

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



**FIRST COMMITTEE**  
**40th meeting**  
**held on**  
**11 November 1986**  
**at 3 p.m.**  
**New York**

---

**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 40th MEETING**

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

**CONTENTS**

**CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)**

---

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Printing Section, room DC/2.750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

---

**DISEP. GENERAL**  
**A/C.1/41/PV. 40**  
**8 December 1986**  
**ENGLISH**

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

**AGENDA ITEMS 46 TO 65 AND 144. (continued)**

**CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS**

The CHAIRMAN: This afternoon the Committee will take decisions on draft resolutions listed in cluster 9 of the informal paper distributed to the Committee, namely, A/C.1/41/L. 3, L.6, L. 28/Rev.1, L. 33, L. 48, L.52, L.58 and L.64.

Before proceeding to take action on them I shall first call on any delegation wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. PAN Guoxiang (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Please allow me to make a brief statement before the vote on draft resolution L.28/Rev.1, submitted by the Chinese delegation.

In draft resolution L. 28, the Chinese delegation urges the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States, which possess the most important nuclear arsenals, to discharge their special responsibility for nuclear disarmament, to take the lead in halting the nuclear-arms race and to negotiate in earnest with a view to reaching early agreement on the drastic reduction of their nuclear weapons. The draft resolution also appeals to other nuclear-weapon States to participate in the process of nuclear disarmament when the Soviet Union and the United States have drastically reduced their nuclear weapons.

In our opinion, the above proposal of the Chinese delegation is a reasonable one which reflects the actual situation in the international disarmament field at present. The Soviet Union and the United States have already agreed in principle to take the lead in drastically reducing their nuclear weapons and are carrying on negotiations on this issue at various levels.

The main purpose of the draft resolution of the Chinese delegation is to encourage the Soviet Union and the United States to reach early agreement on the

(Mr Fan Guoxiang, China)

drastic reduction of their nuclear weapons in order to create the necessary conditions for other nuclear-weapon States to participate in the process of nuclear disarmament so as to eliminate all nuclear weapons.

In the course of consultation\* with all sides, a number of countries have made certain suggestions with regard to operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution L.28.

(Mr. Pan Guoxiang, China)

In order to accommodate the concerns of these countries, and also taking into consideration the views of all sides, the Chinese delegation has decided to delete operative paragraph 3 of L.28.

The Chinese delegation wishes to state here that, after deleting operative paragraph 3, China, as a nuclear-weapon State, will certainly not evade its own responsibilities. In accordance with the position it has stated repeatedly, China will make its contribution towards opposing the nuclear-arms race and achieving the total destruction of all nuclear weapons.

We trust that the draft resolution in its revised version will receive the support of the entire membership of the First Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegations wish to introduce draft resolutions, I should like to inform members that, because of ongoing consultations, the following draft resolutions in cluster 9 will not be taken up and the Committee will postpone action on them: A/C.1/41/L.3 and L.52.

I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements on draft resolutions in cluster 9.

Mr. ROSE (German Democratic Republic) : The delegation of the German Democratic Republic would like to inform delegations that it does not insist on a vote on its draft resolution L.6, entitled "Nuclear weapons in all aspects". As a result of intensive consultations with the sponsors of draft resolution L.33, it was possible to merge draft resolutions L.6 and L.33. It was possible to do so because the two drafts proceed from the same basic concerns and because important elements of the draft submitted by the German Democratic Republic have been incorporated in the revised version, draft resolution L.33/Rev.1.

In this context, my delegation would like to add that the draft resolution now before us covers the question of nuclear disarmament in all aspects; that is, both

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

quantitative and qualitative. Hence we felt there was no need to submit a separate draft resolution on the prohibition of nuclear neutron weapons this year.

Such an approach meets the request of the Chairman to reduce the number of draft resolutions.

I should like to take this opportunity to thank the sponsors of L.33 And, in particular, the delegation of Argentina, for their good co-operation, which led to the successful conclusion of the consultations.

Mr. CAMPORA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish) : The Argentine delegation has asked to speak to inform the Committee that draft resolution L. 33 is now being introduced as L.33/Rev.1, and in its new version, it is sponsored by many delegations. This question of great importance regarding the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament is now dealt with in a draft with wide support. This leads us to hope that it will draw broad support in the General Assembly and in the Conference on Disarmament. It is hoped that this topic will be addressed with the seriousness its high priority requires.

Mr.BAYART (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): The draft resolutions in cluster 9 touch upon very important issues relating to the halting of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament. These are matters to which Mongolia attached great significance. I should like, therefore, to set forth briefly our position for the records of the First Committee with respect to draft resolutions L. 33/Rev.1, L. 48, L.64 and others.

In our opinion these draft resolutions are in consonance with the demands of the entire world. Nuclear disarmament is a requirement of the times; it is an absolute necessity. It is a multifaceted task that involves all of humanity and therefore requires redoubled efforts on the part of all States and peoples to

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

ensure total efficiency for all of the disarmament machinery. Unfortunately, it should be emphasized that, because of the Western group of countries, the Conference on Disarmament has hitherto been unable fully to discharge its responsibilities as a multilateral negotiating body on disarmament in this most important issue on matters of high priority in present world politics, namely, the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament.

We think this is inadmissible, particularly since it is extremely detrimental to the authority of the single negotiating body on disarmament. One at times hears assertions to the effect that the question of the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament are not ripe for negotiation or that the Conference on Disarmament, is not the most appropriate place to consider these matters.

Of course, Mongolia, like many other States, attaches tremendous significance to the American-Soviet talks on a wide range of issues relating to nuclear and space weapons. These negotiations are of prime importance. Nuclear disarmament, it has been suggested, is the responsibility of only two States. This is essentially undemocratic and is in fact a denial of the actual situation with respect to disarmament, where all sovereign States are involved on an equal basis. Nuclear disarmament is a cause which is of concern to all. Nuclear war threatens the life of all States and peoples.

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

Therefore the efforts of all States and peoples should be devoted to it. We think it is now high time - and this would in fact accord with the interests of all peoples - for the Conference on Disarmament to commence multilateral negotiations on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and on nuclear disarmament and to that end to create an auxiliary body whose mandate would be to carry out practical talks.

That is the essence of draft resolution L. 33/Rev.1, and Mongolia supports it.

Turning to the draft resolutions that refer to a freeze on nuclear armaments, we also support them. Mongolia has always favoured, and continues to favour, the freezing of nuclear arsenals since we see that as a necessary and logical step that would lead to the reduction and final elimination of nuclear weapons, which are the main source of the threat of nuclear warfare.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments on the draft resolutions in cluster 9? It appears not.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): At this stage I should like to inform the Committee that the following delegations have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/41/L. 33/Rev.1, Bulgaria, the Ukrainian SSR, Viet Nam and Poland; L.56, Samoa; L.66/Rev.1, Liberia; L.72, Liberia; and L.60, the German Democratic Republic.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their votes before the voting on all draft resolutions in cluster 9.

Mr. van BOHEMEN (New Zealand): New Zealand will vote in favour of draft resolutions L.48 and L.64, on a nuclear-arms freeze. Our support for those draft resolutions reflects the concern of the New Zealand Government and people at the continuing nuclear-arms race. This signifies our determination that the nuclear-arms race must be brought to a halt as soon as possible and that the reduction of nuclear weapons should begin forthwith.

(Mr. van Bohemen, New Zealand)

In New Zealand's view a nuclear freeze must be based on a balance of deterrence at the lowest possible level of nuclear weapons. First, and foremost among the elements of a freeze must be a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty that would ban all nuclear tests by all States in all environments for all time.

A nuclear-arms freeze should also be accompanied by negotiations, not unilateral actions, aimed at achieving deep cuts in nuclear arsenals as a matter of priority and with the goal of the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons. A freeze must be balanced, mutual and verifiable in all of its elements.

Accordingly we would note that the draft resolutions contained in documents L.48 and L.64 do not accord with New Zealand's views in all respects. While we admire the simplicity and clarity of the call for a negotiated freeze contained in document L.48, we regret that the draft resolution makes no reference to the need for adequate measures of verification and that in enumerating some of the elements of a freeze it does not mention a comprehensive nuclear-test ban.

With respect to draft resolution L.64, we would note that there are a number of questionable assertions in its preamble. We would also note that, while New Zealand believes that a nuclear freeze is an important step towards preventing the continuation of the nuclear-arms race, we find it difficult to accept its characterization as the most effective first step, as is stated in the draft. Moreover we are disappointed that the test ban called for in paragraph 1 (a) is not a call for a truly comprehensive ban on all nuclear test explosions.

In spite of these reservations we shall vote in favour of them as a mark of our belief that the nuclear-arms race must be stopped and turned back. A properly ordered nuclear freeze would represent a significant step in that direction.



**Mr. TEJA (India):** My brief remarks pertain to the draft resolution on the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes contained in document L. 58.

Paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament outlined the various stages in the process of nuclear disarmament. One of the stages comprising such a process consisted of

**"Cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, and the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes".**

(S-10/2, para. 50 (b))

India has consistently abstained in the votes on proposals that seek to separate the question of cessation of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes from the question of cessation of the production of nuclear weapons, because such a partial approach is not in conformity with the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament.

In our view there should be a simultaneous stoppage of the production of nuclear weapons and of fissionable material for weapons purposes. In such an event all States, including the nuclear-weapon States, would accept the same system of equitable and non-discriminatory safeguards on all their nuclear facilities.

My delegation will therefore not be able to support the draft resolution in document L. 58.

**Mr. JOHANSEN (Norway):** The Norwegian Government shares the growing concern at the continuing nuclear-arms race. Curbing the arms race and reducing the overall levels of armaments must be the primary goal.

In the opinion of the Norwegian Government a nuclear-arms freeze, subject to adequate verification measures and based on an agreement between the parties concerned, could constitute an important element in our efforts to achieve a reduction in the nuclear stockpiles. In this respect we would like to reiterate

(Mr. Johansen, Norway)

OUK strong Support for the ongoing bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Those negotiations offer the best opportunity to obtain deep reductions in the nuclear arsenals.

Consistent with its approach to the disarmament process, Norway will vote in favour of draft resolutions L.48 and L.64 on a nuclear freeze put forward by India and Mexico respectively. Although neither of the two draft resolutions meet all OUK concerns, we have decided to vote in favour of them to demonstrate the basic attitude of the Norwegian Government towards the nuclear-arms race.

We shall cast positive votes on the firm understanding that both draft resolutions recognize the need for a freeze to be balanced, mutual and verifiable in order not to upset stability.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other delegation wishes to explain its votes before the voting on the draft resolution, in cluster 9, we shall now begin the voting.

As far as draft resolution A/C.1/41/r.3 is concerned, I have already informed the Committee that we shall take action on it at a later stage. As for draft resolution L.6, the representative of the German Democratic Republic has kindly informed us that his delegation does not insist on a vote.

(The Chairman)

The voting will therefore begin with the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.28/Rev.1, under item 60, "General and complete disarmament", entitled "Nuclear disarmament". That draft resolution was introduced by the representative of China at the 30th meeting of the First Committee on 3 November 1986. The sponsor has requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, may I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly?

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.28/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Next we come to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.33/Rev.1, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament". It was introduced by the representative of Argentina at the 36th meeting of the First Committee on 6 November 1986. The sponsors are as follows: Argentina, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Poland, Romania, Sweden, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.

**A recorded vote was taken.**

**In favour:** Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

**Abstaining:** Denmark, Greece, Israel, Japan, Spain

**Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.33/Rev.1 was adopted by 113 votes to 15, with 5 abstentions.**

**The CHAIRMAN:** The next draft resolution before us is contained in

document A/C.1/41/L.48, entitled "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly: freeze on nuclear weapons".

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of India at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee on 4 November 1986. The sponsor is India.

A recorded vote has been requested.

**A recorded vote was taken.**

**In favour:** Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

**Abstaining:** Australia, China, Iceland, Japan, Spain

**Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.48 was adopted by 115 votes to 12, with 5 abstentions.**

**The CHAIRMAN:** Next we shall take action on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.58, entitled "General and complete disarmament: prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes".

**This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 5 November 1986. The sponsors are as follows:** Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Cameroon, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Romania, Samoa, Sweden and Uruguay.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, 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, 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, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, 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 Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against France

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, China, India, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.58 was adopted by 129 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The last draft resolution now before us in clause 9 is contained in document A/C.1/41/L.64 entitled "Implementation of the Concluding Document of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly: implementation of General Assembly resolution 40/151 C on a nuclear-arms freeze". 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: Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru and Sweden.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: China, Iceland, Netherlands, Spain

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.64 was adopted by 118 votes to 12, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes after the voting on draft resolutions in cluster 9.

Mr. SOULIOTIS (Greece) : As it is widely known, the Greek Government's firm policy in favour of nuclear disarmament and the high priority it accords to pursuing the preservation of peace and security has been unequivocally and repeatedly stated in this forum and in all other forums dealing with disarmament. In this spirit my delegation would have voted in favour of resolution A/C.1/41/L.33/Rev.1 were it not for its fourth preambular paragraph referring to the doctrine of deterrence "as the most dangerous myth in existence".

My delegation is unable to share that view, since it believes that that qualification oversimplifies the matter and, in any case, does not facilitate the process of bilateral negotiations between the two super-powers aimed at substantial progress towards peace and disarmament under strict and effective international control.

Mr. KOZYREV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation wish to express its satisfaction that the draft resolution<sup>8</sup> we have just voted on in the First Committee have been adopted. We support them and we welcome the result of the voting as a manifestation of the awareness of the majority of the world community of the need for practical decisions to be taken on what are undoubtedly the most important issues of the present day - matters of nuclear disarmament.

In this connection I should like to quote the words of the Soviet leader, Mr. Gorbachev, when celebrating the sixty-ninth anniversary of the great October Revolution: when he stated:

"Now, after Reykjavik, we have a new situation in international relations.

There is no going back to the past. The way forward can only be through new political thinking. This is precisely the position taken by the



(Mr. KOZYREV, USSR)

Twenty-Seventh Congress and this is precisely what underlies our actions in international affairs. The terror of war should be removed from life, and should the senselessness of militarism."

We welcome in particular the adoption of draft resolution L.33/Rev.1 as a further example of a constructive approach on how to reduce the number of draft resolutions and at the same time combining them, not by weakening them but by making them complementary and stronger so that decisions taken reflect the aspirations of the international community.

In connection with that draft resolution the Soviet Union wishes to stress that one of the important ways of curtailing the arms race continues to be the prohibition of the neutron weapon. We believe that the matter will be given due regard at the third special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, in which all disarmament matters, including nuclear weapons, will be considered comprehensively.

The Soviet delegation also voted in favour of draft resolution L.58 on the understanding that the questions it deals with are made part of our new proposal on the immediate start of a multilateral exchange of views among all nuclear Powers on the question of nuclear disarmament. During such an exchange we could focus in particular on the question of the cessation of the production of fissionable material for the purpose of developing and manufacturing weapons.

Mr. LE HOAI TRUNG (Viet Nam): Like those contained in clusters 7, 8, 10, and 11 the draft resolutions contained in cluster 9 that have just been adopted by the Committee touch upon the extremely important issues in the struggle for peace and disarmament, namely, the prevention of nuclear war and nuclear disarmament. Nowadays, no responsible Government or statesman should fail to recognize the obvious fact that the greatest peril the world is facing today is the threat to

(Mr. Le Hoi Trung, Viet Nam)

the survival of humanity posed by the existence of nuclear weapons. That fact is established by the very nature of nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons are more than weapons of war. They are instruments of mass annihilation. Since the Soviet Union and the United States are the major nuclear Powers, the negotiations between them play an essential role in achieving the goal of nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Le Hoai Trung, Viet Nam)

The recent meeting between the Leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States of America at Reykjavik marked an important stage in a complex and difficult process of dialogue. Much to our regret, while opening up a realistic possibility for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, the Reykjavik meeting failed to yield far-reaching results because of the American side's obstinate position on the question of the so-called strategic defence Initiative (SDI). It is in the vital interest of all the peoples of the world that the bilateral negotiations between those two countries should be pursued resolutely and seriously to attain the objectives declared by the two countries and to work out effective agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in space and eliminating the arms race on Earth, with the ultimate goal of achieving the complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere. That is why Viet Nam would have lent its support to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.52, entitled "Bilateral and nuclear-arms negotiations", had it been put to a vote in its present form.

We now have before us numerous constructive proposals to avert a nuclear war and free mankind of nuclear weapons. The Soviet comprehensive programme for nuclear disarmament is still before us. Its phased and time-bound framework provides realistic possibilities for humankind to return to a nuclear-free world by the end of this century.

For a long time now the international community has emphatically demanded a freeze on nuclear weapons, the non-use of nuclear weapons and so on. As we have often elaborated our position on those issues, we shall refrain from doing so at this stage. Rather, we wish to emphasize that it is now imperative that a new impetus be given to negotiations on measures aimed at preventing nuclear war and attaining nuclear disarmament at all levels, bilateral and multilateral, and that all States exercise the necessary political will to ensure the success of those negotiations.

(Mr. Le Hoai Trung, Viet Nam)

In conclusion, I wish to share the universal view that, while the Soviet Union and the United States have special responsibilities, the other nuclear-weapon States also should assume their obligations and responsibilities with regard to active negotiations on effective nuclear disarmament and refrain from any actions which have or may have negative effects on the outcome of the nuclear disarmament negotiations.

MS. LETTS (Australia) : I wish very briefly to explain my delegation's negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.33/Rev.1 on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament.

My delegation voted against it because we do not believe it expresses the kind of relationship which should exist between bilateral and multilateral efforts towards nuclear disarmament; it certainly underestimates the importance of the former. We regret that fact because Australia is deeply committed to effective measures of nuclear disarmament.

Mr. van SCHAIK (Netherlands): My delegation wishes to place on record the reasons leading it to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.48 and to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.64, both touching upon the subject of a nuclear-arms freeze.

The Netherlands, encouraged by the intensified dialogue between the two Powers possessing the largest military arsenals, is increasingly of the view that to strive for a nuclear-arms freeze would be tantamount to wrong emphasis in the context of the objective of reversing the nuclear-arms race - an objective that we all share.

The United States and the Soviet Union seem to agree in principle on the necessity of and the modalities for drastic reductions. In the light of this situation, to stress a freeze would not only have the effect of giving a wrong

(Mr. A. van Schaik, Netherlands)

signal and advocating less than can now realistically be expected to be attainable; for the Netherlands and its Western European allies, a freeze would also have the undesirable effect of sanctioning regional instabilities, thereby affecting security interests.

A further argument against both drafts is that it has become apparent from the bilateral negotiations to which I have referred that far-reaching verification provisions to accompany any nuclear-arms control agreement are needed and can be agreed upon. There is also an intricate link between verification and a well-defined scope. Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.48 contains an inadequate, open-ended definition of "scope" and remains silent on the subject of verification. We appreciate that an attempt is made in draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.64 to lay down a precisely defined scope. On verification, however, that draft, while mentioning this important aspect, explicitly fails to take account of recent developments in the bilateral relationship.

Although we continue to consider draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.64 in a slightly more favourable spirit, we cannot but conclude that the objective of a nuclear-arms freeze is somewhat out of touch with reality. The absence of a third draft on this subject at this year's session is an indication that some seem to have similar views.

If it turns out that the more ambitious trend in the setting of objectives by the two Powers directly responsible is confirmed in the year to come, the Netherlands will have to regard a nuclear-arms freeze as being increasingly at variance with its fundamental desire for expedient measures of nuclear disarmament. In that case we shall have to draw our conclusions accordingly at next year's session, if we are again asked to act on a draft resolution recommending a freeze.

Mr. CAMFORA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The Argentine delegation wishes to say that it agrees with the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons. However, we abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.58 on this question because, in our view, it should not be divorced from the general problem of nuclear disarmament.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): I should like first to explain my country's votes, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.28.

Allow me at the outset to say we would have preferred the preambular part to have been somewhat different. We went along with the Favourable vote of the Committee in general, but it must be said that the emphasis placed at the outset on the overall and major threat of world war and on the ultimate goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons should not, in our opinion, overlook the genuine conditions for security. This recalling of the dangers and this affirmation of the ultimate goal should, in our view, be accompanied by the taking into consideration of practical modalities of security today. That would have been our preference with regard to the preambular part.

With reference to operative paragraph 3, I merely wish to make it clear how we approach it, that is, in our view, when one refers to complementarity and linkage, when it is said that bilateral and multilateral efforts should complement and facilitate each other, that must be based on the priority given to prior negotiations and reductions between the two major nuclear Powers.

(Mr. Morel, France)

Indeed, these two nuclear Powers should not be placed on the same footing with the other 6, and I can but recall here the conditions set by my country - reaffirmed here to the General Assembly three years ago by the President of France - on negotiations on multilateral reduction of nuclear weapons. Those conditions have to do with, first, the reduction of the arsenals of the two super-Powers to levels such that it could be considered that the spread between arsenals had changed significantly; secondly, with the quantitative and qualitative limitation of defensive strategic systems; and, finally, with tangible progress in redressing the imbalance of conventional forces in Europe and with the elimination of all chemical threats. Those are the three well-known conditions my country would like to free met before we ourselves could join in multilateral negotiations in this area.

I should like also to recall the reasons for our negative votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.48 and A/C.1/41/L.64, on a nuclear-weapon8 freeze. Our objections are to the idea of a freeze itself, and they have been stated here repeatedly. First of all, a freeze would by definition mean fixing the existing situation and, hence, the imbalances that that situation might involve as well as the risks entailed for the security of the States concerned. Secondly, a freeze would be equivalent, to conferring a lasting advantage upon any State that had increased its armaments significantly, to the detriment of States that had limited their efforts. In addition, a freeze would be difficult to verify, and the negotiations needed to bring about conditions for effective verification would be just as long and complicated as the negotiations on verification of an agreement on a reduction of those weapons itself. Finally, a freeze, in so far as it might be of benefit to a given Power, might substantially reduce the interest of that Power in negotiating and, hence, its will seriously to negotiate a reduction of weapons.

(Mr. Morel, France)

Hence progress towards the reduction of nuclear arsenals would not, in our view\*, be encouraged by measures or, rather, by declarations aimed at a freeze. The way leading to such reductions, as I recalled earlier, should initially be paved with reductions by the two major nuclear Powers, and the negotiations on such reductions should have as their starting-point the definition and then the establishment of a satisfactory balance.

Mr. CORDEN (United States of America): The United States delegation has joined in the adoption, without a vote, of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.28, concerning nuclear disarmament. The United States Government recognizes the great interest that has been shown in this subject and endorses the goals represented by the draft resolution. In this context I should like to point out that the United States has taken the lead in this area and is in fact negotiating in earnest on this subject in the bilateral negotiations in Geneva.

The United States Government fully recognizes that it has a special responsibility to bring about nuclear disarmament. In addition, we believe that the Conference on Disarmament can continue to play an appropriate role in the consideration of this subject, for we are of the view that negotiations on the subject should continue to be conducted among the nuclear-weapon states concerned.

Mr. KONISHI (Japan) : I should like to explain my delegation's vote against draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.64 and abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L. 48. We have done so because we have certain reservations about the practicability or meaningfulness of these so-called freeze proposals.

I do not need to emphasize here the consistent efforts of Japan in pursuit of nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of all nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth. We have been engaged in such efforts in the United Nations, the Conference on Disarmament and various other international forums. WC



(Mr Konishi, Japan)

take an active interest in such issues as the nuclear-test ban. We follow the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on nuclear and space weapons with great interest.

In the process towards the realization of nuclear disarmament we cannot and should not overlook the present situation. Mere a balance of military capability plays a role in maintaining an equilibrium and the peace and security of the international community is in reality dependent on the ideas which lie behind the concept of deterrence. Any realistic step towards disarmament should be predicated on the effective functioning of this mechanism and take fully into account the stability that is created through these various balances. A nuclear freeze, unless immediately followed by firmly and delicately constructed arrangements for a balanced reduction in nuclear weapons, could lead to the preservation of a real or perceived nuclear superiority of one side over the other. Such an outcome could possibly contribute to a destabilization of the basic fabric of international security.

In addition to conceptual difficulties such as these, it is also widely recognized that verification of a nuclear freeze would be extremely difficult, and thus could not meet the necessary confidence-building. It would be more meaningful and productive if, instead of the unrealistic notion of a freeze, we worked more on such priority items as the nuclear-test ban, non-proliferation and the striving for balanced and verifiable arrangements to reduce the size of existing nuclear weapons that are deployed by the nuclear-weapon States.

Those are the basic reasons why we could not support draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.48 and A/C.1/41/L.64.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): I wish to explain my delegation's support for draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.28/Rev.1 and its negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.33/Rev.1, both on the subject of nuclear disarmament, and also by implication on draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.48 and /C.1/41/L.64, on a freeze.

It is surely self-evident that bilateral negotiations between the two Powers with the overwhelming preponderance - amounting to approximately 95 per cent - of the world's nuclear weapons offers by far the most realistic hope of halting the nuclear-arms race and initiating a balanced and verifiable process designed to reduce substantially the number of nuclear weapons in the world. Both sides involved obviously share that view, judging by their actions. The United States has put forward a number of proposals for radical cuts in the number of strategic nuclear weapons possessed by the two major Powers. Those proposals have our full support. The Soviet Union has also made important proposals. We hope that the negotiations will quickly produce concrete agreements.

When it comes to negotiations on arms control and disarmament, the United Kingdom claims no special status.

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

We remain ready to play a full part in the process. However, as far as the British nuclear deterrent is concerned, we must naturally take into account that our force is a strategic one and that it represents less than 3 per cent of the strategic nuclear forces available to the Soviet Union and the United States. It would be unrealistic and unreasonable, as things stand, for us to seek to trade reductions with super-Powers, but, as we have repeatedly said in this forum and elsewhere, we have never said "never" as regards contributing to nuclear disarmament. We have made it clear that, if the strategic arsenals of the two major nuclear Powers were to be very substantially reduced and if no significant changes occurred in Soviet defensive capabilities, the United Kingdom would wish to review its position and to consider how best it could contribute in the light of the reduced threat. That continues to be our position.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): I wish to explain the reasons for which Australia voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.64. This draft resolution was submitted by Mexico and Sweden. Australia voted in support of the draft resolution to demonstrate once again the Australian Government's support for a freeze on nuclear-weapon testing, production and development as a means of breaking the upward spiral of the nuclear arms race.

The draft resolution notes that the freeze is not an end in itself, and that is how Australia sees it. It should be only the first step. It must be followed by negotiations aimed at deep cuts in the high stockpiles of nuclear weapons. The immediate goal must be the most stable possible balance at the lowest possible level of nuclear weapons. The ultimate goal must remain their complete elimination.

Australia's approach to the freeze question also takes into account the need for mutuality and balance. Any attempt to implement a nuclear freeze in which one

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

**side felt a serious strategic inferiority was being imposed upon it could lead to instability and run the risk of provoking nuclear conflict.**

**Australia also attaches importance to the need for any arms control agreement such as would be represented by a freeze to include adequate measures for verification. Without such measures there can be no confidence in international disarmament and arms control agreements.**

**Australia's support for the freeze concept does not preclude support for alternative approaches as well. Australia has long given priority to the achievement of a comprehensive nuclear test ban, which in its conception goes further than the nuclear-weapon test ban or the bilateral nuclear-weapon test moratorium called for in the draft resolution, since, in our view, a comprehensive test ban should also include a ban on so-called peaceful nuclear explosions.**

**Australia has also made known its strong support for the bilateral nuclear arms limitation negotiations that are being conducted by the United States and the Soviet Union in Geneva, which are not mentioned in the draft resolution. We appreciate that these will be difficult negotiations, but they are of vital importance and cover much the same ground that would need to be covered even if they were instituted following an agreement to freeze.**

**We have also noted that this year's draft resolution does not contain critical references to nuclear deterrence. From Australia's point of view, this is welcome, since we believe that the continuation of nuclear stability is the only option available at the present time to avoid serious nuclear instability and overt nuclear conflict. However, I want this to be clear: Australia regards deterrence as only an interim step along the road to the goal of complete nuclear disarmament**

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Obviously these remarks reflect some variance in a number of areas between our national approach and that of the draft resolution just adopted. Our vote is without prejudice in this respect and has been cast, as indicated at the outset and at last year's session of the General Assembly, to give expression to Australia's support for the aspirations manifest in the freeze proposal. Australia will continue to work towards these goals in all responsible ways open to it.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegation wishes to explain its vote, we have concluded action on cluster 9, except for draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.3 and L.52, on which consultations are still going on.

As I informed members at the end of this morning's meeting, we shall now take action on a number of draft resolutions on which decisions were deferred yesterday. It is my intention to take them up in the following order: A/C.1/41/L.39, listed in cluster 4; A/C.1/41/L.60, listed in cluster 5; and A/C.1/41/L.9/Rev.1, listed in cluster 3. If there are no objections, we shall follow that order in considering those draft resolutions this afternoon.

I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their votes on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.39.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): I should like to explain why my delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.39, which requests the Secretary-General to present an updated report on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and military expenditures to the General Assembly at the Forty-third session.

My delegation considers that the updating of this report should not be undertaken until after the International Conference on Disarmament and Development. The documentation prepared in advance of that Conference and the

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

results of the Conference itself will be of direct relevance to a review of the study. In this way it will be possible to avoid a duplication of work, which might otherwise result from commissioning an update of the study now, and also better to utilize valuable resources. The latter point is especially important in view of the current financial climate of the Organization, which the draft resolution itself rightly notes.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegation wishes to speak, the Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.39, listed in cluster 4, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". This draft resolution, which has programme budget implications as contained in document A/C.1/41/L.76, has one sponsor, Romania, by whose representative it was introduced at the 35th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1986.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour : Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, 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 Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.39 was adopted by 119 votes to 1, with 13 abstentions.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their vote after the vote.

**Mr. CORDEN (United States of America):** The United States delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L. 39, pertaining to the report entitled "Economic and social consequences of the arms race and military expenditures". Delegations will recall that the United States opposed General Assembly adoption of resolution 40/150 on this subject last year. Our opposition at that time was based on our conviction that an update of the report in question was both unnecessary and financially unwarranted, and nothing has taken place in the intervening year to alter our position on this matter. For these reasons, the United States voted against draft resolution A/C.1/41/L. 39 today.

**Ms. LETTS (Australia):** Australia abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L. 39. Australia is deeply concerned about the economic and social consequences of the arms race. We have over the years contributed in a major way to improving understanding of this phenomenon through participating in United Nations studies and by being highly supportive of efforts to improve the data base for these studies. We have, however, abstained in the vote on this draft resolution mainly out of concern to see the best use made of scarce Secretariat human and financial resources during this year when great demands will be made of the Secretariat in preparing for the disarmament and development Conference. We expect that among those demands will be included the compiling of up-to-date statistics in this field.



(Ms. Letts, Australia)

In practice, such an updating would in itself constitute an updating of the report on the economic and social consequences of the arms race. In deciding to abstain in the vote on this draft resolution, we also had in mind the fact that it is no simple matter to assess the economic and social consequences of the arms race. Experience has shown that there is a range of views on how the data should be manipulated and interpreted. My delegation considers it unfair to ask the Secretariat to undertake such a task.

Mr. KONISAI (Japan) : I wish to explain my delegation's affirmative vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/41/L.39. In response to General Assembly resolution 40/152 K of last year, entitled "United Nations disarmament studies", Japan submitted its views on how the work of the United Nations in the field of disarmament studies could best be streamlined and further improved. In formulating our views, we took into account particularly the current grave financial situation facing this Organization. It is the sincere hope of my delegation that due regard will be paid to views such as ours on the improvement of the studies and the process of updating the Secretary-General's report on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and military expenditures, as requested in the resolution which has just been adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegation wishes to speak, we shall now take up the draft resolution in document A/C.1/41/L.60, listed in cluster 5 under agenda item 61 (h).

Since no delegation wishes to speak on the draft resolution or explain its vote before the vote, we shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.60, under the agenda item review and implementation of the concluding document of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly, entitled "United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament". This draft resolution was introduced by the

(The Chairman)

representative of Nigeria at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 3 November 1986, and has the following sponsors: Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Dominican Republic, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Indonesia, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zaire and Zambia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A roll call vote was taken.

In favor:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, 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, Guatemala, 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, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, 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, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: None

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.60 was adopted by 134 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. CORDEN (United States of America) : The United States delegation greatly regrets that it was not able to support the draft resolution on the United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament, draft resolution A/C. 1/41/60. The United States has been, and continues to be, a strong supporter of the Programme. Representatives of the United States Government have addressed several classes of Fellows, both in Geneva and in Washington, and we have ourselves profited from these exchanges, and we hope the Fellows have.

My delegation is grateful for the recognition given the United States efforts in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. However, as members of the Committee are aware, the United States voted against the draft resolution last year, because it had financial implications. As my delegation indicated in its explanation of vote last year, the United States cannot support additional expenditures associated with the implementation of new programmes. Paragraph 3 approves the modalities for the implementation of the new training programme, which continues to entail the additional costs approved last year.

Mr. KONISHI (Japan) : My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution, as the Japanese Government considers that the United Nations Fellowship Programme is very important in promoting expertise in disarmament, especially in the developing countries. For that reason my Government annually invites the participants in the Programme to visit Japan, including visits to Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

As for the implementation of the new disarmament training programme at the regional level, we hope that due attention will be paid to relevant parts of the Secretary-General's report (A/41/720) as well as the financial constraints on the United Nations at the present time.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) : I wish to put on record that my delegation supported the draft resolution because of our support for the United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament. We have done so on the understanding, made explicit when the draft resolution was introduced, that paragraphs 2 and 3 will impose no additional budgetary commitments.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other representative wishes to speak in explanation of vote, we shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.9/Rev.1, listed in cluster I. Before we take action on that draft resolution, I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

MR. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I wish to inform the Committee that India has joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.9/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we take action on the draft resolution, I shall call on those representatives who wish to make statements on it.

MR. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): we have examined draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.9, which has only just been distributed, and have noted the Secretariat's information as to its financial implications. Since my delegation has no instructions on any new financial commitments that might result from the adoption of this draft resolution, it will abstain in the voting.

Mr. CORDEN (United States of America) : The United States delegation is pleased to join in support for what we had hoped would be the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.9/Rev.1 on the successful outcome of the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the biological and toxin weapons Convention, held in Geneva in September last.. My delegation was also pleased to join in sponsoring the draft resolution.

As the United States made clear at the conclusion of the Review Conference in September, the United States approached the Second Review Conference in both a critical and a constructive way. In this context, the United States delegation

(Mr. Corden, United States)

pointed out that the United States was convinced that violations of the Convention had taken place. Indeed, in the Final Declaration several parties expressed grave doubts about compliance, and the Conference as a whole stressed the need to deal seriously with compliance issues.

The United States also made clear at the Review Conference the complications posed by developments in the field of bio-technology for effective verification of compliance with the provisions of the Convention. Recognizing the importance of the norm against biological and toxin weapons established by the Convention, the United States joined in recommending several measures intended to strengthen that norm, including the international exchange of information on outbreaks of infectious diseases and on laboratories and research centres. The United States hopes that these measures will be fully implemented by all States Parties to the Convention and that they will lead to greater international transparency and openness with regard to the biological and toxin weapons Convention.

Mr. BOTLER (Australia) : I had not intended to speak on this draft resolution before the vote, but I feel constrained to do so in the light of the statement made by the representative of Venezuela. As I understood him, he made it clear, with regret, that because of the terms of the financial implications paper issued by the Secretariat yesterday, he would not be in a position to join in a consensus on the adoption of a substantive draft resolution.

**(Mr. Rutler, Australia)**

**I also understood him to indicate that he was not in fact in possession of clear or final instructions on this matter at the present time - a position in which, of course, many of us find ourselves from time to time.**

**In these circumstances, my delegation would deeply regret a decision to proceed with action on this draft resolution at this time. The biological weapons Review Conference, held in Geneva in September last, was attended by many of us. It was a conference on a subject of undoubted importance. It was a conference that reached a conclusion of very considerable significance - not least because it was forward-looking and because it provided for further strengthening and development of the Convention on biological and toxin weapons. The Final Document of the Review Conference was itself adopted by consensus and as the result of very arduous and detailed work. I think that there are many, many delegations in this room now that would deeply regret it if we were not able to take note of that Final Document on a basis of consensus. I believe that if a little more time were allowed we would in fact be able to take precisely that action - that is, adopt this substantive draft resolution by consensus.**

**In these circumstances, I propose that we take no action on this draft resolution at present and move on to other business, returning to the draft after a certain amount of time has been allowed for the necessary consultations, which, we hope, will lead to consensus action.**

**Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation is of course aware of the importance of this draft resolution, and it is not our intention to prevent it from being adopted by consensus.**

**Hence, my delegation would be satisfied if it were placed on record that it expressed reservations concerning the financial implications of the draft resolution. If that were done, we would be prepared to participate in the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote.**

The CHAIRMAN: The statement just made by the representative of Venezuela has been duly noted, and I thank him for his co-operation. I would only add that the note by the Secretariat in document A/C.1/41/9 indicates that this draft resolution does not really have any Financial implications so far as the united Nations is concerned.

We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.9/Rev.1, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Austria at the 24th meeting of the First Committee, on 29 October 1986. I have already drawn attention to the note by the Secretariat in document A/C.1/41/9.

The draft resolution has the following sponsors: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bhutan, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mongolia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Spain, Sweden, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States.

It has been requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to do that.

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.9/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus completed action on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.9/Rev.1.

After further consultations, we are now in a position to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.23, listed in cluster 8.



(The Chairman)

I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting on this draft resolution.

Mr. PRIER (Israel) : I wish to say a few words about draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.23.

My delegation hopes that the time will come when a majority of the First Committee will actively resent listening patiently to unbridled invective against my country and will refuse to yield to the urgings of its sponsors to sustain the unrelenting onslaught on Israel. It is ultimately the dignity and credibility of the United Nations that is being challenged.

It is not the insinuations of the draft resolution but the declarations of the Government of Israel which represent Israel's policy. This is that Israel will not be the first country to introduce nuclear weapons into the Middle East.

In the circumstances, Israel requests a "no" vote on the entire draft resolution. And, in addition to the general remarks I have just made, I should like to make a few particular remarks on that.

First of all, Israel is singled out from all the countries which have a similar scientific and industrial capability. While a non-NPT country like Pakistan can preside over the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Israel's nuclear activities are annually scrutinized by the United Nations. I submit that this is not an acceptable measure of probity.

Secondly, last year's resolution asked the Secretary-General

"to follow closely Israeli nuclear activities and to report thereon as appropriate to the General Assembly". (resolution 40/93, para. 7)

The present draft resolution pre-empt~~s~~ the Secretary-General and questions his judgement. Furthermore, it denigrates the Committee and the General Assembly by forcing it to act upon newspaper reports and speculation.

(Mr. Freier, Israel)

Lastly, at the last General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the Arab States raised this very item but dropped it once they realized they could not muster sufficient votes for such a resolution. Israel believes that Member States should vote against the present draft resolution, as they would have done at the IAEA.

While Israel objects to every single operative paragraph, it will request "no" votes only on paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6, in order not to take more of the Committee's time than is absolutely necessary. I want briefly to comment on these operative paragraphs.

If the Committee looks at paragraph 3, my comment is that the Security Council need not investigate on the strength of newspaper speculations. If such investigations were conducted with respect to every country whose nuclear stance is subject to newspaper speculations, there is little else the Security Council would do.

On paragraph 4, this item denies Israel the right of membership in the IAEA, which expressly encourages international collaboration for the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Israel can and does contribute in this field, and can benefit from such collaboration, just as any other country.

On paragraph 5, this item runs counter to the aims of the United Nations which insists on fostering international collaboration. Such an item, if adopted, would prohibit the USSR, for example, from inviting the services of an Israeli specialist after the Chernobyl accident, as it did, or the IAEA, or the World Health Organization from drawing on Israeli experience in nuclear medicine, for instance. This to me is really preposterous.

On paragraph 6, we have stated and restated that Israel has no nuclear collaboration with South Africa. But just to be sure, let me quote once again

(Mr. Freier, Israel)

Israel's Ambassador to the United Nations, who said in the General Assembly on 6 November :

**"Israel is repeatedly condemned For an alleged collaboration with South Africa in this area as well" - the nuclear area. "we categorically deny this allegation. But what does the United Nations say about the matter?**

**Occasionally it tells the truth. Recently, on 15 May this year, the United Nations distributed a report by a team of experts from Nigeria, Sweden, the Soviet Union, Venezuela and France who had investigated South Africa's nuclear weapons capability. The 44-page document was presented . . . at the United Nations on the subject. Certain countries are mentioned in the context of nuclear collaboration with South Africa. Again, Israel is not among them."**

**(A/41/PV.59, pp. 72 and 73)**

**Therefore, as I said, we should like to have a separate vote on paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6.**

**Mr. HADDAWI (Iraq): The Israeli nuclear armament still poses a most serious threat to all the people of the Middle East as well as to the people of adjacent regions, most particularly Africa, for it impedes all efforts to implement resolutions to consider Africa and other regions as nuclear-free zones.**

**Furthermore, Tsrael refuses to admit that it has become A nuclear Power and that it possesses a nuclear arsenal together with the means of delivery. So, it is not merely newspaper reports, as the Israeli representative suggested.**

**Israel's co-operation with South Africa in the nuclear field makes it all the more necessary that the strongest deterrence measures be applied against it until it behaves responsibly, as do the majority of member countries. This morning the Committee adopted a draft resolution implicating Israel with regard to co-operation with South Africa. So the denial of the Israel representative here is meaningless.**

(Mr. Haddawi, Iraq)

Israel must desist from being a nuclear Power if we are to have a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. Israel must comply with the requirements of the International Atomic Energy Agency by submitting its nuclear facilities for inspection, just as the rest of us do. It has to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty to prove its seriousness and to allay the fears of the people of the region.

I do not intend to speak at length on this subject, but only to bring, once again, to the attention of the Committee that unless and until Israel complies with the prerequisites of responsibility, notably in the field of nuclear armaments, the Middle East will remain in constant turmoil, so much so that international peace and security will be jeopardized to an unimaginable extent.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.23, are of the opinion that it will be adopted by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. NASHASHIBI (Jordan): I hardly need to recall today the recent report in The Sunday Times of London revealing the secrets of the Israeli nuclear arsenal on the basis of what was stated by the Israeli nuclear expert, Mordechai Vanunu, who worked for 10 years in an Israeli nuclear-bomb factory and who was apprehended recently by the Israeli Mossad and sent back to Israel. It is stated that Israel at present has between 100 and 200 nuclear bombs and that the nuclear-bomb factory is underground in the Negev desert, near the Dimona reactor. Thus the nuclear spread to the Middle East, as a result of the nuclear weapons possessed by Israel, is an established fact.

In support of this, there is the Secretary-General's report (A/36/431) of 18 September 1981, which gave a full exposé of Israel's nuclear arsenal programme, which Israel uses as a weapon to threaten and terrorize the Arab world, to force it to accept the fait accompli, namely, to abandon its natural right.. Further support

(Mr. Nashashibi, Jordan)

of this is the statement of the former President of Israel, Ephraim Katzir, who stated in a newspaper interview with The Washington Post, dated 3 December 1964, that Israel had the capability to produce nuclear weapons, and could do it in a very short period.

(Mr. Naashah ibiJor dan)

Also the book entitled Two Minutes over Baghdad, which was written by Israeli authors, authorized by the Israeli military censors and published in June 1982, is yet another proof of the military capability of Israel with the co-operation of the racist régime of South Africa: it has the capability of delivering nuclear weapons to targets in the heart of the Arab world.

**The CHAIRMAN:** If there are no further statements or explanations of vote on the draft resolution, we shall now begin the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L. 23, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament". It was introduced by the representative of Iraq at the 29th meeting of the First Committee, on 3 November 1986, and has the following sponsors: Algeria, Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen.

Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolution before us, I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. KHERADI** (Secretary of the Committee): I have been authorized to make the following statement to the Committee.

With regard to operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L. 23, the Secretariat could continue to seek further relevant information for the purpose of updating the previous report and subsequently present it to the General Assembly at its forty-second session. The implementation of the draft resolution could be achieved by the Secretariat within existing resources.

**The CHAIRMAN:** We shall now begin the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L. 23. Separate votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6.

We shall first vote on operative paragraph 3.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, 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, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaïre, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Gabon, Jamaica, Lesotho, Malawi, Nepal, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Samoa, Spain, Uruguay.

Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.23 was adopted by 89 votes to 23, with 19 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution L.23.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist 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, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaïre, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Greece, Jamaica, Lesotho, Mexico, Nepal, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.23 was adopted by 79 votes to 27, with 21 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on operative paragraph 5 Of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.23.

A recorded vote has been requested.



A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist 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, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

Abstaining: Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Jamaica, Lesotho, Mexico, Nepal, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay.

Operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/41/PV.23 was adopted by 79 votes to 27, with 20 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution L. 23

A recorded vote has been requested.

A cecoded vote was taken.

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

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Guatemala, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Germany, Federal Republic of , Greece, Iceland, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Malawi, Mexico, Nepal, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Samoa, Uruguay.

Operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.23 was adopted by 81 votes to 21, with 25 abstentions.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I shall now put to the vote draft resolution

A/C.1/41/L. 23, as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

**A recorded vote was taken.**

**In Favour :** Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, 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, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

**Against:** Israel, United States of America

**Abstaining:** Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zaire

**Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L. 23, as a whole, was adopted by 92 votes to 2, with 42 abstentions.**

**The CHAIRMAN:** I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes after the voting on draft resolution L.23.

**MS LEETS** (Australia): Australia has again this year abstained in the vote on the draft resolution relating to Israeli nuclear armament, which appears this year in document A/C.1/41/L.23. Our decision to abstain was made in consideration of several operative paragraphs in the draft resolution, specifically

(Ms. Le Jette, Australia)

paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6, all of which we have voted against in the separate votes taken on them.

The call in paragraph 3 for the Security Council to investigate Israel's nuclear activities asks the Council, in the view of my delegation, to engage in activities outside its field of competence and, in addition, such investigation could well involve, inter alia, an examination of Israel's relationship with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), something which is definitely outside the Council's competence.

The request in paragraphs 4 and 5 for the IAEA and all States and organizations to suspend scientific co-operation with, and assistance to, Israel in the nuclear field could, in the opinion of the Australian delegation, have implications for Israel's rights and privileges as a member of the IAEA.

My delegation voted against the condemnation, in paragraph 6, of the alleged continuing nuclear collaboration between Israel and South Africa. The allegation of such collaboration between these two countries has never been satisfactorily substantiated. The final preambular paragraph of the draft resolution expresses deep concern over the continuing development and acquisition of nuclear weapons by Israel. Australia does not consider allegations in the media as constituting adequate substantiation of the allegation that Israel indeed possesses a nuclear weapons capability.

Mr. KOZYREV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has asked to speak to express its conviction about the timeliness of our Committee's adoption of draft resolution 5.23. It is true that the international community has every reason to be seriously concerned at the fact that Israel stubbornly refuses to assume the obligation not to manufacture or to acquire nuclear weapons, despite the frequent appeals made by the General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

(Mr. Kozlov, USSR)

That State has also refused to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards.

In these circumstances, we should naturally condemn Israel's reluctance to give up the possession of any nuclear weapons - and no efforts to confuse this very clear-cut issue by introducing matters alien to the subject, particularly dubious attempts to speculate about humanitarian activities by certain individuals and citizens who have provided assistance in the case of nuclear disaster, can change or alter this state of affairs.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.23, listed in cluster 8. The remaining draft resolution in this cluster is L. 20, and it will be considered at a later stage.

It is my intention to take up tomorrow, at the morning and afternoon meetings, clusters 11, 10 and and, it is hoped, we shall take a decision on the convening of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, on which a draft decision proposed by the Chairman will be distributed tomorrow.

The meeting rose at 5.40p.m.