Disputes
76 (03.12.86)	Non-Use of Force – Special Committee – Report
77 (03.12.86)	ENCITRAL Report
78 (03.12.86)	Safety of Diplomatic Missions, Consulates and Representatives
79 (03.12.86)	Diplomatic Relations – 25th Anniversary Vienna Convention
80 (03.12.86)	Mercenaries Convention – Report <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee
81 (03.12.86)	International Law Commission – Report
82 (03.12.86)	Relations with the Host Country – Report
83 (03.12.86)	Special Committee on the Charter – Report
84 (03.12.86)	Good-neighbourliness
85 (03.12.86)	Children, Foster Placement, Adoption – Declaration
86[C] (04.12.86)	EN Disarmament Studies
86[E] (04.12.86)	Disarmament Commission – Report
86[L] (04.12.86)	Stockholm Conference on Confidence and CBMs in Europe
86[Q] (04.12.86)	Verification – All Aspects
86[R] (04.12.86)	Study on Deterrence
87 (04.12.86)	Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace – Implementation of Declaration
89 (04.12.86)	Mediterranean – Security and Cooperation
94 (04.12.86)	Racism and Racial Discrimination – 2nd Decade
96 (04.12.86)	Aging
97 (04.12.86)	Youth – Participation, Development, Peace
98 (04.12.86)	Youth – Human Rights – Education, Work
99 (04.12.86)	Youth – EN – Youth Organizations
100 (04.12.86)	Self-Determination – Right of Peoples
104 (04.12.86)	Racial Discrimination – Status of Convention
105 (04.12.86)	Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination
106 (04.12.86)	Disabled Persons – Implementation of Programme and Decade
107 (04.12.86)	Crime Prevention, Criminal Justice
108 (04.12.86)	Women – Convention Against Discrimination
109 (04.12.86)	Women – Participation in Promoting Peace
110 (04.12.86)	Women – Their Role in Society
111 (04.12.86)	Women – Implementation of Nairobi Strategies
112 (04.12.86)	Religious Intolerance
114 (04.12.86)	Human Rights – Implications of Scient./Techn. Developments
116 (04.12.86)	Human Rights of Children – Convention
118 (04.12.86)	Illiteracy
119 (04.12.86)	Human Rights – International Covenants
120 (04.12.86)	Human Rights – Setting International Standards
121 (04.12.86)	Human Rights – EN Instruments – Reporting Obligations
122 (04.12.86)	Refugees – Africa – 2nd International Conference
124 (04.12.86)	Refugees – Report EN High Commissioner
125 (04.12.86)	Drugs – Abuse and Illicit Trafficking – Conference
126 (04.12.86)	Drugs Trafficking – Draft Convention
127 (04.12.86)	Drugs Trafficking – International Campaign



A/RES/40/	Subject
129 (04.12.86)	Human Rights Promotion – National Institutions
130 (04.12.86)	Human Rights – Public Information Activities
134 (04.12.86)	Torture – Status of Convention
135 (04.12.86)	Torture – Voluntary EN Fund
136 (04.12.86)	Africa – Assistance to Student Refugees
137 (04.12.86)	Refugees – Djibouti – Assistance
138 (04.12.86)	Refugees – Somalia – Assistance
139 (04.12.86)	Refugees – Sudan
140 (04.12.86)	Chad – Displaced Persons – Emergency Assistance
142 (04.12.86)	Social Progress and Development – Implementation of Declaration
144 (04.12.86)	Summary or Arbitrary Executions
145 (04.12.86)	Disappearances
147 (04.12.86)	Genocide – Status of Convention
148 (04.12.86)	Human Rights and Mass Exoduses
149 (04.12.86)	Human Rights – Administration of Justice
150 (04.12.86)	Universal Declaration on Human Rights – Declaration
152 (04.12.86)	Improvement of Social Life
153 (04.12.86)	Human Rights – Asian and Pacific Zone
154 (04.12.86)	Human Rights Promotion – Regional Arrangements
160 (04.12.86)	Nazi, Fascist and Neo-Fascist Activities
163 (05.12.86)	Island Developing Countries
166 (05.12.86)	Transfer of Technology – International Code
167 (05.12.86)	Restrictive Business Practices
168 (05.12.86)	Commodities
169 (05.12.86)	ENCTAD – 7th Session
170 (05.12.86)	Committee on the Dev. and Utiliz. of New Sources of Energy – Report
171 (05.12.86)	Development – Operational Activities
172 (05.12.86)	ENITAR – Restructuring Plan
173 (05.12.86)	EN University
174 (05.12.86)	Development Analysis and Planning
175 (05.12.86)	University for Peace
176 (05.12.86)	Board of Auditors – Financial Reports
177[A] (05.12.86)	Committee on Conferences – Report
177[B] (05.12.86)	Committee on Conferences – Renewal of Mandate
177[C] (05.12.86)	Conference-Servicing Utilities – Improved Utilization
177[D] (05.12.86)	Control and Limitation of Documentation
178 (05.12.86)	EN Expenses – Scale of Assessment
182 (08.12.86)	Development – Indigenous Entrepreneurs
183 (08.12.86)	Development – Science, Technology – EN Financing System
185 (08.12.86)	Africa – Locust and Grasshopper Infestation
186 (08.12.86)	Kiribati, Mauritania, Tuvalu – LDCs
188 (08.12.86)	ECOSOC, ENDP Governing Council – 1987 Sessions
189 (08.12.86)	Commission on Human Settlements – 10th Session
190 (08.12.86)	International Year of Shelter for the Homeless
191 (08.12.86)	Food and Agricultural Problems
192 (08.12.86)	Economic Assistance – Special Programmes
193 (08.12.86)	Assistance – Solomon Islands
194 (08.12.86)	Assistance – El Salvador

---

<b>A/RES/40/</b>	<b>Subject</b>
196 (08.12.86)	Assistance – Reconstruction of Lebanon
198 (08.12.86)	Assistance – Mozambique
201 (08.12.86)	ENDRO
202 (08.12.86)	Third World Debt – Cooperation
203 (11.12.86)	Programme Planning
204[A] (11.12.86)	EN – Financial Emergency
204[B] (11.12.86)	EN – Financial Emergency – Postage Stamps
205 (11.12.86)	EN, Specialized Agencies – Respect for Privileges and Immunities
206[A] (11.12.86)	EN Secretariat – Composition
206[B] (11.12.86)	EN Secretariat – Composition Upper Echelons
206[C] (11.12.86)	Professional Categories – Geographical Distribution
206[D] (11.12.86)	EN Secretariat – Women
207 (11.12.86)	ICSC – Report on the EN Common System
208 (11.12.86)	EN Pension Scheme
209[1] (11.12.86)	ACABQ – First Report
209[2] (11.12.86)	International Computing Centre – 1987 Budget Estimates
209[4] (11.12.86)	Consultant Services
209[7] (11.12.86)	Conference Services – Vienna
209[10] (11.12.86)	Secretary-General a.o. – Salary and Pension
210 (11.12.86)	Damages for Acts in the Headquarters District
212[A] (11.12.86)	Nuclear Energy – EN Conference

---

*Source:* Index to Proceedings of the General Assembly (ST/LIB/Ser.B/A.41, Part 1).

---

**Voting chart of resolutions adopted  
during the 41th Session of the UN Security Council**

S/RES/	Subject	Date	Total vote			D K	F	U K	U S A	U S S R
			Yes	No	Ab.					
581 (1986)	Apartheid	13.02.86	13	0	2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
582 (1986)	Iran (Islamic Republic of) – Iraq	24.02.86	unanimous			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
583 (1986)	ENIFIL	18.04.86	unanimous			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
584 (1986)	ENDOF	29.05.86	unanimous			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
585 (1986)	ENFICYP	13.06.86	unanimous			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
586 (1986)	ENIFIL	18.07.86	unanimous			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
587 (1986)	ENIFIL	23.09.86	14	0	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
588 (1986)	Iran (Islamic Republic of) – Iraq	08.10.86	unanimous			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
589 (1986)	EN Secretary-General – Appointment	10.10.86	unanimous			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
590 (1986)	ENDOF	26.11.86	unanimous			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
591 (1986)	Apartheid	28.11.86	'consensus'			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
592 (1986)	Territories Occupied by Israel	08.12.86	14	0	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
593 (1986)	ENFICYP	11.12.86	unanimous			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Source: Index to Proceedings of the Security Council (ST/LIB/SER.B/S.23).



## Index

### Status of Document

Answer to oral question in the European Parliament, 85/003, 85/004, 85/005, 85/006, 85/007, 85/008, 85/009, 85/010, 85/011, 85/018, 85/019, 85/020, 85/021, 85/022, 85/023, 85/024, 85/025, 85/026, 85/027, 85/028, 85/029, 85/030, 85/031, 85/032, 85/033, 85/034, 85/035, 85/036, 85/037, 85/038, 85/039, 85/040, 85/041, 85/042, 85/043, 85/044, 85/045, 85/046, 85/047, 85/048, 85/049, 85/052, 85/053, 85/054, 85/055, 85/056, 85/057, 85/058, 85/059, 85/060, 85/061, 85/062, 85/074, 85/075, 85/076, 85/077, 85/078, 85/079, 85/080, 85/081, 85/082, 85/083, 85/084, 85/085, 85/086, 85/087, 85/097, 85/098, 85/099, 85/100, 85/101, 85/102, 85/103, 85/104, 85/105, 85/106, 85/107, 85/108, 85/109, 85/110, 85/111, 85/147, 85/148, 85/149, 85/150, 85/151, 85/152, 85/153, 85/154, 85/155, 85/156, 85/157, 85/158, 85/159, 85/160, 85/176, 85/177, 85/178, 85/179, 85/180, 85/181, 85/182, 85/183, 85/184, 85/185, 85/186, 85/197, 85/198, 85/199, 85/200, 85/201, 85/202, 85/203, 85/204, 85/205, 85/206, 85/207, 85/208, 85/209, 85/210, 85/211, 85/212, 85/220, 85/221, 85/222, 85/223, 85/256, 85/257, 85/258, 85/259, 85/260, 85/261, 85/262, 85/264, 85/265, 85/266, 85/267, 85/268, 85/269, 85/319, 85/320, 85/321, 85/322, 85/323, 85/324, 85/325, 86/026, 86/027, 86/028, 86/029, 86/030, 86/031, 86/032, 86/033, 86/034, 86/035, 86/036, 86/037, 86/072, 86/073, 86/074, 86/075, 86/076, 86/077, 86/078, 86/079, 86/080, 86/081, 86/082, 86/083, 86/084, 86/091, 86/092, 86/093, 86/094, 86/095, 86/096, 86/097, 86/098, 86/099, 86/100, 86/101, 86/125, 86/126, 86/127, 86/128, 86/129, 86/130, 86/131, 86/132, 86/133, 86/140, 86/141, 86/142, 86/143, 86/144, 86/145, 86/146, 86/147, 86/148, 86/149, 86/150, 86/165, 86/166, 86/167, 86/168, 86/169, 86/170, 86/171, 86/172, 86/173, 86/174, 86/200, 86/201, 86/202, 86/203, 86/204, 86/205, 86/206, 86/207, 86/208, 86/209, 86/210, 86/211, 86/251, 86/252, 86/253, 86/254, 86/255, 86/256, 86/257, 86/258, 86/259, 86/260, 86/261, 86/262, 86/263, 86/264, 86/265, 86/266, 86/267, 86/268, 86/269, 86/278, 86/279, 86/280, 86/281, 86/282, 86/283, 86/284, 86/285, 86/286, 86/287, 86/288, 86/289, 86/290, 86/291, 86/292, 86/293, 86/294, 86/307, 86/308, 86/309, 86/310, 86/311, 86/312, 86/313, 86/314, 86/315, 86/316, 86/317, 86/318, 86/319, 86/320, 86/385, 86/386, 86/387, 86/388, 86/389, 86/390, 86/391, 86/392, 86/393, 86/394, 86/395, 86/396, 86/397, 86/398, 86/399, 86/400, 86/401, 86/403

Answer to written question in the European Parliament, 85/063, 85/064, 85/065, 85/066, 85/067, 85/088, 85/089, 85/090, 85/091, 85/093, 85/115, 85/116, 85/117, 85/118, 85/119, 85/120, 85/121, 85/122, 85/123, 85/124, 85/125, 85/126, 85/127, 85/128, 85/129, 85/130, 85/131, 85/132, 85/133, 85/134, 85/135, 85/136, 85/137, 85/138, 85/139, 85/140, 85/141, 85/142, 85/143, 85/144, 85/242, 85/243, 85/244, 85/245, 85/246, 85/247, 85/248, 85/272, 85/273, 85/274, 85/275, 85/276, 85/277, 85/278, 85/280, 85/281, 85/282, 85/283, 85/284, 85/285, 85/286, 85/287, 85/288, 86/001, 86/002, 86/003, 86/004, 86/005, 86/006, 86/007, 86/008, 86/009, 86/010, 86/012, 86/013, 86/014, 86/015, 86/016, 86/017, 86/018, 86/019, 86/020, 86/021, 86/022, 86/023, 86/038, 86/039, 86/040, 86/041, 86/042, 86/044, 86/045, 86/046, 86/047, 86/048, 86/049, 86/050, 86/051, 86/052, 86/053, 86/054, 86/055, 86/056, 86/057, 86/058, 86/059, 86/062, 86/063, 86/064, 86/065, 86/066, 86/106, 86/107, 86/108, 86/109, 86/110, 86/111, 86/112, 86/113, 86/114, 86/115, 86/116, 86/120, 86/121, 86/122, 86/156, 86/157, 86/158, 86/159, 86/160, 86/161, 86/162, 86/176, 86/177, 86/178, 86/179, 86/180, 86/181, 86/182, 86/188, 86/189, 86/190, 86/191, 86/192, 86/193, 86/194, 86/195, 86/197, 86/212, 86/213, 86/214, 86/215, 86/216, 86/217, 86/218, 86/219, 86/220, 86/221, 86/222, 86/223, 86/224, 86/225, 86/226, 86/227, 86/232, 86/233, 86/234, 86/235, 86/236, 86/237, 86/238, 86/239, 86/240, 86/241, 86/242, 86/243, 86/244, 86/344

Balance speech before the European Parliament, 85/096, 85/318, 86/164, 86/402

- Conclusions of the European Council, 85/114, 86/184, 86/382, 86/383
- Decision, 86/090, 86/175
- Joint decision (with Spain and Portugal), 85/291
- Declaration, 85/001, 85/012, 85/013, 85/014, 85/015, 85/016, 85/050, 85/069, 85/070, 85/071, 85/072, 85/073, 85/092, 85/094, 85/095, 85/112, 85/113, 85/161, 85/162, 85/163, 85/170, 85/171, 85/332 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/043, 86/060, 86/061, 86/070, 86/071, 86/085, 86/086, 86/087, 86/088, 86/102, 86/103, 86/105, 86/117, 86/119, 86/134, 86/139, 86/151, 86/153, 86/154, 86/163, 86/185, 86/186, 86/196, 86/228, 86/229, 86/230, 86/231, 86/245, 86/246, 86/249, 86/270, 86/271, 86/272, 86/276, 86/303, 86/321, 86/352, 86/377, 86/404, 86/406, 86/408
- Joint declaration
- with Spain and Portugal, 85/173, 85/174, 85/187, 85/188, 85/191, 85/232, 85/253, 85/330, 85/331, 85/333, 85/335 (Vol. 1986-1)
- with other actors, 85/253, 86/068, 86/306
- Message, 85/017, 85/167, 85/342 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/024, 86/248
- Press statement, press release, 85/164, 85/165, 85/166, 85/169, 85/172, 85/175, 85/293, 85/294, 85/305, 85/337 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/069, 86/089, 86/104, 86/138, 86/351, 86/361, 86/378
- Programme speech to European Parliament, 85/002, 85/146, 86/025, 86/198
- Report on European Council to the European Parliament, 85/051, 85/145, 85/317, 86/187, 86/384
- Report of the European Council to European Parliament on European Union, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/407
- Report to European Parliament (other), 85/292, 86/137
- Report to the Economic and Social Committee of the EC, 85/292
- Statement or speech in international forum (other than European Parliament), 85/334 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/340 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/067, 86/118, 86/183, 86/199, 86/273, 86/274, 86/296, 86/323
- Council of Europe, 85/068
- CSCE, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/339 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/123, 86/124, 86/343, 86/405
- UNESCO, 85/338 (Vol. 1986-1)
- United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), 86/136, 86/152
- United Nations General Assembly
- Plenary session, 85/189, 85/219, 85/226, 85/228, 85/233, 85/237, 85/251, 85/254, 85/279, 85/295, 85/297, 85/309, 85/312, 85/315, 85/326, 85/327, 85/328, 86/135, 86/155, 86/250, 86/275, 86/297, 86/301, 86/302, 86/304, 86/330, 86/340, 86/347, 86/349, 86/354, 86/362, 86/365, 86/373, 86/376, 86/379, 86/380, 86/381
- First (Political and Security) Committee, 85/217, 85/234, 85/240, 85/241, 85/249, 85/263, 85/289, 85/306, 86/298, 86/331, 86/332, 86/333, 86/334, 86/335, 86/336, 86/341, 86/342, 86/350, 86/353, 86/355, 86/357, 86/367
- Special Political Committee, 85/193, 85/195, 85/213, 85/231, 85/250, 85/255, 85/270, 85/296, 85/313, 86/300, 86/324, 86/345, 86/359, 86/374
- Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, 86/368, 86/369
- Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, 85/194, 85/229, 85/238, 85/239, 85/252, 85/290, 85/300, 85/302, 86/277, 86/299, 86/325, 86/326, 86/327, 86/328, 86/337, 86/338, 86/339, 86/346, 86/356, 86/360, 86/363, 86/364, 86/370, 86/375
- Fourth (Trusteeship) Committee, 85/230, 86/322
- Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee, 85/190, 85/196, 85/215, 85/218, 85/227, 85/235, 85/236, 85/271, 85/299, 85/301, 85/311, 85/314, 85/316, 85/329, 86/295, 86/348, 86/366, 86/371
- Sixth (Legal) Committee, 85/192, 85/216, 85/225, 85/298, 85/303, 85/304, 85/307, 85/308, 85/310, 86/305, 86/329, 86/358, 86/372
- Special Committee against Apartheid, 85/214
- Preparatory Committee for the Celebration of the 40th Anniversary, and Consultative Group, 85/168, 85/224

## EPC Structure and Procedure

### Basic documents on EPC

Copenhagen Report, 85/041, 86/090

Draft Treaty on European Political Cooperation, 85/317, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1)

London Report, 86/090

Luxembourg Report, 86/090

Single European Act, 86/090, 86/133, 86/140, 86/168, 86/198, 86/283, 86/308, 86/343, 86/387, 86/402, 86/407

Solemn Declaration on European Union, 85/080, 85/147, 85/317, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/090

### Basic principles of EPC

Common position, 85/002, 85/003, 85/005, 85/037, 85/053, 85/145, 85/151, 85/152, 85/154, 85/164, 85/169, 85/186, 85/209, 85/219, 85/246, 85/252, 85/310, 85/317, 85/327, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/058, 86/059, 86/121, 86/169, 86/187, 86/311, 86/400

Common vote, 85/053, 85/104, 85/322, 86/058, 86/106, 86/106, 86/190, 86/407

European identity in foreign policy, 85/014, 85/051, 85/096, 85/317, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/140

General principles, 85/002, 85/003, 85/004, 85/051, 85/080, 85/104, 85/317, 86/311

Harmonization of foreign policies, 85/051, 85/145, 86/198

Institutionalization of EPC, 85/055, 86/187

Joint action, 85/152, 85/163, 85/172, 85/178, 85/186, 85/225, 85/288, 85/293, 85/317, 85/320, 86/061, 86/140, 86/311

Working languages, 85/242

Sphere of action of EPC, 85/003, 85/004, 85/005, 85/007, 85/009, 85/010, 85/027, 85/034, 85/035, 85/036, 85/040, 85/045, 85/047, 85/066, 85/067, 85/082, 85/093, 85/097, 85/101, 85/106, 85/109, 85/118, 85/119, 85/124, 85/125, 85/126, 85/127, 85/128, 85/132, 85/136, 85/142, 85/143, 85/147, 85/150, 85/151, 85/155, 85/156, 85/176, 85/180, 85/202, 85/203, 85/204, 85/205, 85/247, 85/248, 85/259, 85/260, 85/266, 85/283, 85/284, 85/319, 86/016, 86/017, 86/018, 86/019, 86/035, 86/064, 86/077, 86/082, 86/095, 86/095, 86/101, 86/106, 86/109, 86/114, 86/120, 86/122, 86/129, 86/131, 86/133, 86/146, 86/158, 86/160, 86/197, 86/205, 86/207, 86/215, 86/225, 86/252, 86/253, 86/259, 86/260, 86/266, 86/278, 86/279, 86/280, 86/282, 86/283, 86/289, 86/309, 86/311, 86/317

### Structure of EPC

COREU, 86/090, 86/137, 86/387

Diplomatic missions, 85/020, 85/063, 85/065, 85/291, 86/090, 86/137, 86/195

EPC Secretariat, 85/041, 85/055, 85/145, 85/267, 85/317, 86/090, 86/140, 86/387, 86/402, 86/407

European Correspondents' Group, 86/090, 86/387

European Council, 86/198

Foreign Ministers, 85/003, 85/004, 85/005, 86/090, 86/137, 86/387

Member States, 85/005, 85/025, 85/030, 85/031, 85/037, 85/041, 85/044, 85/051, 85/053, 85/060, 85/068, 85/069, 85/078, 85/080, 85/082, 85/104, 85/154, 86/042, 86/090, 86/092, 86/195, 86/218, 86/311

Ministers of Justice, 85/021, 86/039, 86/093, 86/134, 86/142, 86/144

Ministers for the Interior, 85/021, 86/039, 86/093, 86/134, 86/142, 86/144

Political Committee, 86/090, 86/137, 86/387

Presidency, 85/002, 85/003, 85/004, 85/005, 85/007, 85/041, 85/052, 85/055, 85/096, 85/098, 85/104, 85/147, 85/242, 85/274, 85/281, 85/291, 85/317, 86/090, 86/164, 86/195, 86/387

Translation service, 85/242, 86/090, 86/387

Trevi group, 85/208, 85/272, 85/274, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/039, 86/093, 86/134, 86/142, 86/194, 86/200, 86/226, 86/318

Troika, 85/041, 85/133, 85/139, 86/090, 86/133, 86/134

- Troika missions, 85/165, 85/166, 85/169, 85/170, 85/171, 85/172, 85/186, 85/221, 86/038, 86/187
- Working groups, 86/090, 86/387
  - Africa, 86/137
  - Asia, 86/137
  - Cooperation in Combating International Terrorism, 86/061, 86/093, 86/133, 86/142, 86/144
  - CSCCE, CDE and other aspects of the Helinki Final Act, 86/137
  - Eastern Europe, 86/137
  - Latin America, 86/137
  - Middle East, 86/071, 86/137
  - United Nations, 86/137
- Relations of EPC with the European Communities, 85/002, 85/041, 85/080, 85/281, 85/317, 86/090, 86/128, 86/260, 86/309, 86/387, 86/402
- Jurisdiction of the EC institutions, 85/005, 85/054, 85/151, 85/177, 85/254, 85/258, 86/065, 86/076, 86/176, 86/201, 86/251, 86/309, 86/312, 86/314, 86/317, 86/343
- Relations with the Commission, 85/005, 85/033, 85/165, 85/166, 85/172, 85/317, 85/318, 86/076, 86/090, 86/195, 86/200
- Relations with COREPER, 86/076
- Relations with the Council of Ministers, 85/003, 85/005, 85/044, 85/062, 85/077, 86/076, 86/090
- Relations with the Economic and Social Committee, 85/291, 86/025
- Relations with the European Parliament, 85/002, 85/005, 85/007, 85/008, 85/045, 85/052, 85/054, 85/080, 85/146, 85/148, 85/207, 85/242, 85/262, 85/267, 85/291, 85/293, 85/317, 85/318, 86/033, 86/071, 86/090, 86/093, 86/137, 86/140, 86/160, 86/164, 86/187, 86/195, 86/198, 86/210
  - Relations with the Political Affairs Committee, 86/090, 86/198
- Resolutions of the European Parliament, 85/076, 8375/098, 85/146, 85/147, 85/201, 85/210, 85/262, 85/268, 85/293, 86/002, 86/025, 86/071, 86/140, 86/307, 86/308, 86/385, 86/386

## **Contacts of EPC**

- Contacts with third countries, 86/183, 86/185, 86/198, 86/264, 86/286, 86/347, 86/407
  - Albania, 85/074, 85/149
  - Bolivia, 85/064
  - Burundi, 85/261
  - Canada, 85/041
  - Chile, 85/028, 85/081, 85/091, 86/094, 85/183, 85/286
  - China, People's Republic of -, 85/041, 85/096, 85/147, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/047
  - Colombia, 85/253
  - Costa Rica, 85/253
  - Cyprus, 85/176
  - Egypt, 86/071, 86/286, 86/407
  - El Salvador, 85/253, 86/196
  - Ethiopia, 85/148, 85/197
  - Front-Line States, 86/025, 86/068, 86/069, 86/072, 86/127, 86/263, 86/273, 86/275, 86/347, 86/407
  - Guatemala, 85/253
  - Honduras, 85/253
  - India, 85/041, 86/047, 86/141, 86/144
  - Indonesia, 85/141, 85/210



- Iran, 85/022, 85/090, 85/206, 85/223, 86/177  
Iraq, 85/090  
Israel, 85/054, 85/138, 85/211, 86/021, 86/026  
Japan, 85/041, 85/147, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/047, 86/407  
Jordan, 85/002, 85/120, 86/286  
Lebanon, 85/039, 85/096  
Malta, 86/407  
Mexico, 85/253  
Nicaragua, 85/077, 85/253  
Norway, 85/041, 85/281  
Pakistan, 85/099, 85/201  
Panama, 85/253, 85/297, 86/150, 86/164  
Philippines, 85/262, 86/075, 86/089, 86/132  
Poland, 86/092  
Portugal, 85/041, 85/164, 85/165, 85/166, 85/168, 85/170, 85/187, 85/189, 85/191, 85/253, 85/292, 85/293, 85/294, 85/330, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1)  
South Africa, 85/165, 85/166, 85/169, 85/170, 85/171, 85/172, 85/186, 85/189, 85/194, 85/214, 85/221, 85/228, 85/238, 85/282, 85/318, 85/321, 86/038, 86/067, 86/069, 86/072, 86/074, 86/086, 86/118, 86/127, 86/164, 86/187, 86/198, 86/386, 86/407  
Soviet Union, 85/088, 85/089, 85/096, 85/198, 85/220, 85/258, 86/047, 86/056, 86/107, 86/110, 86/182, 86/407  
Spain, 85/041, 85/164, 85/165, 85/166, 85/168, 85/170, 85/187, 85/189, 85/191, 85/253, 85/292, 85/293, 85/294, 85/330, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1)  
Syria, 85/096, 85/120  
Turkey, 85/019, 85/041, 85/052, 85/059, 85/062, 85/105, 85/115, 85/134, 85/176, 85/268, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/113, 86/128, 86/281, 86/313, 86/317, 86/407  
Uganda, 85/020, 85/063, 85/065  
United States, 85/002, 85/041, 85/147, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/044, 86/095, 86/110, 86/407  
Venezuela, 85/253  
Vietnam, 86/156  
Yugoslavia, 86/181, 86/338, 86/407  
Zambia, 86/067, 86/198  
Zimbabwe, 86/066, 86/198
- Contacts with international organizations and political groupings  
African National Congress, 85/172, 85/194, 85/228, 86/072  
Arab League (League of Arab States), 86/133, 86/140, 86/286  
ASEAN, 85/012, 85/041, 85/123, 85/147, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/047, 86/089  
Central American States, 85/001, 85/002, 85/017, 85/041, 85/051, 85/058, 85/068, 85/077, 85/096, 85/133, 85/139, 85/146, 85/182, 85/189, 85/297, 85/318, 85/340 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/062, 86/362, 86/363, 86/368, 86/381, 86/407  
COMECON, 85/258  
Contadora Group, 85/001, 85/002, 85/017, 85/032, 85/041, 85/056, 85/096, 85/133, 85/139, 85/146, 85/189, 85/253, 85/297, 85/318, 85/340 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/235  
Council of Europe, 85/041, 86/093  
EFTA, 85/281  
Gulf Cooperation Council, 86/407  
South Asia Regional Cooperation, 86/116  
SWAPO, 86/072  
United Nations, 85/148, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1)  
    Secretary-General, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/104

## Countries

- Afghanistan, 85/002, 85/056, 85/068, 85/096, 85/117, 85/146, 85/162, 85/189, 85/238, 85/251, 85/300, 85/331, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/025, 86/137, 86/140, 86/152, 86/232, 86/240, 86/275, 86/306, 86/340, 86/363, 86/383, 86/384, 86/394, 86/407
- Albania, 85/074, 85/149, 86/098, 86/112
- Algeria, 86/157
- Angola, 85/002, 85/094, 85/096, 85/135, 85/187, 85/189, 85/279, 85/337 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/004, 86/005, 86/067, 86/068, 86/086, 86/199, 86/247, 86/273, 86/307
- Argentina, 85/051, 85/173, 85/232, 85/297, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/152
- Australia, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1)
- Austria, 85/296, 85/333, 86/023, 86/026, 86/343
- Belgium, 85/005, 85/252, 85/292, 86/041, 86/052, 86/055, 86/084, 86/109, 86/115, 86/158, 86/162, 86/189, 86/227, 86/305
- Benin, 85/110
- Bolivia, 85/064, 85/068
- Botswana, 85/112, 85/135, 85/279, 86/067, 86/153, 86/173, 86/407
- Brazil, 85/002, 85/051, 85/173, 85/297
- Bulgaria, 85/084, 85/103, 85/159, 86/151, 86/401
- Burundi, 85/261, 86/395
- Cambodia, 85/002, 85/012, 85/068, 85/096, 85/146, 85/189, 85/237, 85/238, 85/300, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/139, 86/152, 86/275, 86/304, 86/306, 86/363, 86/407
- Cameroon, 86/333
- Canada, 85/041, 85/221, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/302
- Chile, 85/002, 85/028, 85/051, 85/064, 85/068, 85/081, 85/091, 85/174, 85/183, 85/189, 85/286, 85/300, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/025, 86/046, 86/048, 86/059, 86/094, 86/103, 86/137, 86/152, 86/245, 86/249, 86/272, 86/275, 86/294, 86/363, 86/407
- China, People's Republic of -, 85/041, 85/051, 85/096, 85/160, 85/204, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/047, 86/052, 86/285, 86/341
- Colombia, 86/042
- Comoros, 85/257
- Congo, People's Republic of the -, 86/059
- Costa Rica, 85/253, 85/340 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/050, 86/085, 86/176, 86/319
- Cuba, 85/199,
- Cyprus, 85/013, 85/038, 85/068, 85/095, 85/126, 85/176, 85/184, 85/185, 85/189, 85/195, 85/212, 85/222, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/100, 86/145, 86/152, 86/201, 86/243, 86/275, 86/280, 86/300, 86/309, 86/313, 86/316, 86/385, 86/403, 86/407
- Czechoslovakia, 85/151, 86/363, 86/402
- Denmark, 85/007, 85/053, 85/055, 85/061, 85/087, 85/292, 85/325, 86/052, 86/055, 86/115, 86/227, 86/252, 86/311
- Djibuti, 86/231, 86/275
- Egypt, 85/051, 85/054, 85/069, 85/093, 85/146, 85/229, 86/071, 86/275, 86/286, 86/407
- El Salvador, 85/188, 85/253, 85/300, 86/001, 86/152, 86/193, 86/196, 86/312, 86/363
- Ethiopia, 85/024, 85/148, 85/197, 86/033, 86/083, 86/231, 86/275
- Finland, 85/041, 85/055
- France, 85/079, 85/082, 85/145, 85/151, 85/292, 85/325, 86/016, 86/017, 86/019, 86/052, 86/055, 86/092, 86/115, 86/120, 86/121, 86/126, 86/160, 86/162, 86/164, 86/165, 86/174, 86/227, 86/252, 86/402
- Germany, Democratic Republic of -, 85/003, 86/405
- Germany, Federal Republic of -, 85/003, 85/035, 85/046, 85/122, 85/143, 85/145, 85/156, 85/222, 85/247, 85/285, 85/292, 86/052, 86/055, 86/115, 86/122, 86/149, 86/161, 86/162, 86/164, 86/165, 86/227, 86/252, 86/363, 86/377, 86/386, 86/402, 86/405, 86/407

- Greece, 85/007, 85/074, 85/104, 85/119, 85/125, 85/126, 85/127, 85/292, 86/052, 86/055, 86/112, 86/115, 86/162, 86/187, 86/227, 86/244, 86/256, 86/260, 86/313, 86/385, 86/401
- Grenada, 86/079
- Guatemala, 85/253, 85/277, 85/300, 85/340 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/084, 86/152, 86/363, 86/407
- Guinea-Bissau, Republic of -, 86/229
- Honduras, 85/253, 85/307, 86/050, 86/319
- Hungary, 86/151, 86/363, 86/402
- India, 85/041, 85/051, 85/323, 86/047, 86/088, 86/109, 86/141, 86/144, 86/228, 86/275
- Indonesia, 85/141, 85/146, 85/210, 86/015
- Iran, 85/002, 85/004, 85/022, 85/043, 85/051, 85/068, 85/069, 85/090, 85/097, 85/146, 85/189, 85/206, 85/217, 85/223, 85/241, 85/294, 85/300, 85/312, 85/318, 85/322, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/025, 86/087, 86/096, 86/105, 86/137, 86/140, 86/143, 86/152, 86/177, 86/191, 86/209, 86/246, 86/268, 86/275, 86/285, 86/306, 86/363, 86/376, 86/407
- Iraq, 85/002, 85/004, 85/043, 85/051, 85/068, 85/069, 85/090, 85/097, 85/146, 85/189, 85/217, 85/233, 85/241, 85/294, 85/312, 85/318, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/025, 86/087, 86/096, 86/105, 86/140, 86/143, 86/177, 86/191, 86/209, 86/246, 86/275, 86/306, 86/376, 86/407
- Ireland, 85/007, 85/009, 85/202, 85/203, 85/252, 85/292, 86/052, 86/055, 86/162, 86/227
- Israel, 85/002, 85/016, 85/039, 85/051, 85/054, 85/068, 85/069, 85/138, 85/146, 85/179, 85/189, 85/191, 85/211, 85/231, 85/233, 85/250, 85/256, 85/270, 85/300, 85/305, 85/309, 85/312, 85/318, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/021, 86/023, 86/026, 86/036, 86/099, 86/137, 86/171, 86/178, 86/267, 86/275, 86/300, 86/315, 86/359, 86/363, 86/373, 86/376, 86/389, 86/408
- Italy, 85/002, 85/010, 85/035, 85/082, 85/099, 85/165, 85/166, 85/186, 85/292, 85/333, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/052, 86/055, 86/098, 86/115, 86/133, 86/162, 86/227
- Ivory Coast, 86/307
- Japan, 85/041, 85/109, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/047, 86/374, 86/402, 86/407
- Jordan, 85/002, 85/051, 85/069, 85/120, 85/146, 85/175, 85/189, 85/211, 85/294, 85/305, 85/309, 85/318, 86/023, 86/026, 86/071, 86/286
- Kenya, 85/229, 86/010
- Laos, 86/275
- Lebanon, 85/016, 85/039, 85/051, 85/068, 85/069, 85/092, 85/096, 85/107, 85/146, 85/175, 85/189, 85/192, 85/250, 85/270, 85/312, 85/314, 85/318, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/178, 86/186, 86/243, 86/252, 86/275, 86/300, 86/306, 86/321, 86/324, 86/376, 86/407
- Lesotho, 86/067, 86/159, 86/211
- Libya, 85/005, 85/031, 85/078, 85/259, 86/078, 86/081, 86/099, 86/119, 86/133, 86/149, 86/164, 86/168, 86/172, 86/221, 86/224, 86/244, 86/252, 86/275, 86/276, 86/324, 86/399, 86/402, 86/407
- Luxembourg, 85/146, 85/165, 85/166, 85/186, 85/189, 85/292, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/052, 86/055, 86/141, 86/161, 86/227
- Malta, 85/049, 86/407
- Mexico, 85/189, 86/115
- Morocco, 85/284, 86/157, 86/166, 86/208, 86/255, 86/314, 86/320, 86/391
- Mozambique, 85/002, 85/015, 85/068, 85/096, 86/065, 86/067, 86/068, 86/072, 86/303, 86/307, 86/392
- Namibia, 85/002, 85/070, 85/112, 85/146, 85/161, 85/167, 85/187, 85/189, 85/195, 85/219, 85/238, 85/279, 85/300, 85/327, 85/337 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/004, 86/005, 86/006, 86/007, 86/008, 86/067, 86/068, 86/072, 86/106, 86/152, 86/162, 86/180, 86/197, 86/199, 86/202, 86/212, 86/216, 86/217, 86/218, 86/234, 86/247, 86/273, 86/274, 86/275, 86/306, 86/307, 86/327, 86/354, 86/363, 86/365, 86/407
- Netherlands, The -, 85/126, 85/165, 85/166, 85/186, 85/292, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/025, 86/052, 86/055, 86/076, 86/096, 86/115, 86/140, 86/141, 86/162, 86/164, 86/165, 86/189, 86/198, 86/227, 86/272
- New Zealand, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/016, 86/160

- Nicaragua, 85/029, 85/032, 85/058, 85/077, 85/108, 85/111, 85/199, 85/253, 85/275, 86/050, 86/053, 86/062, 86/080, 86/085, 86/111, 86/130, 86/133, 86/176, 86/233, 86/251, 86/319, 86/368, 86/381, 86/384
- Nigeria, 85/110, 85/216, 86/014, 86/031, 86/190, 86/285, 86/346
- North Korea, 85/101, 85/189, 85/199, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/275
- Norway, 85/041, 85/055
- Pakistan, 85/057, 85/068, 85/099, 85/162, 85/189, 85/201, 85/251, 85/331, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/091, 86/096, 86/285, 86/290, 86/340
- Panama, 85/253, 85/297, 86/150, 86/164
- Paraguay, 85/189
- Peru, 85/173, 85/297, 86/152, 86/284, 86/341
- Philippines, 85/262, 85/332, 86/070, 86/075, 86/089, 86/132, 86/138, 86/213, 86/363, 86/407
- Poland, 85/002, 85/046, 85/146, 85/158, 85/189, 85/287, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/092, 86/121, 86/137, 86/151, 86/270, 86/363, 86/372, 86/407
- Portugal, 85/041, 85/044, 85/141, 85/164, 85/165, 85/166, 85/168, 85/169, 85/170, 85/171, 85/172, 85/173, 85/174, 85/186, 85/187, 85/188, 85/191, 85/194, 85/195, 85/196, 85/209, 85/214, 85/216, 85/217, 85/221, 85/224, 85/225, 85/228, 85/229, 85/232, 85/234, 85/239, 85/240, 85/241, 85/249, 85/250, 85/251, 85/253, 85/254, 85/255, 85/263, 85/272, 85/275, 85/279, 85/289, 85/292, 85/293, 85/294, 85/295, 85/296, 85/297, 85/300, 85/302, 85/303, 85/304, 85/306, 85/307, 85/310, 85/312, 85/313, 85/315, 85/318, 85/321, 85/324, 85/325, 85/326, 85/327, 85/328, 85/330, 85/331, 85/332, 85/337 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/018, 86/052, 86/055, 86/198, 86/227, 86/309, 86/407
- Romania, 86/151, 86/372, 86/402, 86/407
- Saudi Arabia, 85/243, 86/285
- Senegal, 85/221
- Somalia, 85/231, 86/275
- South Africa, 85/002, 85/015, 85/030, 85/040, 85/048, 85/050, 85/051, 85/061, 85/068, 85/070, 85/086, 85/087, 85/094, 85/112, 85/121, 85/135, 85/144, 85/146, 85/152, 85/157, 85/161, 85/164, 85/166, 85/167, 85/169, 85/170, 85/171, 85/172, 85/186, 85/187, 85/189, 85/194, 85/209, 85/214, 85/221, 85/228, 85/238, 85/279, 85/282, 85/288, 85/291, 85/292, 85/293, 85/300, 85/315, 85/318, 85/320, 85/321, 85/324, 85/325, 85/327, 85/337 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/003, 86/014, 86/020, 86/025, 86/030, 86/037, 86/038, 86/040, 86/058, 86/063, 86/065, 86/067, 86/068, 86/069, 86/072, 86/074, 86/076, 86/086, 86/097, 86/102, 86/118, 86/126, 86/127, 86/136, 86/137, 86/140, 86/152, 86/153, 86/158, 86/159, 86/161, 86/164, 86/165, 86/173, 86/175, 86/179, 86/180, 86/183, 86/185, 86/187, 86/189, 86/190, 86/195, 86/198, 86/199, 86/204, 86/206, 86/211, 86/217, 86/218, 86/219, 86/234, 86/237, 86/238, 86/247, 86/257, 86/262, 86/263, 86/264, 86/271, 86/273, 86/274, 86/275, 86/277, 86/285, 86/291, 86/296, 86/303, 86/307, 86/308, 86/322, 86/323, 86/326, 86/327, 86/347, 86/349, 86/354, 86/361, 86/363, 86/365, 86/384, 86/386, 86/392, 86/397, 86/402, 86/406, 86/407
- South Korea, 85/101, 85/189, 85/278, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1)
- Soviet Union, 85/002, 85/008, 85/014, 85/023, 85/035, 85/051, 85/056, 85/068, 85/083, 85/088, 85/089, 85/096, 85/114, 85/117, 85/146, 85/150, 85/153, 85/162, 85/179, 85/189, 85/198, 85/217, 85/220, 85/251, 85/258, 85/259, 85/269, 85/276, 85/300, 85/306, 85/318, 85/330, 85/331, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/009, 86/022, 86/027, 86/029, 86/034, 86/047, 86/052, 86/056, 86/059, 86/100, 86/107, 86/110, 86/137, 86/140, 86/148, 86/151, 86/170, 86/182, 86/198, 86/220, 86/222, 86/232, 86/240, 86/254, 86/265, 86/275, 86/278, 86/287, 86/288, 86/300, 86/306, 86/308, 86/340, 86/343, 86/344, 86/363, 86/374, 86/383, 86/384, 86/394, 86/402, 86/404, 86/405, 86/407
- Spain, 85/036, 85/041, 85/044, 85/136, 85/164, 85/165, 85/166, 85/168, 85/169, 85/170, 85/171, 85/172, 85/173, 85/174, 85/186, 85/187, 85/188, 85/189, 85/191, 85/194, 85/195, 85/196, 85/209, 85/214, 85/216, 85/217, 85/221, 85/224, 85/225, 85/228, 85/229, 85/232, 85/234, 85/239, 85/240, 85/241, 85/249, 85/250, 85/251, 85/253, 85/254, 85/255, 85/263, 85/269,

- 85/272, 85/275, 85/279, 85/289, 85/292, 85/293, 85/294, 85/295, 85/296, 85/297, 85/300, 85/302, 85/303, 85/304, 85/306, 85/307, 85/310, 85/312, 85/313, 85/315, 85/318, 85/321, 85/324, 85/325, 85/326, 85/327, 85/328, 85/330, 85/331, 85/332, 85/337 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/009, 86/022, 86/027, 86/029, 86/034, 86/052, 86/055, 86/077, 86/133, 86/198, 86/227, 86/252, 86/309, 86/314
- Sri Lanka, 85/026, 86/088, 86/140, 86/141, 86/228, 86/275
- Sudan, 85/071, 85/096, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/060, 86/163, 86/231, 86/231, 86/275, 86/363, 86/407
- Surinam, 85/189
- Swaziland, 85/307
- Sweden, 85/041, 85/055
- Syria, 85/016, 85/039, 85/068, 85/096, 85/116, 85/120, 86/011, 86/099, 86/143, 86/171, 86/178, 86/351, 86/377, 86/400, 86/402, 86/407
- Tanzania, 85/72
- Thailand, 85/012, 85/068, 85/123, 85/189, 85/237, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/304, 86/306
- Tunisia, 85/191
- Turkey, 85/018, 85/019, 85/038, 85/041, 85/047, 85/052, 85/059, 85/062, 85/105, 85/115, 85/130, 85/131, 85/134, 85/146, 85/176, 85/177, 85/181, 85/268, 85/285, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/035, 86/049, 86/057, 86/113, 86/122, 86/125, 86/128, 86/137, 86/143, 86/145, 86/169, 86/187, 86/192, 86/201, 86/214, 86/236, 86/252, 86/256, 86/260, 86/280, 86/281, 86/309, 86/313, 86/316, 86/317, 86/385, 86/402, 86/403, 86/407
- Uganda, 85/020, 85/063, 85/065, 86/010, 86/152, 86/363
- United Kingdom, 85/027, 85/035, 85/036, 85/037, 85/052, 85/067, 85/082, 85/142, 85/145, 85/160, 85/186, 85/202, 85/203, 85/222, 85/248, 85/260, 85/292, 86/031, 86/042, 86/052, 86/055, 86/094, 86/115, 86/121, 86/133, 86/134, 86/141, 86/149, 86/159, 86/164, 86/165, 86/185, 86/198, 86/200, 86/225, 86/227, 86/252, 86/278, 86/279, 86/280, 86/298, 86/308, 86/402
- United States, 85/002, 85/003, 85/011, 85/014, 85/029, 85/032, 85/035, 85/037, 85/040, 85/041, 85/058, 85/068, 85/076, 85/077, 85/082, 85/083, 85/101, 85/108, 85/109, 85/111, 85/122, 85/144, 85/146, 85/147, 85/151, 85/156, 85/189, 85/199, 85/217, 85/221, 85/271, 85/275, 85/306, 85/318, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/044, 86/048, 86/052, 86/053, 86/055, 86/062, 86/068, 86/080, 86/081, 86/095, 86/110, 86/111, 86/130, 86/133, 86/140, 86/148, 86/149, 86/168, 86/176, 86/198, 86/221, 86/222, 86/223, 86/224, 86/237, 86/251, 86/252, 86/253, 86/254, 86/285, 86/287, 86/300, 86/308, 86/310, 86/319, 86/324, 86/343, 86/368, 86/381, 86/384, 86/386, 86/396, 86/399, 86/402, 86/407
- Uruguay, 85/002, 85/006, 85/051, 85/102, 85/173, 85/297, 86/152
- Vietnam, 85/002, 85/011, 85/012, 85/068, 85/123, 85/146, 85/189, 85/237, 85/260, 85/300, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/137, 86/139, 86/156, 86/275, 86/304, 86/306, 86/363, 86/407
- Yugoslavia, 85/149, 85/244, 85/260, 86/181, 86/338, 86/407
- Zaire, 85/207
- Zambia, 85/135, 86/004, 86/006, 86/007, 86/067, 86/068, 86/153, 86/173, 86/198, 86/386, 86/407
- Zimbabwe, 86/012, 86/066, 86/073, 86/153, 86/173, 86/198, 86/386, 86/407

## Regions and Subregions

- Africa, 85/096, 85/146, 85/189, 85/219, 85/227, 85/252, 85/295, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/013, 86/108, 86/155, 86/198, 86/275, 86/298
- Front-Line States, 85/040, 85/135, 85/146, 85/172, 85/186, 85/187, 85/189, 85/194, 85/228, 85/279, 85/337 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/025, 86/067, 86/068, 86/069, 86/072, 86/074, 86/086, 86/118, 86/136, 86/164, 86/187, 86/204, 86/211, 86/263, 86/273, 86/275, 86/277, 86/307, 86/347, 86/354, 86/407

- Horn of Africa, 85/002, 85/147, 85/189, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/047, 86/231, 86/275, 86/407
- Maghreb, 86/166, 86/314
- Southern Africa, 85/002, 85/015, 85/068, 85/094, 85/096, 85/112, 85/146, 85/147, 85/152, 85/161, 85/186, 85/187, 85/189, 85/194, 85/221, 85/295, 85/300, 85/337 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/025, 86/047, 86/067, 86/068, 86/072, 86/086, 86/137, 86/140, 86/153, 86/164, 86/173, 86/185, 86/198, 86/199, 86/238, 86/247, 86/263, 86/264, 86/273, 86/275, 86/303, 86/306, 86/307, 86/347, 86/386, 86/392, 86/407
- Western Sahara, 85/284, 86/152, 86/314, 86/390
- America
- Central America, 85/001, 85/002, 85/017, 85/032, 85/051, 85/058, 85/068, 85/077, 85/096, 85/108, 85/111, 85/133, 85/139, 85/146, 85/173, 85/182, 85/189, 85/200, 85/245, 85/253, 85/275, 85/277, 85/297, 85/300, 85/318, 85/340 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/001, 86/024, 86/025, 86/043, 86/046, 86/050, 86/080, 86/084, 86/085, 86/111, 86/117, 86/130, 86/137, 86/150, 86/154, 86/164, 86/176, 86/188, 86/193, 86/196, 86/233, 86/251, 86/261, 86/275, 86/312, 86/319, 86/362, 86/363, 86/368, 86/381, 86/384, 86/398, 86/407
- Falklands, 86/221
- Latin America, 85/002, 85/017, 85/044, 85/051, 85/058, 85/096, 85/102, 85/146, 85/189, 85/253, 85/297, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/025, 86/176, 86/183, 86/275, 86/298, 86/336, 86/336, 86/407
- South America, 85/017, 85/085, 85/189, 86/275, 86/363
- Asia, 85/096, 86/298, 86/336
- Hong Kong, 85/160, 85/204, 85/260
- Persian Gulf, 85/002, 85/004, 85/043, 85/051, 85/146, 85/189, 86/096, 86/147, 86/209, 86/275
- South Asia, 85/342 (Vol. 1986-1)
- Southeast Asia, 85/002, 85/012, 85/189, 85/237, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/306
- Timor, 85/141
- Europe, 85/003, 85/035, 85/078, 85/150, 85/189, 85/217, 85/240, 85/274, 85/330, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/025, 86/047, 86/119, 86/123, 86/137, 86/198, 86/298, 86/341
- Balkans, 85/149
- Baltic Countries, 85/008, 85/076
- Berlin, 86/363, 86/377, 86/402
- Central Europe, 85/023, 85/217, 86/298
- Eastern Europe, 85/023, 85/051, 85/076, 85/114, 85/137, 85/146, 85/150, 85/189, 85/318, 85/330, 86/293
- Gibraltar, 85/036, 86/279
- Mediterranean, 85/010, 85/040, 85/051, 85/259, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/061, 86/119, 86/133, 86/140, 86/172, 86/275
- Northern Ireland, 85/009, 86/225
- Scandinavia, 85/221
- Western Europe, 85/023, 85/033, 85/076, 85/080, 85/109, 85/114, 85/122, 85/137, 86/140, 86/293
- Middle East, 85/002, 85/016, 85/042, 85/051, 85/054, 85/068, 85/069, 85/096, 85/116, 85/120, 85/146, 85/175, 85/189, 85/191, 85/195, 85/231, 85/233, 85/238, 85/250, 85/294, 85/300, 85/305, 85/309, 85/312, 85/318, 85/326, 85/328, 85/330, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/025, 86/026, 86/052, 86/093, 86/133, 86/140, 86/144, 86/152, 86/164, 86/171, 86/200, 86/267, 86/275, 86/286, 86/306, 86/324, 86/327, 86/330, 86/351, 86/359, 86/363, 86/373, 86/376, 86/378, 86/379, 86/380, 86/384, 86/393, 86/407
- Gaza Strip, 85/231, 85/270, 86/324, 86/359, 86/373, 86/402
- Golan Heights, 85/231, 85/309, 85/312, 86/359, 86/376, 86/378
- Jerusalem, 85/231, 85/309, 85/312, 86/321, 86/359, 86/373, 86/378
- West Bank, 85/231, 85/250, 85/270, 86/324, 86/359, 86/373, 86/376, 86/402

**International Organizations and Political Groupings**

- ACP States, 85/044, 85/051, 86/234
- African National Congress, 85/186, 85/194, 85/221, 85/318, 86/068, 86/072, 86/086, 86/127, 86/136, 86/153, 86/159, 86/173, 86/183, 86/185, 86/187, 86/277, 86/296, 86/307, 86/347, 86/386, 86/402, 86/407
- Amnesty International, 85/074, 85/136, 85/146, 86/073, 86/166, 86/192, 86/201, 86/359, 86/363
- Arab League, 85/226, 86/096, 86/133, 86/140, 86/200, 86/286, 86/301, 86/407
- ASEAN, 85/012, 85/041, 85/051, 85/123, 85/237, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/047, 86/089, 86/139, 86/275, 86/304, 86/306, 86/402, 86/407
- Central American States, 85/001, 85/002, 85/017, 85/041, 85/051, 85/058, 85/068, 85/077, 85/095, 85/133, 85/139, 85/253, 85/297, 85/340 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/251, 86/362, 86/363, 86/368, 86/381, 86/398, 86/407
- COMECON, 85/114, 86/343
- Commonwealth., 86/068, 86/136, 86/164, 86/165, 86/183, 86/386, 86/402, 86/407
- Contadora Group, 85/001, 85/002, 85/017, 85/029, 85/032, 85/041, 85/051, 85/056, 85/058, 85/068, 85/077, 85/096, 85/108, 85/111, 85/133, 85/139, 85/146, 85/147, 85/173, 85/189, 85/200, 85/245, 85/253, 85/275, 85/277, 85/297, 85/300, 85/318, 85/340 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/001, 86/024, 86/025, 86/043, 86/046, 86/050, 86/062, 86/085, 86/111, 86/117, 86/154, 86/164, 86/235, 86/239, 86/261, 86/275, 86/319, 86/362, 86/363, 86/398, 86/407
- Council of Europe, 85/041, 85/060, 85/068, 85/115, 85/132, 85/272, 86/093, 86/137, 86/169, 86/182, 86/183, 86/201, 86/241, 86/281, 86/337, 86/407
- CSCE, 85/002, 85/003, 85/014, 85/023, 85/068, 85/072, 85/113, 85/146, 85/147, 85/153, 85/154, 85/189, 85/300, 85/306, 85/318, 85/330, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/009, 86/025, 86/029, 86/032, 86/047, 86/056, 86/071, 86/110, 86/123, 86/124, 86/137, 86/140, 86/164, 86/182, 86/222, 86/230, 86/293, 86/298, 86/341, 86/343, 86/367
- Berne Expert Meeting on Human Contacts, 85/189, 85/330, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/032, 86/095, 86/107, 86/123, 86/124, 86/137, 86/140, 86/164, 86/258, 86/278, 86/343, 86/388, 86/407
- Budapest Cultural Forum, 85/014, 85/189, 85/318, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/339 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/110, 86/123, 86/137
- Madrid Conference, 85/076, 85/088, 85/089, 86/137
- Ottawa Expert Meeting on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, 85/002, 85/014, 85/072, 85/076, 85/088, 85/089, 85/103, 85/113, 85/146, 85/153, 85/154, 85/159, 85/179, 85/189, 85/276, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/056, 86/107, 86/110, 86/123, 86/137, 86/258, 86/343, 86/388
- Stockholm Conference on Security and Confidence-Building Measures in Europe, 85/002, 85/003, 85/004, 85/146, 85/147, 85/189, 85/240, 85/249, 85/318, 85/330, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/032, 86/047, 86/110, 86/123, 86/140, 86/275, 86/298, 86/308, 86/336, 86/343, 86/367, 86/407
- Vienna Follow-up Meeting, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/032, 86/123, 86/137, 86/140, 86/210, 86/275, 86/278, 86/288, 86/308, 86/343, 86/363, 86/384, 86/402, 86/407
- European Commission on Human Rights, 85/300, 86/201, 86/241, 86/281
- European Communities, 85/002, 85/007, 85/018, 85/040, 85/047, 85/051, 85/052, 85/056, 85/057, 85/077, 85/079, 85/096, 85/114, 85/173, 85/185, 85/186, 85/189, 85/201, 85/205, 85/219, 85/221, 85/250, 85/251, 85/252, 85/253, 85/254, 85/297, 86/025, 86/026, 86/096, 86/138, 86/192, 86/198, 86/241, 86/279, 86/343, 86/347, 86/359, 86/385, 86/403, 86/407
- European Court of Human Rights, 85/300, 86/241
- European Space Agency, 85/132, 86/140, 86/374
- Geneva Disarmament Conference, 85/122, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/047, 86/051, 86/140, 86/269, 86/308, 86/330, 86/332, 86/334
- Group of 77, 85/229, 85/313, 85/335 (Vol. 1986-1)

- Gulf Cooperation Council, 85/294, 85/312, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/096, 86/407  
International Atomic Energy Agency, 85/193, 85/233, 86/058, 86/190, 86/275, 86/330, 86/343  
International Civil Aviation Organization, 85/163, 85/178, 85/225, 86/064, 86/093  
International Court of Justice, 85/275, 85/319, 86/111, 86/319, 86/398  
International Development Association, 85/129, 86/155  
International Labour Organization, 85/273, 85/311, 86/052, 86/137, 86/179, 86/183, 86/213  
International Law Commission, 85/303  
International Maritime Organization, 85/225  
International Monetary Fund, 85/189  
International Red Cross, 85/090, 85/141, 86/186, 86/193, 86/323, 86/359, 86/363, 86/376  
International Seabed Authority, 85/079  
Interpol, 85/098  
Islamic Conference, 85/251  
NATO, 85/036, 85/106, 85/128, 86/133, 86/140, 86/207, 86/266, 86/308, 86/311, 86/384, 86/401  
Nordic Council, 86/311  
Organization of African Unity, 85/002, 85/189, 85/252, 85/279, 85/284, 85/295, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/013, 86/273, 86/354  
Organization of American States, 85/253  
Pacifist movements, 85/053  
PLO, 85/002, 85/051, 85/069, 85/189, 85/191, 85/231, 85/309, 85/312, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/267, 86/373, 86/376, 86/378, 86/384  
Polisario Front, 85/284  
Red Cross, see International Red Cross  
South Asia Regional Cooperation, 85/342 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/116  
Southern African Development Coordination Conference, 85/172, 85/186, 85/194, 85/228, 85/279, 86/067, 86/072, 86/118, 86/136, 86/159, 86/173, 86/238, 86/263, 86/277, 86/347  
SWAPO, 85/279, 85/327, 86/005, 86/006, 86/072, 86/199, 86/247, 86/273, 86/274, 86/354, 86/365  
UNESCO, 85/037, 85/073, 85/246, 85/255, 85/263, 85/313, 85/338 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/042, 86/048, 86/052, 86/055, 86/137, 86/240, 86/345  
UNIFIL, 85/069, 85/189, 85/195, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/275, 86/300, 86/407  
United Nations, 85/002, 85/016, 85/025, 85/053, 85/056, 85/061, 85/068, 85/070, 85/076, 85/079, 85/087, 85/095, 85/129, 85/140, 85/146, 85/147, 85/167, 85/168, 85/184, 85/189, 85/190, 85/194, 85/195, 85/196, 85/213, 85/218, 85/219, 85/224, 85/226, 85/227, 85/229, 85/233, 85/235, 85/236, 85/238, 85/243, 85/249, 85/250, 85/251, 85/255, 85/271, 85/279, 85/295, 85/299, 85/300, 85/301, 85/311, 85/314, 85/315, 85/316, 85/318, 85/327, 85/335 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/047, 86/048, 86/055, 86/058, 86/067, 86/068, 86/135, 86/137, 86/140, 86/183, 86/199, 86/247, 86/273, 86/274, 86/280, 86/297, 86/301, 86/305, 86/308, 86/310, 86/337, 86/345, 86/349, 86/354, 86/355, 86/365, 86/371, 86/407  
Budgetary questions and financial problems, 85/037, 85/073, 85/147, 85/190, 85/195, 85/196, 85/215, 85/218, 85/219, 85/227, 85/235, 85/236, 85/250, 85/252, 85/271, 85/299, 85/301, 85/316, 85/326, 85/329, 86/052, 86/104, 86/108, 86/135, 86/152, 86/275, 86/277, 86/295, 86/297, 86/298, 86/300, 86/301, 86/306, 86/310, 86/324, 86/331, 86/333, 86/345, 86/346, 86/348, 86/349, 86/363, 86/365, 86/366, 86/371, 86/374, 86/379  
ECOSOC, 85/218, 85/227, 85/235, 85/236, 85/300, 86/114, 86/137, 86/152, 86/155, 86/337, 86/363  
General Assembly, 85/025, 85/027, 85/053, 85/056, 85/104, 85/133, 85/189, 85/190, 85/194, 85/196, 85/215, 85/218, 85/226, 85/227, 85/230, 85/231, 85/233, 85/234, 85/235, 85/236, 85/237, 85/238, 85/239, 85/249, 85/250, 85/251, 85/255, 85/271, 85/279, 85/287, 85/290, 85/295, 85/298, 85/299, 85/300, 85/301, 85/303, 85/306, 85/309, 85/311, 85/314, 85/315, 85/316, 85/318, 85/322, 85/327, 85/331, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/061, 86/115, 86/135, 86/137, 86/140, 86/165, 86/174, 86/273, 86/277, 86/295, 86/298, 86/302, 86/308, 86/329, 86/331, 86/332, 86/333, 86/340, 86/349, 86/363, 86/369, 86/407



- First (Political and Security) Committee, 85/053, 85/217, 85/234, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/298, 86/332, 86/333, 86/334, 86/335, 86/336
- Special Political Committee, 85/255, 85/270, 86/137, 86/345
- Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, 85/316
- Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, 85/238, 85/251, 85/290, 85/300, 85/322, 86/137, 86/152, 86/329, 86/340, 86/364, 86/375
- Fourth (Trusteeship) Committee, 85/230
- Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee, 85/190, 85/196, 85/215, 85/227, 85/236, 85/271, 85/299, 85/301, 85/314, 86/052, 86/297, 86/348, 86/366
- Sixth (Legal) Committee, 85/307, 86/305, 86/329, 86/346, 86/372
- Secretariat, 85/218, 85/227, 85/235, 85/311, 85/314, 86/052, 86/295, 86/356, 86/363, 86/366, 86/371
- Secretary-General, 85/002, 85/013, 85/016, 85/030, 85/038, 85/056, 85/068, 85/069, 85/095, 85/146, 85/162, 85/167, 85/176, 85/185, 85/189, 85/194, 85/195, 85/217, 85/218, 85/219, 85/226, 85/227, 85/231, 85/233, 85/234, 85/235, 85/237, 85/241, 85/249, 85/251, 85/252, 85/255, 85/263, 85/271, 85/279, 85/295, 85/297, 85/300, 85/301, 85/306, 85/312, 85/314, 85/314, 85/327, 85/331, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/025, 86/051, 86/087, 86/096, 86/100, 86/105, 86/106, 86/115, 86/135, 86/145, 86/152, 86/186, 86/199, 86/209, 86/246, 86/247, 86/273, 86/275, 86/280, 86/300, 86/301, 86/304, 86/305, 86/306, 86/313, 86/314, 86/316, 86/324, 86/330, 86/337, 86/340, 86/341, 86/348, 86/354, 86/367, 86/376, 86/383, 86/385, 86/390, 86/391, 86/403, 86/407, 86/407
- Security Council, 85/004, 85/068, 85/069, 85/146, 85/164, 85/166, 85/168, 85/195, 85/219, 85/225, 85/279, 85/300, 85/305, 85/306, 85/309, 85/312, 85/315, 85/327, 85/328, 86/061, 86/087, 86/105, 86/165, 86/186, 86/274, 86/300, 86/324, 86/349, 86/365, 86/367, 86/380
- United Nations Commission on Human Rights, 85/022, 85/056, 85/117, 85/140, 85/206, 85/213, 85/223, 85/251, 85/300, 85/331, 86/049, 86/137, 86/152, 86/177, 86/188, 86/232, 86/310, 86/312, 86/339, 86/340, 86/346, 86/356, 86/363, 86/407
- High Commissioner for Human Rights, 85/189, 85/300
- United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, 85/290, 86/277
- United Nations Conference on Disarmament, 85/217, 85/241, 85/289, 86/298, 86/333, 86/374
- United Nations Council for Namibia, 85/327, 86/162, 86/197, 86/202, 86/247
- United Nations Development Programme, 85/190, 86/240
- United Nations Disarmament Commission, 85/240, 85/263, 86/298, 86/333, 86/335, 86/336, 86/355, 86/357
- United Nations Disaster Relief Office, 86/115
- United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, 85/218, 85/236
- United Nations Environment Programme, 85/193
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 85/190, 85/213, 85/252, 86/004, 86/141
- United Nations Industrial Development Organization, 85/189, 85/227, 85/301, 86/371
- UNRWA, 85/250, 85/270, 86/186, 86/324, 86/359, 86/373, 86/376, 86/407
- Warsaw Pact, 85/002, 86/140, 86/167
- WEU, 85/007, 85/034, 85/066, 85/106, 85/128, 85/132, 85/150, 86/140, 86/283, 86/308
- World Bank, 85/189, 86/155
- World Health Organization, 85/193, 85/311, 86/114, 86/131

## Issues

- Armed conflict, 85/002, 85/004, 85/043, 85/051, 85/068, 85/069, 85/090, 85/097, 85/120, 85/146, 85/162, 85/187, 85/217, 85/241, 85/294, 85/327, 85/331, 86/025, 86/067, 86/096, 86/105, 86/177, 86/191, 86/209, 86/246, 86/275
- Civil objectives, civil victims, 85/002, 85/069, 85/090, 85/189, 85/250, 85/251, 85/312, 86/001, 86/188, 86/199, 86/246, 86/359, 86/407

Civil war, 85/295, 85/315  
Incursions, 85/012, 85/068, 85/112, 85/135, 85/146, 85/187, 85/279., 86/199, 86/204, 86/247, 86/273, 86/275, 86/304, 86/307  
Invasion; occupation, 85/016, 85/068, 85/090, 85/117, 85/167, 85/189, 85/231, 85/237, 85/251, 85/270, 85/279, 85/300, 85/305, 85/309, 85/312, 85/327, 85/331, 86/067, 86/068, 86/199, 86/247, 86/273, 86/275, 86/304, 86/306, 86/354, 86/365, 86/373, 86/376, 86/383, 86/394  
Neutrality, 85/002, 85/007, 85/237, 85/284  
Prisoners of war, 85/090, 85/189, 85/269, 85/300, 85/312  
Refugees, 85/012, 85/056, 85/162, 85/176, 85/186, 85/189, 85/190, 85/213, 85/237, 85/250, 85/251, 85/252, 85/260, 85/270, 85/295, 85/300, 85/331, 86/004, 86/005, 86/013, 86/076, 86/137, 86/141, 86/186, 86/231, 86/275, 86/292, 86/304, 86/324, 86/340, 86/360, 86/363, 86/376, 86/407  
War criminals, 85/098, 85/247  
War victims, 85/011

#### Conflict resolution

Good offices, mediation, 85/013, 85/038, 85/162, 85/185, 85/189, 85/251, 85/312, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/141, 86/209, 86/275, 86/280, 86/316, 86/376, 86/385  
Negotiated solution, 85/054, 85/058, 85/069, 85/182, 85/185, 85/189, 85/245, 85/251, 85/253, 85/294, 85/318, 85/340 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/024, 86/025, 86/043, 86/071, 86/080, 86/105, 86/111, 86/150, 86/154, 86/209, 86/231, 86/232, 86/233, 86/235, 86/239, 86/251, 86/275, 86/306, 86/373, 86/379, 86/393, 86/407  
Peace-keeping forces, 85/069, 85/147, 85/189, 85/219, 85/301, 85/306, 85/312, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/047, 86/052, 86/053, 86/135, 86/233, 86/300, 86/367  
Withdrawal of troops, 85/002, 85/012, 85/016, 85/039, 85/068, 85/069, 85/117, 85/123, 85/146, 85/162, 85/189, 85/237, 85/251, 85/253, 85/256, 85/297, 85/300, 85/312, 85/331, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/046, 86/068, 86/086, 86/232, 86/275, 86/300, 86/304, 86/306, 86/340, 86/363, 86/394, 86/407

#### Culture, education

Cultural cooperation, 85/037, 85/172, 85/186, 85/194, 85/228, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/338 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/339 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/067, 86/123, 86/343, 86/347  
Education, 85/172, 85/186, 85/194, 85/228, 85/250, 85/254, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/338 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/339 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/076, 86/090, 86/108, 86/118, 86/136, 86/155, 86/275, 86/277, 86/324, 86/339, 86/343, 86/347, 86/359, 86/373, 86/395, 86/402  
New international information order, 85/255, 85/313, 86/345  
Economic relations, 85/005, 85/040, 85/077, 85/146, 85/160, 85/168, 85/177, 85/185, 85/189, 85/201, 85/221, 85/222, 86/091, 85/253, 85/258, 85/318, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/337 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/095, 86/096, 86/118, 86/138, 86/183, 86/192, 86/197, 86/198, 86/201, 86/202, 86/218, 86/219, 86/326, 86/359, 86/369, 86/373  
Aid programmes, 85/024, 85/040, 85/056, 85/071, 85/096, 85/146, 85/148, 85/172, 85/186, 85/189, 85/197, 85/237, 85/312, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/013, 86/036, 86/043, 86/083, 86/086, 86/115, 86/130, 86/136, 86/138, 86/155, 86/159, 86/173, 86/176, 86/185, 86/199, 86/275, 86/307, 86/312, 86/324, 86/359, 86/362  
Code of Conduct for EC Companies in South Africa, 85/048, 85/121, 85/144, 85/146, 85/152, 85/161, 85/172, 85/186, 85/194, 85/228, 85/291, 85/292, 85/293, 85/300, 85/318, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/025, 86/038, 86/067, 86/118, 86/126, 86/136, 86/175, 86/179, 86/183, 86/195, 86/257, 86/347, 86/407  
Development cooperation, 85/002, 85/051, 85/068, 85/071, 85/096, 85/146, 85/147, 85/190, 85/217, 85/219, 85/227, 85/229, 85/234, 85/252, 85/253, 85/255, 85/295, 85/297, 85/300, 85/306, 85/340 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/047, 86/065, 86/073, 86/090, 86/138, 86/155, 86/163, 86/173, 86/174, 86/176, 86/231, 86/251, 86/275, 86/277, 86/298, 86/342  
Economic sanctions, 85/040, 85/061, 85/087, 85/152, 85/164, 85/172, 85/186, 85/189, 85/209,

- 85/221, 85/228, 85/320, 85/324, 85/325, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/020, 86/025, 86/037, 86/062, 86/063, 86/074, 86/136, 86/165, 86/183, 86/185, 86/211, 86/237, 86/263, 86/271, 86/275, 86/307, 86/347, 86/363, 86/386, 86/407
- Boycott, 85/040, 85/087, 85/157, 86/177, 86/191
- Embargo, 85/030, 85/040, 85/077, 85/087, 85/111, 85/172, 85/186, 85/194, 85/228, 85/300, 85/324, 86/003, 86/038, 86/062, 86/067, 86/118, 86/136, 86/165, 86/347, 86/368, 86/381, 86/407
- Energy supplies, 85/004, 85/172, 85/186, 85/194, 86/063, 86/067, 86/074, 86/136, 86/147, 86/177, 86/185, 86/187, 86/191, 86/218, 86/219, 86/275, 86/307, 86/347, 86/386, 86/407
- Financial aid, 85/018, 85/047, 85/052, 85/077, 85/129, 85/177, 85/185, 85/186, 85/189, 85/190, 85/194, 85/228, 85/252, 86/065, 86/073, 86/086, 86/198, 86/230, 86/238, 86/251, 86/273, 86/275, 86/277, 86/280, 86/312, 86/359, 86/373
- Food aid, 85/148, 85/189, 85/197, 85/228, 85/237, 85/295, 86/013, 86/083, 86/231, 86/275, 86/347
- Free trade, 85/051, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/165
- New International Economic Order, 85/298
- North-South dialogue, 85/051, 85/189
- Technical and scientific cooperation, 85/005, 85/151, 85/172, 85/186, 85/194, 85/219, 85/228, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/067, 86/123, 86/240, 86/275, 86/280, 86/347
- Third world, 85/096, 85/255, 85/296, 85/318, 86/055, 86/108
- Third world debt, 85/189, 85/219, 86/155, 86/275
- European integration and cooperation, 85/317
- Common defence policy, 85/007, 86/140, 86/242
- Cultural cooperation, 85/037, 85/051
- Eureka, 85/109, 85/151, 86/140
- European Union, 85/051, 85/055, 85/080
- Judicial cooperation, 85/051, 85/098, 85/178, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/002, 86/157
- Technological cooperation, 85/109, 85/132, 85/151
- Human Rights, 85/002, 85/008, 85/012, 85/018, 85/019, 85/020, 85/022, 85/026, 85/028, 85/039, 85/047, 85/049, 85/052, 85/056, 85/059, 85/061, 85/062, 85/063, 85/064, 85/065, 85/067, 85/068, 85/070, 85/072, 85/074, 85/076, 85/081, 85/084, 85/088, 85/089, 86/094, 85/099, 85/100, 85/105, 85/110, 85/113, 85/115, 85/116, 85/117, 85/130, 85/131, 85/134, 85/136, 85/138, 85/141, 85/142, 85/146, 85/153, 85/158, 85/162, 85/168, 85/169, 85/170, 85/174, 85/177, 85/179, 85/181, 85/183, 85/186, 85/189, 85/194, 85/201, 85/206, 85/210, 85/211, 85/213, 85/214, 85/219, 85/221, 85/223, 85/228, 85/231, 85/232, 85/237, 85/238, 85/239, 85/240, 85/248, 85/251, 85/252, 85/253, 85/255, 85/256, 85/257, 85/260, 85/261, 85/262, 85/268, 85/270, 85/276, 85/277, 85/278, 85/280, 85/286, 85/290, 85/297, 85/300, 85/306, 85/318, 85/322, 85/330, 85/331, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/338 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/340 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/001, 86/004, 86/005, 86/006, 86/007, 86/009, 86/010, 86/011, 86/012, 86/014, 86/021, 86/022, 86/025, 86/026, 86/029, 86/032, 86/034, 86/036, 86/047, 86/057, 86/059, 86/066, 86/068, 86/073, 86/084, 86/091, 86/094, 86/095, 86/096, 86/098, 86/112, 86/113, 86/114, 86/120, 86/122, 86/125, 86/128, 86/136, 86/137, 86/152, 86/156, 86/164, 86/166, 86/177, 86/182, 86/183, 86/187, 86/191, 86/192, 86/193, 86/198, 86/201, 86/208, 86/213, 86/214, 86/222, 86/230, 86/231, 86/232, 86/241, 86/243, 86/247, 86/251, 86/265, 86/275, 86/277, 86/278, 86/281, 86/296, 86/307, 86/309, 86/310, 86/312, 86/315, 86/320, 86/339, 86/340, 86/343, 86/346, 86/359, 86/362, 86/363, 86/364, 86/367, 86/370, 86/383, 86/385, 86/389, 86/391, 86/397, 86/402, 86/405, 86/406, 86/407
- Anti-semitism, 85/137, 85/243
- Apartheid, 85/002, 85/040, 85/048, 85/050, 85/051, 85/061, 85/068, 85/070, 85/086, 85/087, 85/121, 85/142, 85/144, 85/146, 85/152, 85/161, 85/164, 85/166, 85/169, 85/170, 85/171, 85/172, 85/186, 85/189, 85/194, 85/214, 85/219, 85/221, 85/228, 85/238, 85/239, 85/288,

- 85/291, 85/292, 85/293, 85/300, 85/315, 85/318, 85/324, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/014, 86/025, 86/030, 86/038, 86/067, 86/068, 86/072, 86/076, 86/086, 86/109, 86/118, 86/127, 86/136, 86/137, 86/153, 86/173, 86/180, 86/183, 86/185, 86/187, 86/198, 86/205, 86/271, 86/273, 86/275, 86/277, 86/296, 86/306, 86/307, 86/323, 86/326, 86/328, 86/347, 86/349, 86/363, 86/386, 86/402, 86/407
- Death penalty**, 85/130, 85/131, 85/155, 85/210, 85/221, 86/015, 86/125, 86/137, 86/156, 86/192, 86/229, 86/270, 86/285
- Democracy**, 85/002, 85/006, 85/018, 85/026, 85/028, 85/047, 85/049, 85/051, 85/057, 85/068, 85/070, 85/077, 85/081, 85/096, 85/100, 85/102, 85/143, 85/146, 85/161, 85/167, 85/171, 85/174, 85/186, 85/189, 85/214, 85/219, 85/221, 85/228, 85/231, 85/232, 85/237, 85/253, 85/277, 85/278, 85/279, 85/297, 85/300, 85/315, 85/327, 85/340 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/001, 86/043, 86/060, 86/067, 86/070, 86/089, 86/091, 86/092, 86/103, 86/109, 86/113, 86/127, 86/128, 86/136, 86/154, 86/163, 86/183, 86/185, 86/187, 86/192, 86/196, 86/198, 86/201, 86/213, 86/222, 86/230, 86/245, 86/249, 86/251, 86/261, 86/272, 86/275, 86/277, 86/281, 86/294, 86/299, 86/303, 86/304, 86/307, 86/343, 86/352, 86/362, 86/363, 86/386, 86/402, 86/403, 86/406, 86/407
- Freedom of conscience**, 85/119, 85/127, 85/181, 85/189, 85/219, 85/253, 85/261, 85/297, 85/294, 85/300, 86/005, 86/009, 86/022, 86/029, 86/103, 86/143, 86/192, 86/220, 86/265, 86/288, 86/299, 86/345, 86/353, 86/363, 86/405
- Freedom of information**, 85/075, 85/137, 85/253, 85/255, 85/321, 86/272, 86/343, 86/345, 86/347, 86/405, 86/406
- Genocide**, 85/237, 85/239
- Homelands, Bantoustans**, 85/189, 85/292, 86/086, 86/183
- Minorities**, 85/019, 85/022, 85/026, 85/039, 85/084, 85/103, 85/107, 85/134, 85/159, 85/171, 85/172, 85/181, 85/186, 85/189, 85/198, 85/206, 85/220, 85/221, 85/223, 85/261, 85/300, 86/095, 86/107, 86/118, 86/136, 86/143, 86/144, 86/152, 86/307
- Armenians**, 85/206, 86/049
- Baha'is**, 85/022, 85/206, 85/300, 86/137, 86/268, 86/363, 86/407
- Bulgarian Muslims**, 85/084, 85/103, 85/159
- Iranian Christians**, 85/206, 85/223
- Kurds**, 85/019, 85/134
- Lebanese Christians**, 85/022, 85/039, 85/107, 86/243
- Palestinians**, 85/002, 85/054, 85/138, 85/211, 85/231, 85/238, 85/250, 85/256, 85/270, 85/305, 85/309, 85/312, 85/333, 86/021, 86/023, 86/026, 86/036, 86/071, 86/185, 86/267, 86/275, 86/324, 86/359, 86/373, 86/376, 86/378, 86/384, 86/407
- Russian Jews**, 85/179, 85/198, 85/220, 86/027, 86/095, 86/107, 86/258
- Tamils**, 85/026, 86/141
- Missing persons**, 85/184, 85/251, 85/300, 86/137, 86/152, 86/166, 86/320, 86/385
- Political prisoners**, 85/018, 85/049, 85/064, 85/077, 85/081, 85/091, 85/099, 85/102, 85/115, 85/116, 85/130, 85/131, 85/134, 85/138, 85/141, 85/148, 85/158, 85/161, 85/164, 85/166, 85/171, 85/172, 85/186, 85/189, 85/194, 85/197, 85/201, 85/207, 85/210, 85/214, 85/219, 85/221, 85/228, 85/231, 85/238, 85/244, 85/257, 85/286, 85/287, 85/292, 85/318, 85/321, 85/322, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/038, 86/067, 86/068, 86/079, 86/086, 86/091, 86/094, 86/102, 86/118, 86/125, 86/127, 86/136, 86/153, 86/156, 86/173, 86/181, 86/183, 86/187, 86/189, 86/192, 86/193, 86/198, 86/206, 86/208, 86/231, 86/270, 86/271, 86/272, 86/275, 86/290, 86/296, 86/307, 86/327, 86/343, 86/347, 86/363, 86/404, 86/407
- Racism, racial discrimination**, 85/144, 85/171, 85/186, 85/194, 85/214, 85/221, 85/228, 85/238, 85/243, 85/290, 85/291, 85/292, 85/300, 85/315, 85/318, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/054, 86/102, 86/136, 86/152, 86/175, 86/179, 86/183, 86/185, 86/205, 86/265, 86/275, 86/277, 86/288, 86/307, 86/325, 86/338, 86/347, 86/363, 86/405
- Religious discrimination**, 85/243, 85/261, 86/137, 86/152, 86/236, 86/265, 86/363, 86/395
- Torture**, 85/022, 85/025, 85/044, 85/077, 85/081, 85/134, 85/136, 85/140, 85/219, 85/251, 85/300, 86/137, 86/152, 86/156, 86/192, 86/201, 86/208, 86/214, 86/312, 86/347, 86/363

Women's policies, 85/335 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/090, 86/152, 86/155, 86/371

Instruments of international relations, 85/192, 86/064

Diplomatic relations, 85/123, 85/219, 85/222, 85/300, 86/119, 86/133, 86/168, 86/173, 86/252, 86/305, 86/351, 86/358, 86/407

Membership in international organizations, 85/037, 85/189, 85/265, 85/273, 85/327, 86/349

Privileges and immunities, 85/068, 85/250, 85/283, 85/314, 86/119, 86/272, 86/371

Abuse of diplomatic immunity, 85/002, 85/192, 85/283, 86/093, 86/168, 86/200, 86/252, 86/305, 86/358, 86/377, 86/407

Recognition, 85/095, 85/167, 85/185, 85/189, 85/212, 85/222, 85/258, 85/279, 85/312, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/061, 86/067, 86/100, 86/212, 86/217, 86/247, 86/273, 86/280, 86/403, 86/407

International balance and prevention of conflict

Arms control, disarmament, 85/002, 85/003, 85/014, 85/027, 85/035, 85/051, 85/053, 85/068, 85/082, 85/083, 85/097, 85/122, 85/132, 85/146, 85/147, 85/189, 85/217, 85/219, 85/234, 85/240, 85/241, 85/249, 85/253, 85/263, 85/289, 85/297, 85/306, 85/318, 85/330, 85/340 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/025, 86/032, 86/046, 86/047, 86/051, 86/095, 86/110, 86/123, 86/140, 86/174, 86/198, 86/222, 86/250, 86/269, 86/275, 86/298, 86/308, 86/331, 86/333, 86/334, 86/335, 86/341, 86/342, 86/343, 86/350, 86/353, 86/355, 86/357, 86/367, 86/370, 86/374, 86/384

Arms trade, 85/015, 85/030, 85/040, 85/097, 85/186, 85/194, 85/228, 85/241, 85/324, 86/003, 86/038, 86/061, 86/065, 86/067, 86/078, 86/093, 86/096, 86/118, 86/119, 86/136, 86/142, 86/172, 86/191, 86/308, 86/332, 86/386, 86/407

Chemical weapons, 85/011, 85/027, 85/056, 85/069, 85/090, 85/097, 85/122, 85/168, 85/189, 85/217, 85/219, 85/241, 85/251, 85/312, 85/330, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/032, 86/047, 86/051, 86/087, 86/096, 86/105, 86/140, 86/177, 86/207, 86/269, 86/275, 86/298, 86/308, 86/332, 86/334, 86/363, 86/376, 86/402, 86/407

Confidence-building measures, 85/003, 85/068, 85/146, 85/147, 85/189, 85/217, 85/219, 85/240, 85/306, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/123, 86/250, 86/298, 86/336, 86/342, 86/343, 86/407

Conventional weapons, 85/082, 85/168, 85/217, 85/249, 85/330, 86/032, 86/140, 86/298, 86/308, 86/341, 86/343, 86/367

East-West relations, 85/002, 85/003, 85/014, 85/035, 85/051, 85/068, 85/083, 85/132, 85/146, 85/147, 85/189, 85/217, 85/241, 85/306, 85/318, 85/330, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/025, 86/032, 86/110, 86/140, 86/164, 86/198, 86/222, 86/259, 86/269, 86/275, 86/298, 86/306, 86/308, 86/343, 86/384, 86/402, 86/407

Militarization of space, 85/014, 85/051, 85/068, 85/082, 85/083, 85/109, 85/146, 85/147, 85/151, 85/189, 85/205, 85/217, 85/219, 85/296, 85/330, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/032, 86/047, 86/140, 86/275, 86/298, 86/374

Naval arms race, 85/249

Non-alignment, 85/002, 85/068, 85/071, 85/251, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/248, 86/340

Non-use of force, 85/003, 85/146, 85/167, 85/189, 85/219, 85/231, 85/237, 85/240, 85/305, 85/306, 85/309, 85/312, 85/340 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/123, 86/308, 86/349, 86/354, 86/359, 86/362, 86/373

Nuclear free zone, 85/003, 85/010, 85/035, 85/217, 86/298

Nuclear tests, 85/083, 86/148, 86/170, 86/287, 86/298, 86/396

Nuclear weapons, 85/003, 85/010, 85/014, 85/035, 85/051, 85/068, 85/082, 85/083, 85/124, 85/146, 85/147, 85/189, 85/217, 85/219, 85/233, 85/249, 85/330, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/032, 86/110, 86/140, 86/287, 86/298, 86/308, 86/334, 86/341, 86/367, 86/384, 86/402, 86/407

Cruise missiles, 85/010, 85/035

Euromissiles, 85/003, 85/035, 86/140

Non-proliferation, 85/217, 85/219, 85/233, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/140, 86/298, 86/330  
Pershing-2 missiles, 85/035, 86/082  
Strategical weapons, 85/014, 85/051, 85/068, 85/083, 85/146, 85/189, 85/330, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/032, 86/110, 86/275, 86/298, 86/402  
SDI, see militarization of space

#### International Instruments

ABM Treaty, 85/083, 85/217, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/140, 86/298  
European Convention on Human Rights, 85/067, 85/125, 85/300, 86/137, 86/222, 86/227, 86/241, 86/363  
Geneva Conventions, 85/069, 85/138, 85/189, 85/217, 85/231, 85/241, 85/300, 85/309, 85/312, 86/001, 86/051, 86/105, 86/188, 86/250, 86/323, 86/332, 86/359, 86/363, 86/373, 86/376, 86/378  
Hague Conventions, 85/138, 85/231, 85/309, 85/312, 86/359, 86/373  
Helsinki Final Act, 85/002, 85/003, 85/008, 85/023, 85/046, 85/068, 85/072, 85/076, 85/084, 85/088, 85/089, 85/103, 85/113, 85/137, 85/146, 85/153, 85/158, 85/179, 85/189, 85/198, 85/219, 85/220, 85/259, 85/276, 85/306, 85/318, 85/331, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/339 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/009, 86/022, 86/027, 86/028, 86/029, 86/092, 86/095, 86/107, 86/123, 86/124, 86/137, 86/182, 86/220, 86/258, 86/265, 86/275, 86/288, 86/308, 86/336, 86/343, 86/384, 86/388, 86/402, 86/404, 86/405  
International Convention against Torture, 85/025, 85/044, 85/140, 85/300, 86/152, 86/363  
International Convention on the Combating of Terrorism, 85/060, 85/178, 85/225  
International Convention on the Elimination and Repression of the Crime of Apartheid, 85/239, 86/328  
International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 85/300, 86/009, 86/265, 86/268, 86/288, 86/327, 86/339, 86/345, 86/363, 86/370  
Lomé Convention, 85/015, 85/051, 85/096, 85/189, 85/228, 85/252, 85/295, 86/065, 86/066, 86/155, 86/234, 86/347  
Madrid Concluding Document, 85/008, 85/088, 85/089, 85/103, 85/113, 85/146, 85/179, 85/189, 85/198, 85/220, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/339 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/027, 86/028, 86/095, 86/107, 86/124, 86/220, 86/258, 86/308, 86/336, 86/343, 86/388, 86/405  
Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (1963), 85/083  
Salt-II Treaty (1971), 85/083  
UN Charter, 85/012, 85/023, 85/068, 85/146, 85/168, 85/179, 85/186, 85/189, 85/194, 85/195, 85/213, 85/214, 85/217, 85/219, 85/221, 85/228, 85/231, 85/233, 85/235, 85/237, 85/238, 85/240, 85/251, 85/253, 85/297, 85/300, 85/301, 85/306, 85/307, 85/311, 85/314, 85/315, 85/316, 85/328, 85/331, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/067, 86/068, 86/104, 86/107, 86/123, 86/135, 86/136, 86/183, 86/199, 86/222, 86/247, 86/268, 86/275, 86/277, 86/296, 86/297, 86/298, 86/300, 86/301, 86/304, 86/327, 86/330, 86/333, 86/336, 86/340, 86/347, 86/349, 86/354, 86/362, 86/363, 86/365, 86/367, 86/374, 86/380  
UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, 85/079, 86/017, 86/133, 86/221  
Universal Declaration on Human Rights, 85/179, 85/186, 85/189, 85/213, 85/214, 85/219, 85/221, 85/228, 85/253, 85/255, 85/297, 85/300, 85/340 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/067, 86/068, 86/107, 86/136, 86/152, 86/183, 86/258, 86/275, 86/277, 86/296, 86/339, 86/345, 86/347, 86/363, 86/388  
UN resolutions, 85/002, 85/004, 85/012, 85/013, 85/022, 85/038, 85/043, 85/051, 85/056, 85/061, 85/068, 85/069, 85/079, 85/095, 85/104, 85/117, 85/152, 85/157, 85/162, 85/164, 85/167, 85/189, 85/215, 85/217, 85/218, 85/225, 85/226, 85/237, 85/251, 85/300, 85/302, 85/303, 85/305, 85/313, 85/322, 85/331, 86/054, 86/058, 86/096, 86/100, 86/114, 86/139, 86/152, 86/165, 86/191, 86/232, 86/247, 86/274, 86/300, 86/301, 86/304, 86/305, 86/306, 86/316, 86/322, 86/324, 86/325, 86/326, 86/327, 86/329, 86/333, 86/338, 86/340, 86/341,

- 86/349, 86/350, 86/353, 86/355, 86/357, 86/358, 86/360, 86/364, 86/368, 86/369, 86/370, 86/379, 86/380, 86/381, 86/403, 86/407  
General Assembly Resolution 302 (IV), 86/324  
General Assembly Resolution 2145 (XXI), 86/199, 86/247, 86/273  
General Assembly Resolution 3295 (XXIX), 86/197  
General Assembly Resolution 35/37, 85/251  
General Assembly Resolution 35/142 B, 86/335  
General Assembly Resolution 35/46, 86/334  
General Assembly Resolution 37/267, 85/190  
General Assembly Resolution 38/81, 85/195, 86/300  
General Assembly Resolution 3913, 85/056  
General Assembly Resolution 39/16, 85/194  
General Assembly Resolution 39/27, 85/271  
General Assembly Resolution 39/63 E, 85/240  
General Assembly Resolution 39/64 B, 85/263  
General Assembly Resolution 39/75, 85/298  
General Assembly Resolution 39/96, 85/296  
General Assembly Resolution 39/151 C, 85/249  
General Assembly Resolution 39/160, 85/234  
General Assembly Resolution 39/246, 85/271  
General Assembly Resolution 39/247 B, 85/196, 85/329  
General Assembly Resolution 40/49, 86/152  
General Assembly Resolution 40/61, 85/326  
General Assembly Resolution 40/64 G, 85/326  
General Assembly Resolution 40/73, 86/305  
General Assembly Resolution 40/141, 86/177  
Security Council Resolution 186 (1964), 85/195  
Security Council Resolution 242 (1967), 85/189, 85/231, 85/256, 85/305, 85/309, 85/312, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/275, 86/359, 86/373, 86/376, 86/378  
Security Council Resolution 338 (1973), 85/189, 85/231, 85/256, 85/305, 85/309, 85/312, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/373, 86/376, 86/378  
Security Council Resolution 385 (1976), 85/279, 86/199, 86/273, 86/274, 86/354, 86/365  
Security Council Resolution 418 (1977), 85/030, 85/040, 85/228, 86/003  
Security Council Resolution 435 (1978), 85/070, 85/112, 85/161, 85/167, 85/189, 85/195, 85/238, 85/279, 85/300, 85/327, 86/008, 86/067, 86/068, 86/162, 86/199, 86/202, 86/217, 86/247, 86/273, 86/274, 86/306, 86/327, 86/354, 86/363, 86/365, 86/407  
Security Council Resolution 478 (1980), 85/233, 85/328, 86/380  
Security Council Resolution 487 (1981), 86/330  
Security Council Resolution 523 (1982), 85/016  
Security Council Resolution 558 (1984), 85/324  
Security Council Resolution 564 (1985), 85/312  
Security Council Resolution 571 (1985), 85/189  
Security Council Resolution 582 (1986), 86/087, 86/105, 86/246, 86/275  
Security Council Resolution 588 (1986), 86/407  
Stockholm Document, 86/336  
Venice Declaration, 85/002, 85/042, 85/051, 85/195, 85/231, 85/318, 86/026, 86/071, 86/343, 86/359, 86/373, 86/376  
Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 85/283, 86/200, 86/272, 86/358  
Yalta Agreements, 85/023, 86/254, 86/293
- Security, 85/147, 85/168, 85/186, 85/189, 85/194, 85/213, 85/217, 85/219, 85/231, 85/234, 85/237, 85/238, 85/240, 85/249, 85/251, 85/253, 85/263, 85/270, 85/279, 85/297, 85/305,

- 85/306, 85/309, 85/312, 85/317, 85/318, 85/336 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/340 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/047, 86/123, 86/124, 86/140, 86/194, 86/298, 86/333, 86/367
- Defence, 85/003, 85/010, 85/027, 85/035, 85/101, 85/106, 85/118, 85/124, 85/128, 85/132, 85/144, 85/147, 85/150, 85/151, 85/172, 85/180, 85/205, 85/230, 85/240, 85/241, 85/259, 85/266, 85/289, 85/312, 86/019, 86/082, 86/101, 86/123, 86/129, 86/140, 86/198, 86/207, 86/234, 86/242, 86/282, 86/308, 86/335, 86/347
- Drugs, 85/085, 85/272, 86/093, 86/134, 86/142, 86/146, 86/183, 86/200, 86/275, 86/306, 86/337, 86/382, 86/384, 86/407
- Hijacking, 85/146, 85/163, 85/178, 85/208, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/045, 86/061, 86/064, 86/140, 86/275
- Hostages, 85/146, 85/188, 85/219, 85/225, 85/300, 85/312, 86/152, 86/363, 86/376
- Immigrants, 85/110, 85/260
- Mercenaries, 85/216, 85/304, 86/329, 86/346
- Nuclear safety, 86/151, 86/275, 86/330, 86/343, 86/407
- Organized crime, 85/033, 85/090, 85/178, 85/225, 85/272, 85/274, 86/039, 86/134, 86/142, 86/194
- Piracy, 85/178
- Public security, 85/009, 85/026, 85/110, 86/119
- Security of civil aviation, 85/189, 85/312, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/064, 86/093, 86/119, 86/203, 86/252, 86/276
- Security of navigation, 85/004, 85/043, 85/189, 85/225, 8541 (Vol. 1986-1) 85/312 , 86/087, 86/147, 86/209, 86/275
- Security policy, economic aspects of -, 85/003, 85/097, 85/147, 85/151, 85/317, 86/308, 86/335
- Terrorism, 85/002, 85/021, 85/026, 85/033, 85/052, 85/060, 85/068, 85/075, 85/078, 85/085, 85/146, 85/163, 85/178, 85/189, 85/191, 85/199, 85/208, 85/219, 85/225, 85/253, 85/272, 85/274, 85/283, 85/297, 85/305, 85/309, 85/312, 85/314, 85/318, 85/326, 85/333, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/002, 86/008, 86/025, 86/026, 86/039, 86/045, 86/046, 86/061, 86/064, 86/078, 86/081, 86/093, 86/099, 86/119, 86/133, 86/134, 86/140, 86/141, 86/142, 86/144, 86/164, 86/167, 86/168, 86/172, 86/194, 86/200, 86/201, 86/203, 86/223, 86/251, 86/252, 86/275, 86/276, 86/284, 86/306, 86/308, 86/318, 86/351, 86/363, 86/367, 86/373, 86/376, 86/382, 86/384, 86/402, 86/407
- Euroterrorism, 85/033, 85/078, 85/208, 85/225, 86/142
- Sovereignty, 85/161, 85/169, 85/175, 85/185, 85/187, 85/189, 85/191, 85/194, 85/219, 85/222, 85/237, 85/240, 85/253, 85/263, 85/279, 85/297, 85/307, 85/312, 85/331, 85/337 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/340 (Vol. 1986-1), 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/046, 86/087, 86/173, 86/186, 86/209, 86/280, 86/303, 86/306
- Decolonization, 85/036, 85/168, 85/219, 85/230, 85/315
- Independence, 85/002, 85/023, 85/039, 85/051, 85/068, 85/069, 85/071, 85/161, 85/162, 85/167, 85/185, 85/189, 85/195, 85/219, 85/222, 85/230, 85/237, 85/238, 85/251, 85/253, 85/279, 85/297, 85/300, 85/304, 85/307, 85/312, 85/327, 85/331, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/046, 86/067, 86/068, 86/100, 86/145, 86/162, 86/186, 86/199, 86/212, 86/217, 86/247, 86/273, 86/274, 86/275, 86/280, 86/303, 86/304, 86/306, 86/307, 86/316, 86/324, 86/340, 86/362, 86/363, 86/376, 86/392, 86/403, 86/407
- Non-interference in internal affairs, 85/024, 85/064, 85/068, 85/077, 85/148, 85/161, 85/189, 85/237, 85/253, 85/295, 85/297, 85/304, 85/307, 85/331, 85/340 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/065, 86/152, 86/182, 86/253, 86/362, 86/407
- Occupied territory, 85/002, 85/138, 85/211, 85/231, 85/256, 85/300, 86/021, 86/023, 86/026, 86/036, 86/137, 86/324, 86/359, 86/363, 86/373, 86/376, 86/378, 86/407
- Self-determination, 85/002, 85/012, 85/023, 85/069, 85/117, 85/167, 85/189, 85/219, 85/231, 85/237, 85/238, 85/240, 85/251, 85/253, 85/256, 85/279, 85/300, 85/309, 85/312, 85/327, 85/331, 86/046, 86/048, 86/182, 86/199, 86/232, 86/267, 86/273, 86/275, 86/299, 86/322, 86/327, 86/346, 86/354, 86/359, 86/363, 86/373, 86/378



Territorial integrity, 85/002, 85/003, 85/012, 85/016, 85/024, 85/039, 85/046, 85/068, 85/069, 85/077, 85/092, 85/094, 85/112, 85/123, 85/135, 85/141, 85/148, 85/161, 85/175, 85/185, 85/189, 85/222, 85/231, 85/238, 85/240, 85/251, 85/253, 85/297, 85/307, 85/312, 85/341 (Vol. 1986-1), 86/046, 86/050, 86/087, 86/100, 86/105, 86/145, 86/153, 86/186, 86/187, 86/209, 86/247, 86/275, 86/280, 86/303, 86/304, 86/306, 86/307, 86/316, 86/324, 86/362, 86/385, 86/392, 86/403



**Venta y suscripciones · Salg og abonnement · Verkauf und Abonnement · Πωλήσεις και συνδρομές  
Sales and subscriptions · Vente et abonnements · Vendita e abbonamenti  
Verkoop en abonnementen · Venda e assinaturas**

**BELGIQUE / BELGIE**

**Moniteur belge / Belgisch Staatsblad**  
Rue de Louvain 40-42 / Leuvensestraat 40-42  
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel  
Tél. 5 12 00 26  
CCP / Postrekening 000-2005502-27

Sous-dépôts / Agentschappen:

**Librairie européenne /  
Europese Boekhandel**  
Rue de la Loi 244 / Wetstraat 244  
1040 Bruxelles / 1040 Brussel

**CREDOC**

Rue de la Montagne 34 / Bergstraat 34  
Bte 11 / Bus 11  
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel

**DANMARK**

**Schultz EF-publikationer**

Montergade 19  
1116 København K  
Tlf. 01 14 11 95  
Telefax: 01 32 75 11

**BR DEUTSCHLAND**

**Bundesanzeiger Verlag**

Brette Straße  
Postfach 10 80 06  
5000 Köln 1  
Tel. (02 21) 20 29-0  
Fernschreiber: ANZEIGER BONN 8 882 595  
Telefax: 20 29 278

**GREECE**

**G. C. Eleftheroudakis SA**

International Bookstore  
4 Nikis Street  
105 63 Athens  
Tel. 322 22 55  
Telex 219410 ELEF

Sub-agent for Northern Greece:

**Molho's Bookstore**

The Business Bookshop  
10 Tsimiski Street  
Thessaloniki  
Tel. 275 271  
Telex 412BB5 LIMO

**ESPAÑA**

**Boletín Oficial del Estado**

Trafalgar 27  
28010 Madrid  
Tel. (91) 446 60 00

**Mundi-Prensa Libros, S.A.**

Castelló 37  
28001 Madrid  
Tel. (91) 431 33 99 (Libros)  
431 32 22 (Suscripciones)  
435 36 37 (Dirección)

Télex 49370-MPLI-E  
Telefax: 34-1-1275 3998

**FRANCE**

**Journal officiel**

**Service des publications  
des Communautés européennes**  
26, rue Desaix  
75727 Paris Cedex 15  
Tél. (1) 40 58 75 00

**IRELAND**

**Government Publications Sales Office**

Sun Alliance House  
Molesworth Street  
Dublin 2  
Tel. 71 03 09

or by post

**Government Stationery Office**

**EEC Section**  
6th floor  
Bishop Street  
Dublin 8  
Tel. 78 16 66

**ITALIA**

**Licosa Spa**

Via Lamarmora, 45  
Casella postale 552  
50 121 Firenze  
Tel. 57 97 51  
Telex 570466 LICOSA I  
CCP 343 509

Subagent:

**Libreria scientifica Lucio de Biasio -AEIOU**

Via Meravigli, 16  
20 123 Milano  
Tel. 80 76 79

**Herder Editrice e Libreria**

Piazza Montecitorio, 117-120  
00 186 Roma  
Tel. 67 94 628/67 95 304

**Libreria giuridica**

Via 12 Ottobre, 172/R  
16 121 Genova  
Tel. 59 56 93

**GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG**

et autres pays / and other countries

**Office des publications officielles  
des Communautés européennes**

2, rue Mercier  
L-2985 Luxembourg  
Tél. 49 92 81  
Télex PUBOF LU 1324 b  
CCP 19190-81  
CC bancaire BIL 8-109/6003/200  
Sogelnet 61-490226-96-26

Abonnements / Subscriptions

**Messageries Paul Kraus**

11, rue Christophe Plantin  
L-2339 Luxembourg  
Tél. 49 98 881  
Télex 2515  
CCP 49242-63

**NEDERLAND**

**Staatsdrukkerij- en uitgeverijbedrijf**

Christoffel Plantijnstraat  
Postbus 20014  
2500 EA 's-Gravenhage  
Tel. (070) 78 98 80 (bestellingen)

**PORTUGAL**

**Imprensa Nacional**

**Casa da Moeda, E. P.**  
Rua D. Francisco Manuel de Melo, 5  
1092 Lisboa Codex  
Tel. 69 34 14  
Telex 15328 INCM

**Distribuidora Livros Bertrand Lda.**

**Grupo Bertrand, SARL**  
Rua das Terras dos Vales, 4-A  
Apart. 37  
2700 Amadora CODEX  
Tel. 493 90 50 - 494 87 BB  
Telex 15798 BERDIS

**UNITED KINGDOM**

**HMSO Books (PC 16)**

HMSO Publications Centre  
51 Nine Elms Lane  
London SW8 5DR  
Tel. (01) 211 77 02

Sub-agent:

**Alan Armstrong & Associates Ltd**

Arkwright Road  
Reading, Berks RG2 0SQ  
Tel. (0734) 75 17 69  
Telex B49937 AAALTD G

**TURKIYE**

**Dünya süper veb ofset A.Ş.**

Narlıbahçe Sokak No. 15  
Cağaloğlu  
İstanbul  
Tel: 512 01 90  
Telex: 23822 dsvo-tr.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**European Community Information  
Service**

2100 M Street, NW  
Suite 707  
Washington, DC 20037  
Tel. (202) 862 9500

**CANADA**

**Renouf Publishing Co., Ltd**

61 Sparks Street  
Ottawa  
Ontario K1P 5R1  
Tel. Toll Free 1 (800) 267 4164  
Ottawa Region (613) 238 8985-6  
Telex 053-4936

**JAPAN**

**Kinokuniya Company Ltd**

17-7 Shinjuku 3-Chome  
Shinjuku-ku  
Tokyo 160-91  
Tel. (03) 354 0131

**Journal Department**

PO Box 55 Chitose  
Tokyo 156  
Tel. (03) 439 0124

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg

---

Single copy: ECU 12.70 ● Annual subscription: ECU 23.50

---



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS  
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

L-2985 Luxembourg

Catalogue number: OY-AA-87-002-2A-C