United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
FORTY-FIRST SESSION
*Official Records**

FIRST COMMITTEE
39th meeting
held on
11 November 1986
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 39th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/41/PV.39
3 December 1986
ENGLISH

86-63232 3192V (E)

The meeting was called to order at LO.25 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 46 TO 65 AND 144 (continued-)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION WON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will begin by taking decisions on draft resolutions listed under cluster 5 of the informal paper distributed to the Committee - draft resolution8 A/C.1/41/L.14, L.16, L.18, L.32, L.60 and L.68.

Before we proceed to take action on those draft resolutions, I shall first call on any delegation wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

Since no delegation wishes to do so at this stage, I shall call on repreeentativee to make statements or comments on the draft resolutions in cluster 5 or to explain their votes before the voting.

First I call on the Secretary of! the Committee.

Mr KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should li ke to inform the Committee that the following delegations have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/41/L.18: Romania; L. 221 the German Democratic Republic; L.60: Burkina Faso; and L.33: Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) : On behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, I wish to make an explanation of vote on draft resolution L.16, on the World Disarmament Compaign.

The 1.2 cannot support this draft resolution, operative paragraph 7 of which, as in the case of its predecessors, talks of all Member States being invited to ensure a flow of 'accurate information" and "to avoid dissemination of false and tendentioun information". In our view, this is a blatant call for censorship and should be unacceptable to all Member States that share tht democratic t: lition of a deep-rooted balief in the right to freedom of speech. The 12 cannot support t he suppression of freedom of speech and ideas for which this d-aft resolution apparently calls.

We also view with concern the idea ot the involvement of children for political purpoeee, no matter how worth while those purposes may be.

Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) (interpretation from French) : Before the Committee begins to vote on draft resolution L.14, I should lika to announce that Mozambique has joined its sponsors.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolutions listed in cluster 5. First, I should like to inform members that, because of ongoing consultations, we shall postpone action on draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.60 and L.68.

We shall begin the votinq with draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.14, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: Disarmament Week". It wan introduced by the representative of Mongolia at the 28th meeting of the First Commi ttee on 31 October 1986. The sponsors are: Afghanistan, Angola, Rulgar La,

(The Chairman)

the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, the Ukrainian SSR and Viet Nam. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favours: Afghanistan, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.14 was adopted by 89 votes to 1, with 22 abstentions.*

me CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.16, entitled "Review and implementation of the concluding document of the twed fth special session of the General Assembly: World Disarmament Campaign", and subtitled "World Disarmament Campaigna action8 and activities". It was

*Subsequently the delegations of Angola, Bolivia, Central African Republic, Djibouti, Guyana, Malawi, Mali, Sierra Leone, Yemen and Zaire advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

(The Chairman)

introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the 30th meeting of the First Committee on 3 November 1986. The sponsors are: Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Romania, the Ukrainian ESR and Viet Nam. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Rwanda, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.16 was adopted by 80 votes to 3, with 35 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/41/L.18, entitled "Review and implementation of the concluding document of the twelfth special session of tha General Assembly: World Disarmament Campaign". It was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 37th meeting of the First Committee on 10 November 1986 and has the following sponsors: Bangladesh, Egypt, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela and Yugoslavia. A recorded vote has been requested.

---

* Subsequently the delegations of Bolivia, Central African Republic, Djibouti, Guyana, Malawi, Mali, Sierra Leone, Yemen and Zaire advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Rahamae, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Againatr None

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

Draft renolution A/C.1/41/L.18 was adopted by 114 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The next draft resolution is contained in document A/C. 1/41/L. 32, entitled "Review and implementation of the concluding document of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly: United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa". It was introduced by the representative of Benin on behalf of the Group of African States at the 37th meeting of the First Committee, on 10 November 1986. The sponsors have

*Subsequently the delegations of Bolivia, Central African Republic, Djibouti, Guyana, Sierra Leone, Yemen and Zaire advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

(The Chat rman)

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.32 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their votes after the voting on all the draft reeolutions in cluster 5 on which we have just taken action.

Mr. FISCHER (Federal Republic of Germany): The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to explain its votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.14 and L.18. Allow me to refer to those drafts in reverse order.

As regards draft reeolution L.18, on the World Disarmament Campaign, my delegation, as in previous years, has abstained in the vote. Again we have done so with great reluctance, since from the outset we have supported the World Disarmament Campaign conducted as agreed upon by consensus at the second special session of the General Aeeembly devoted to disarmament.

Our support for the World Diearmament Campaign is well founded. Since the inception of the campaign in 1982, its activities have indeed been carried out on a global and balanced basis. I am thinking in particular of regional conferences in which representatives of my Government have participated.

I should also like to comment on the generally balanced and factual information contained in campaign publications as well as the wide dissemination given to it, including in non-official languages of the United Nations.

For all this, we should like to expreae our appreciation to the dedicated staff of the Department for Disarmament Affairs af the Secretariat.

With all this in mind, we regret even more that the present text fails to confirm two principles upon which the World Disarmament Campaign rester voluntary participation and universality. We had wished that the sponsors of this text would take into consideration our concerns, which we have repeatedly expressed, and would

(Mr. Fischer, Federal Republic of Germany)

present a draft resolution capable of enlisting maximum support. The World Disarmament Campaign indeed deserves such support.

We therefore call upon the sponsors of this draft to take into account our reservations to the present text so that next year, if the sponsors decide to propose a similar draft resolution then, we shall all be able to join in a consensus on a draft resolution that deals with the worthy and commendable goals of the World Disarmament Campaign.

Secondly, the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany has once again abstained in the vote on the draft resolution on Disarmament Week, this year contained in document A/C. 1/41/L. 14. Again we should like to state that we have abstained with reluctance, since we support the thrust of Disarmament week. We cannot, however, accept the call on specialized agencies or on the International Atomic Energy Agency to disseminate information about matters outside their scope of activities. Those organizations have their own statutes and are under an obligation towards their member States to adhere rigorously to the terms of those statutes.

Mr. YAMADA (Japan): I should like to explain the votes of my delegation, first with respect to the draft resolution on Disarmament Week in document A/C.1/41/L.14.

Japan attaches great importance to the purpose to be served by Disarmament Week, and consistently has given its support to Disarmament Week resolutions in the past. Ever since that week's inauguration in 1978, Japan has also taken an active pact in observance of that important occasion every year. When we auppor ted resolution 40/152 E, on Disarmament Week, last year, my delegation pointed out its concern about some of the formulations in the said resolution and cautioned that if the trend to deviate from consensus language were to continue, Japan would be forced to reconsider its position in the future.

(Mr. Yamada, Japan)

With due respect to the delegation of Mongolia, which takes valuable initiatives on Disarmament Week resolutions every year, and with which we have worked clcecly, my delegation finds it unfortunate chat this year's draft resolution on Disarmament Week in document A/C.1/41/L.14 represents in our view further deviation from that of last year. P a example, the new language in the s :cond and fourth preambular paragraphs is indeed misleading. Under these circumstances, my deiegation wae constrained to abstain.

My delegation wishes at the same time to stress that there is no change in Japan's support for the aim of Disarmament Week and that it will continue to implement it in 4 positive manner. Japan strongl y hopes that a draft resolution more in line with the original aim of Disarmament Week and cne that may attain the widest possible support will be presented at next year 's session of the General Assembly.

With respect to the dr - - resolution on the World Disarmament Campaign in document A/C.1/41/L.16, my delegation wishes to make it clear that our abstention ehould not be conetrued as in any way implying that Japan does not appreciate the importance ot the World Disarmament Campaign. Tho Government of Japan recognizes the significance of the Campaign and will continue to do so. The draft resolution in document A/C. 1/4 1/L. 16, in the view of my delegation, sets cut arbitrarily priority issues in disarmament. Its overall tone is biased and subjective. We therefore abstained on it.

My delegation joined in the consensus adoption of the draft resolution on the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace ad Disarmament in Africa in document A/C.1/41/L. 32. We did so on the understanding that those Centres are financed by existing resources an i voluntary contributions, and thus will not place an extra burden on the United Nations budget.

Mr. van SCHAIK (Nether lands): My delegation abstained on draft resolution \/C.1/41/L.18, on the World Disarmament Campaign. We agree with the objective of the Campa ign, the widest possible dissemination of information and unimpeded access for all sectors of the public to a broad range of informatic n and opinions on question6 of arms limitation and disarmament. The Campa ign has been launched because the United Nations considers disarmament too important a question to leave its fate exclusively in the hand8 of policy maker8 and consequently has decided that in this field public opinion should play a positive role. Hence the recognized objective of the Wor ld Disarmament Campaign o mob il iz ing public opinion on behalf of disarmament.

We should like to seize this opportunity once again to stress our commitment to the freedom of the people of the Nether lands to speak out freely in public about our own Government's policy on peace, security and disarmament, and to disseminate the views thus expreaeed individually or in an organized form, whether they support those policies or not.

To the Netherlands, the objective of the World Disarmament Campaign is not merely a theoretical concept but has been implemented as a matter of tradition. However, activities in the World Disarmament Campaign tend sometime8 to lead one-sidedly to the mobilization of public opinion in a certain direction. In fact, in the World Disarmament Campaign emphasis should rather be placed on the availability and accessibility of United Nations material on disarmament, for which no additional funds and/or voluntary contributions seem to be necessary.

My country 13 at this moment not prepared to contribute financially to this vehicle for the dissemination of information to the public. The reason is that in fact we have doubts on the effectiveness of the Campaign.

(Mr. Van Schaik, Netherlands)

We also wish to recall that yearly celebrations are being held on the occasion of International Peace Day, this year on 15 September, and Disarmament week, 24 to 31 October, on which the Committee has just voted.

For these reasons my delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.18, as well as on the other draft resolution on the World Disarmament Campaign, A/C.1/41/L.16, which contains still more elements running counter to the ideas I have just expressed and on which the United Kingdom delegation has spoken on behalf of the twelve member countries of the European Economic Community.

Mr. KEISALO (Pinland): Finland voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.14 on Disarmament Week. We felt it appropriate to do so, taking into account the main intention of the draft resolution, that is, to mobilize public support for disarmament issues through the holding of Disarmament Week annually.

Some delegations may have had difficulties with the mention of a "comprehensive system of international peace and security" in the preamble of the draft resolution. Finland fully agrees that the world needs a system of international peace and security. The United Nations in fact is such a system in principle. It is debatable, however, how well this system of ours works in Practice, but since we have on our agenda a separate item, item 141, dealing with the proposal to create "a comprehensive system of international peace and security", we shall have an opportunity to come back to this and related questions in greater detail in that context.

Mr. ROWE (Australia): The draft resolution in document A/C.1/41/L.16 on the World Disarmament Campaign, *sponsored by*, among others, Bulgaria, received my delegation's support. That support related to those aspects of the draft resolution which bear directly upon the World Disarmament Campaign, a programme

(Mr. Rowe, Australia)

that. Australia has consistently supported through four successive pledging conferences with substantial convertible currency contributions.

There are, however, elements of this draft resolution to which my delegation takes exception. It is quite clear that this draft resolution is being increasingly used to project the propaganda intentions of a certain group of Member States of this Organization. This trend is to be regretted, I refer in particular to operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, in which a considerable amount of dubious material extraneous to the consideration of the World Disarmament Campaign has been included The call in paragraph 4 for the Soviet Union md tbe United States to inform the Secretary-General annually of actions each has taken in certain specified fields has little or nothing to do with the World Disarmament Campaign.

The same operative paragraph contains a call for the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests. The position of the Australian Government on this matter is very well known. We wish to see the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test ban that incorporates a prohibition of all nuclear test explosions, including so-called peaceful nuclear teat explosions, in all environments foe all time. A bilateral moratorium on nuclear tests, in the strong view of my delegation, while representing a welcome interruption to nuclear testing, would only be a temporary respite by only t.wo of the five nuclear-weapon States. In addition, such a moratorium would not be subject to agreed verification arrangements.

(Mr. Rowe, Australia)

Australia's preference, as I have stated, is for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty which could be subject to agreed verification provisions.

As can be seen, there is much in the draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.16 that is unnecessary or contentious or both. The draft resolution would have been vastly improved if this extraneous material had been left out entirely.

Mr. de la BAUME (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to give an explanation as to why the French delegation abstained on two of the draft resolutions we have just considered, A/C.1/41/L.18 and A/C.1/41/L.14.

As far as the former is concerned, my delegation attaches great importance to the efforts undertaken with regard to the World Disarmament Campaign. However, this year, like past year, my delegation has abstained because of the provision in operative paragraph 4 whereby the General Assembly is called on to express its regret that most of the States which have the largest military expenditures have not so far made any financial contribution to the World Disarmament Campaign.

I should like to point to the effort made by France with regard to information on disarmament and the promotion of that cause, which is extremely important. Furthermore, we believe that the donation made by our country to the United Nations Institute for Mearmament studies - nearly 91.2 million since the creation of that Institute - constitutes a very important contribution to the Campaign, since that is no doubt the most effective way of ensuring the dissemination of information on disarmament and the consideration of matters related to disarmament.

The French delegation also abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.14 because we cannot agree to its operative paragraph 6, which invites specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to intensify their activities to disseminate information on the consequences of the arms race, especially the nuclear-arms race. We believe it is neither advisable nor appropriate for the

(Mr. de la Baume, France)

United Nations thus to invite the specialized agencies in to devote s' 'e of their energies to activities not wit' n the'r spheres of competence, thus distracting them from their real vocations. That would not serve our interests, nor the purposes of those agencies, nor the purposes of disarmament in general.

Mr. KIBIDI (Zaire) (interpretati n from French): My delegation would like to take this opportunity to • t&b that the Government of Zaire has announced its contribution to dincharge its obligation with regard to the World Disarmament Campaign. Our Government has contr ibuted $500 as a voluntary contribution to this Campaign.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thue concluded our consideration of the draft resolutions in cluster 5 except A/C.1/41/L.60 and L.68, which will be considered and voted on at a later stage.

We shall now take up cluster 7, which includes the draft resolutiona in documents A/C. 1/41/L.15 and L.21. Does any member wish to make a statement or to comment on the draft resolutions in this cluster? It appears not.

I shall now call on delegations that wish to explain their votes on these draft resolutions.

Mr. TEJA (India): My delegation will abstain on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/41/L.15 and L.21. We believe that the only real and credible guarantee for non-nuclear-weapon States, without any discrimination as regards the use ok threat of uae of nuclear weapons, lies in the adoption of meaningful nuclear disarmament measures and the complete elimination cf nuclear weapons. Even if nuclear-weapon States do extend some form of security assurances the non-nuclear States will not really be any more secure unless the nuclear-weapon States provide a simultaneous commitment to give up the doctrine of nuclear deterrence and the nuclear weapons which go with it. So long as nuclear-weapon States have nuclear weapons in their arsenals, and so long as their security policies remain predicated on the possible use of nuclear weapons, such assurances will have little use for the non-nuclear-weapon States.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 7, beginning with that in document A/C.1/41/L.15, entitled "Conclusion of effective international agreements on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use ok threat of use of nuclear Weapons".

That draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 3 November 1986. The sponsors are

(The Cha i rman)

Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelcrussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Mongolia, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Viet Nam. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Tran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Lit an Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta. Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Inited Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zalre, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Prance, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, Burma, Chile, China, Colombia, Greece, India, Treland, Israel, Jamaica, Malawi, Samoa, Sudan, Sweden, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.15 was adopted by 91 votes to 10, with 19 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.21, enti tled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

That draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 36th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1396. A recorded vote hae been reques ted.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Benrn, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgarta, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kanya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriyr , Luxembourg, Madagascar , Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nelborlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uni ted Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, India, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.21 was adopted by none, with 5 abstentions.*

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

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes after the voting on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 7.

Mr. THOMPSON-FLORES (Brazil): My Government's views on the question of negative security assurances are well known to Member States, so I shall try to be brief in restating them once again in connection with the draft resolutions we have just acted upon.

It is our feeling, which is shared with a Group of 21 of the Conference on Disarmament, that the nuclear-weapon Powers have striven to legitimize their exclusive possession of nuclear weapons through the reaffirmation of theories, doctrines and perceptions that only serve their own interests, without taking due account of the security needs of the international community at large. As a result of such attitudes, the nuclear-weapon Powers have engaged in an unbridled proliferation of nuclear armaments, both vertical and geographical, which has gravely endangered the security of all other nations. In the process all they have offered those other nations is unilateral declarations of guarantees, which, with one notable exception, are tantamount to virtually no reliable guarantees at all.

As long as this situation is allowed to prevail, no progress can be made in the multilateral consideration of the matter. For that reason, my delegation has, as in the past few years, abstained in the votes on draft resolutions L.15 and L.21, which do not, in our view, adequately reflect those concerns.

Mr. YAMADA (Japan): With respect to draft resolution L.15, we noted some improvement compared with the previous year's resolution 40/85, such as the deletion of the references in the operative paragraphs which might have the effect of prejudging the work of the Conference on Disarmament. However, there are still references to specific modalities, and some of the preambular paragraphs are one-sided. On the whole, we find draft resolution L.15 neither balanced nor objective. Therefore we voted against it.

(Mr. Yamada, Japan)

With reqard to draft resolution L.21, my delegation has reservations on operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 5, which refer to specific modalities of negative security assurances, possibly prejudging the work of the Conference on Disarmament, However, we note that this draft resolution does reflect the stage of work at the Conference on Disarmament, in particular by the reference to "a common formula". In the hope that the wrk in the Conference on Disarmament will be continued in this direction, my delegation voted in favour of it.

Mr. CAMPORA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Argentina ahstained in the votee on draft resolutions L.15 and L.21, concernirg the conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, because we doubt the effectiveness of such arrangements. Rut we have no doubt as to the moral and political ohliqation of nuclear-weapon States vis-à-vis those States that do not poLsess nuclear weapons and have renounced the possession of ouch weapons in the future.

In this respect, the nuclear-weapon States must unequivocally and without any pre-conditions state that they renounce the use or threat of use of such weapons aqainst non-nuclear-weapon States. To the extent that such renunciation becomes a concrete and unconditional guaraniee will this item acquire the meaning it has totally lacked so far.

Mr von BOHEMEN (New Zealand) : New Zealand voted against draft resolution L. 15. We did so because, despite some improvements In the text as compared to last year's resolution, the draft remained uite unbalanced in its approach to some important security questions touched on in the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded action on the drnft resolutions listed in cluster 7.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolutions listed in clueter 8: A/C.1/41/L.19, L.25 parts A and B, and L.59. Action on draft resolutions L.20 and 23 will he postponed to a later stage, perhaps this afternoon.

I shall now cull on those delegations wishing to mske statements on draft resolutions listed in cluster 8.

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel): At this stage, I merely wish to discuss for a moment draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.25 B, "Nuclear capability of South Africa", in Particular its eleventh preambular psraqraph, where, contrary to fact, Israel has been named and singled out from other countries. My delegation will request a separate vote on the two words "and Israel" in that paragraph when the time comes to vote. Israel has no nuclear collaboration with South Africa, and we do not think that this should be part of the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote, the st Committee will now take decisions on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 8, beginning with the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.19. The draft resolution is entitled "Establ shment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East" snd was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 35th meeting of the First Committee, held on 6 November 1986. The sponsor of the draft resolution in Egypt.

The sponsor has requested that the First Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.19 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to the draft resolutions contained in document A/C.1/41/L.25, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa", which was introduced by the representative of Benin, on behalf of the Croup of African States, at the 37t meeting of the First Committee, held on 10 November 1936.

We shall first take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.25 A, entitled "Implementation of the Decl ration". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Num, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Chile, France, Israel, Lesotho, Malawi, United Kinydom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.25 A was adopted by 126 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.25 B, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa".

A separate vote has been requested on the deletion of the words "and Israel" in the eleventh preambular paragraph. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call first on the representative of Democratic Yemen, who wishes to speak on a point of order,

Mr. AL--ALFI (Democratic Yemen): I wish to request that the Secretary of the Committee be asked to clarify precisely what it is we are about to vote on.

The CHAIRMAN: I cull upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): If I understood you correctly, Mr. Chairman, you stated that the voting was taking place on the two words "and Israel" in the eleventh preamhular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.25, part B, which is entitled "Nuclear capability of Routh Africa".

The CHAIRMAN: There are a number of point6 of order. I call first on the representative of Democratic Yemen.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen): I am sorry to speak once again. I think the question before the Committee in simple. Those in favour of deleting the words should identify themselves; those who are against deleting them should identify themselves. There is a misunderstanding.

The CHAIRMAN: There are scm more point6 of order, hut perhaps the representative of Democratic Yemen has spoken on behalf of the other delegation6 that have raised 6 point of order. That appear6 to be the case. I should now like to ask the representative of Israel to repeat hi6 request for a separate vote on the eleventh preamhular paragraph of the draft resolution in document L.25, part R, line 2.

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel): My request is that the word6 "and Israel" be deleted From that line. Therefore I would think that if one vote6 "yes", one is voting to delete th se words.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that, after the point of order raised hy the repreeentative of! Democratic Yemen, and the additional explanation of the repreeentative of Israel, it is auite clear what we are about to vote on.

Since we have had to spend some minutes on points of order, we should start the voting from the very beginning.

A recorded vote ha6 been requested on the eleventh preamhular paragraph of draft resolution L.25, part B.

I call on the Secretary to conduct the voting.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The voting will commence afresh.

I should like to give a word of explanation regarding what was said by the representative of Democratic Yemen.

I think I correctly referred to the fact that the voting was proceeding on the proposal made by the representative of Israel and as interpreted by you, Mr. Chairman, and I think in your statement you correctly referred to the question of deletion. So I did not think it necessary at that stage to repeat what you had already placed on record.

The voting will now commence on the question of the deletion of the two words "and Israel" in the eleventh preambular paragraph of A/C.1/41/L.25 B.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nether Lands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Brunei, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Mexico, Nepal, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Spain, Togo, Uruguay, Venezuela

Deletion of the words "and Israel" was rejected by 76 votes to 23, with 26 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.25 B as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbadoa, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burklna Faao, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon. Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprua, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djihouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Biaaau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indoneaia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jnnahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua Now Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Ropuhlic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republica, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Naa, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United State8 of America

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Luxemhourg, Netherlanda, New Zealand, Portugal

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.25 B, as a whole, was adopted by 117 votes to 4, with 12 ● batwdonr.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.59, entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 40/79 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 35th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1986. The eponsore are: the Bahamas, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Suriname, Trinidad and Tohago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

A recorded vote has been reoueated.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Alqer ia, Angola, Australia, Austr ia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgiun, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Social ist Republic, Cameroon. Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia. Democra tic Kampuchea, Democra tic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic F&public, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Por tugal, Qatar, Romania; Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzan ta, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugosla·ia, Za ire, Zamb ia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Absta in inq: Argentina, Central African Republic, C&e d'Ivoire, Cuba, France, Guyana, Mali

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.59 was adopted by 126 votes to none, with 7 absten ions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes after the voting on draft resolutions in cluster 5.

Mr. MLLOJA (Albania): The Albanian dele tion voted in favour of draft resolution A/C. 1/41/L. 25. This stand is in keeping with the policy of my Government in support of the just cause of the African peoples. However, we shoul l like to stress - and this must be put on record - that our support for this draft resolution does not affect at all our well-known and principled attitude on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Mr. KOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russ tan): The Soviet Union has tirelessly given its support. co the African States attempting to set up a nuclear-free zone on their continent. We firmly condemn any attempt undertaken by the racist régime of Pretoria to acquire nuclear weapons, and we share the indignation inspired by the acts of certain Western States and Israel and attempts made by transnaticnal corporations that contribute to the nuclear preparations of South Africa.

Because of these considerations of principle, the Soviet Union has supported the draft resolution contained in document A/C. l/4 l/L. 25 A.

With regard to the wording of operative paragraph 1 of this draft, the delegation of the Soviet Union wishes to s . e that the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone on the African continent must meet the recognized principles of in terna tional law, in particular the principle of the free navigation on the high seas.

Those considerations explain our support of draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L. 25 A and B.

Mr. THOMPSON-FLORES (Brazil) : I should like to state my delegation's position on the various proposals presented under cluster 5.

Brazil has joined the consensus on draft r(solution A/C. 1/41/L. 19 concer ning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, and supported draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L. 25 A and B, respectively on the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa and the question of the nuclear capability of South Africa.

The last two have a special interest in the context of the initiative on the zone of peace and co-operation in the South Atlantic, wi th which they are fully compatible and which they complement.

(Mr. Thompson-Flores, Brazil)

Regarding operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.19, it is our opinion, as repeatedly stated in the past, that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones should not in any way be related to adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, a discriminatory and unbalanced instrument that has allowed the only existing modality of proliferation of nuclear weapons, that is, the one being carried out by nuclear-weapon Powers, to proceed Unchecked. We again cast a positive vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.59 on the signature and ratification of Protocol I to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, an instrument we have signed and ratified and shall continue firmly to support.

Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland): I wish to explain the votes of Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and my own country on the two draft resolutions contained in document A/C.1/41/L.25 A and B, on the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

Our countries' strong condemnation of apartheid in all its forms and manifestations has been voiced on many occasions. That condemnation is based on the traditional Nordic concepts of justice, freedom and democracy and our belief in the equality and dignity of every human being. Apartheid is a fundamental violation of those values.

The position of the Nordic Governments has again been recently demonstrated in the economic and other measures against South Africa taken by all Nordic Governments further to restrict co-operation with South Africa in order to increase the international pressure on the South African Government. The Nordic countries also share the concern voiced in those draft resolutions that South Africa might acquire nuclear weapons. Such a development would be a major setback to international non-proliferation efforts and would add to the already grave threat to international peace and security caused by the policy of apartheid.

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

For that reason, our delegations voted in favour of the two draft resolutions. However, in so doing, we must voice reservations awed by • ic formulations used in both.

First, because of the strict adherence of the Nordic countries to the provisions of the Charter, we must generally reserve our position with regard to formulations that fail to take into account the proper division of competence between the Security Council and the General Assembly .

Secondly, the Nordic countries deplore, and voted against, the inappropriate and selective mentioning of individual countries or groups of countries, • inc% this makes it more difficult to reach international consensus in dealing with the question of South Africa.

(Mr. Patqkallio, Finland)

Third, since the General Assembly is composed of delegations representing Member States, it should address itself to Governments rather than to private citizens and enterprises.

Those are the considerations on which most of our reservations are based. As regards specific paragraphs, I ahould also like to add that we have reservations as regards operative paragraph 7 in resolution A, "Implementation of the Declaration'.

MrTEJA (India): The delegation of India has, as with similar resolutions in past years, extended its support to draft resolution L.19 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. However, we should like to put on record that our support for that draft resolution is without prejudice to our position on the inadequacy of partial measures, particularly in the field of nuclear disarmament, and our position on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the application of the so-called full-scope safeguards.

Mr. CAMPORA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish) : The Argentine delegation supported draft resolution L.l, on the eatablishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. We also supported draft resolution L.25 A on the implementation of the Declaration on the denuclearization of Africa. That support is in keeping with the position of Argentins, in favour of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons in general and the geographical non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in particular.

It is the belief of the Argentine delegation that nuclear-weapon States must show scrupulous respect for the wishes of those countries and regions that have decided to declare their territories free of nuclear weapons.

With regard to the aforementioned draft resolutions we must recall that Argentina has well-known reservations with regard to the Non-Proliferation Treaty

(Mr. Camarrag e n t i n a)

and the safeguards régime of the International Atomic Energy Agency, aspects which were referrad to in the aforementioned draft resolutions.

Mr. de la BAUME (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation regretted having to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.25 A and to vote against draft rwolution L.25 B.

The French Government agrees entirely with the fundamental objectives of those two resolutions, the denuclearization of Africa and the prevention of the acquisition by South Africa of nuclear capability for military purposes. Fur thermore, the French Government shares the concerns of the African States as to the [illegible] of force and destabilization measures taken by South Africa against countries in the region.

My country supports the principle that all State0 must refrain from any action that might lead to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. We also feel that South African must submit all its nuclear facilities to the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

On all those points tbe French Government agrees fully with the sponsors of the draft resolutions mentioned. But,at the same time, we attach great importance to the distinction that must be made between the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and its use for military purposes. We do not believe that this distinction has been made sufficiently clear in draft resolution A/C.1/41/L. 25 A. Further , we feel that the expression of views on th6 possession and development of the nuclear capability of South Africa goes beyond what we would have thought to be useful, With regard to A/C.1/41/L.25 B, the indispensable distinction between military applications and civilian uses is not reflected at all. Hence, in vlw of the importance we attach to that distinction, we were canpalled, as with similar draft. resolutions i n previous years, to vote against draft resolution L.25 B.

(Mr. de la Baume, France)

France abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.59 on the ratification of Additional Protocol I of tha Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco).

We cannot agree that France should he called into question whereas certain countries in the actual zone of application of the Treaty have not signed or ratified it, nor have they had recourse to the clause that admits the entry into force of the Treaty to them even before all countries of the region have become parties to the Treaty.

The French Government will in due course take an appropriate decision with regard to the ratification of Additional Protocol I in light of the state of the ratification of the Treaty itself.

Mr. BARTHELEMY (United States of America): The United Staten deleqation was nleaeed to have joined in the consensus adoption of draft reeolution L.19, concerning the eetahliahment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. It contains a preambular paragraph that emphasizes the need for appropr late measures on the question of. the prohibition of military ottacke on nuclear facilities.

As regards the general question of the prohibition of military attacks on nuclear facilities, which arises in a number of draft resol tions addressed by this bo y, including this one, I ehould like to take this occasion to note that the nuclear facilities of natione at peace are protected by the provisions of the United Nations Charter concerning the use Of force and that, when nations are enqaqed tn active hostilities, long-standing laws and customs of war prohibit attacks against facilities that are not legitimate military objectives, as well as attacks which would cause disproportionate civilian casualt ies. In our view, States should comply with existing international obligations.

(Mr. Bart helemy, United States)

As my delegation indicated on 10 November in its explanation of vote following the adoption of resolution A/C.1/41/L.7 on radiological weapons, we continue to believe that the question of additional legal protection against attacks on nuclear facilities should be considered separately from the question of a ban on radiological weapons.

Mr. ROWE (Australia): Australia abstained in the vote on draft resolution L.25 B on the nuclear capability of South Africa. Our decision to abstain was determined by several aspects of the draft resolution with which we could not agree. Foremost among them was a reference in the eleventh preambular paragraph to 'certain Western States and Israel".

That singling out of States by name should not, in our view, be acceptable practice in a draft resolution such as this and is unhelpful.

(Mr. Rowe, Australia)

In the seventh preambular paragraph, the sponsors of the draft resolution made reference to South Africa's nuclear-weapon capability. We have heard many such unsubstantiated assertions in the past. My delegation does not, thersfore, regard that reference as being at all helpful to the Committee's consideration of thie important item.

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel): Israel is once more pleased to be able to join the consensus on the draft resolution adopted under agenda item 49, draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.19. This in, an in the past, subject to the position of the Government of Israel, camnunicated by the Permanent Representative of Israel to the Secretary-General on 13 June 1985 and published in document A/40/383 and incorporated by the Secretary-General into his report (A/40/442), as well as in the letter of the Permanent Repreeentative of Israel dated 6 May 1906, incorporated into this year's report of the Secretary-General (A/41/465).

I feel it important to stress once again the position consistently taken by my delegation, that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East can take place only through direct and free negotiations among the sovereign States of the region. Thrt position is in accordance with the practice thnt has been followed in other parts of the world - Latin America and the South Pacific. That position is also in conformity with the recommendations of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, also known am the Palme Commission, found in document A/CN.10/38 of 8 April 1983.

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to explain its abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.59, just adopted by the First Committee. Cuba shares the view reflected in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of

(Mr. Nuñez Mosquera, Cuba)

ayreemente freely ente.ed into by the States of the regions in question is a very important disarmament measure. My country considers that the Government of Mexico made a praiseworthy reqional contribution hy proposing the Treaty of Tlatelolco

An members know, Cuba does not possess nuclear weapons and is not about to develop them. Rut Cuha cannot renounce its right to defend its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity with weapons it deems necessary, so long AR a part of its territory, Guantanamo, continues to be illegally occupied by a United Staten military baae imposed upon Cuba, and RO long as the only nuclear Power in our hemisphere maintains a hostile and aqqreasive attitude against our country in all spheres. That hostility is reflected, inter alla, in the maintenance for the past quarter century of a criminal economic blockade against Cuba, in menacing military manoeuvres and in spy flights over our territory.

So long as that rituatinn persists, my country's position cannot be one of meek acceptance or voluntary renunciation. We therefore had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.59.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) : I should like to explain why the United Kinqdom delegation wan unable to aupport draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.25 A and L.25 B, just adopted hy the Committee. The United Kinqdom fully supports the Governments of the independent States of southern Africa in their efforts to quarantee and safequard their territorial integrity and national sovereignty. While we note that South Africa has announced its intention to abide by the spirit of the Non-Prol iferation Treaty, we believe that South Africa should accede to that Treaty at the e liest opportunity so as to reassure its neighbours and the world about i ts nuclear programme. We also believe that South Africa should place its nuclear facilities under the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

As we have stated on previous occasions, the United Kingdom does not collaborate in any way with South Africa in the development of its civil nuclear power programme, still leas in the development of a nuclear-weapon capability. Indeed, we have joined the other member States of the European Community in a prohibition of all new collaboration with South Africa in the nuclear sector.

None the less, all States have the ight to apply and develop proqrammee for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, a right that is internationally recognized and set out in a number of international instruments.

We also note that these draft resolutions contain judqemente that are either insufficiently substantiated or are more properly matters for the Security Council.

Mr. NASHASHIBI (Jordan): Jordan voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.19, L.25 A and L.25 B to express its rejection of the introduction of nuclear weapons in the Middle Eaet and the African continent, which would create danger and add further complications in an already dangerous and complex situation. Israel's collaboration with the régime of South Africa was referred to by many participants in the international seminar on the United Nations arms embargo against South Africa, held at London From 28 to 30 May 1986, and in the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa. In a paper submitted to the World Conference (A/CONF.137/WP.2) it was stated that a further potentially very dangeroua conduit for South Africa is Israel, because of its intimate co-operation in the nuclear and military fields and hecaune it can he used in the reverse direction to funnel South African exports Into the European Community.

In a paper submitted to the seminar on the arms emharqo, Signe Landgren of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute stated that.

(Mr. Nashashibi, Jordan)

"Israel is, of course, the closest contact for South Africa in the Middle East. South Africa has supplied large amounts of hardware, and also military voluntaet 8, during Israel's wars with its Arab neighbours after 1948. In 1967, for example, South Africa was the chief supplier of spare parts for the Mirage fighters of the Israeli air force. It seems reasonable to assume that technological co-operation in military research and development has taken the place of direct arms exports since the Israeli arms industry is more advanced than that of South Africa.

"In 1982, one Marais of ARMSCOR confirmed in an interview that Israel played a role as intermediary for South African arms exports."

Mr. AL-HINAI (Oman) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation was gratified at the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.19 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. My country hopes that all the States of the region will view this matter in terms of the need for stability and just peace in the region and for the solution of all the region's prohleme. That would bring us closer to true international peace and security.

My country hopes also that certain parties will refrain from engaging in a nuclear-arms race.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus completed its action on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 8, apart from those contained in documents A/C.1/41/L.20 and L.23.

As I stated yesterday, it is my intention to take up this afternoon the draft resolutions in cluster 9 and those from cluatera 4, 5 and 8 action on which had been postponed, to wit, draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.39 from cluster 4, L.60 from cluster 5 and, 1 hope, L.23 from cluster 8, all bearing in mind the matter of flexibility I have mentioned in earlier statements.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.