



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 41ST MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 56, 128 AND 135 (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 Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 56, 128 AND 135 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will continue taking action on all draft resolutions on disarmament items. We shall now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15, which is related to agenda item 45 "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa" and is entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa". This draft resolution has 27 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the First Committee's 30th meeting on 13 November. Those 27 sponsors are: Algeria, Angola, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Qatar, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, San Tome and Principe, the Sudan, the United Republic of Cameroon, Zaire and Zambia.

I shall call first on those representative wishing to explain their vote before the voting.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): My explanation of vote relates to the draft resolution about to be voted upon. However, because of the connexion between the subject, my remarks will also cover draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16. I shall therefore not speak again when that draft resolution comes up for a vote.

My delegation wishes to recall that our Government has given support to efforts to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones and we therefore voted in favour of resolution 32/81 which proposed the formation of a nuclear-free zone in Africa. The French Government also shares the view that all States should refrain from acts conducive to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. We therefore feel that South Africa should open all its nuclear facilities to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). On this point the French Government agrees entirely with the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.15 and A/C.1/36/L.16.

However, we note that the two texts fail to distinguish between the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and its military uses. In other words, the sponsors of the

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

two drafts assume that any co-operation between industrialized countries and countries importing nuclear technology or installations for civilian purposes, even under IAEA controls, must necessarily lead to military uses. Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15 makes this supposition even more explicitly than draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16. I note also that the two texts contradict the report of the Group of Experts set up under resolution 34/76 B, which was adopted by consensus in 1979. That report, prepared by highly-qualified experts representative of the various regions of the world, draws a very clear distinction between the peaceful uses of nuclear energy under IAEA safeguards and uses which do not come under any form of control.

In addition to these objections we have other very important ones on the question whether the drafts are consistent with the Charter. For example, the drafts provide that the General Assembly should address requests or recommendations to the Security Council, although the Security Council is already seized of various aspects of the situation in South Africa. We feel that this is not in keeping with Article 12 of the Charter.

More specifically with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15, we note that under operative paragraph 3 the Security Council would be required to institute enforcement action against South Africa. In the same draft, the last preambular paragraph casts doubts on the use of the veto by some members of the Security Council in connexion with draft resolutions submitted to the Council this year. This is at variance with the principles of the Charter as well as being a breach of the principle of respect for the sovereignty of Member States.

My delegation will therefore abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16 and vote against draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): I shall explain my vote on both draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.15 and A/C.1/36/L.16.

The Netherlands sincerely regrets that this year again, as last year, we are deprived of the possibility of voting favourably on the two draft resolutions regarding nuclear activities in Africa. Our problem with those draft resolutions is virtually the same this year as last year. While we understand the mood of the sponsors and in fact share that mood, at least to a certain extent, we cannot go along with certain wording in the draft resolution which we find extravagant or at least not suitable in a United Nations resolution.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

Words such as "frenzied", "strong regret" and "indignation" should not be used too freely. Furthermore, we would wish to distinguish between military and peaceful uses of nuclear energy, which the draft resolution fails to do.

Having said that, I should like to place before this Committee certain considerations which, in the view of the Netherlands Government, are principal elements in the situation. Our main considerations are the following.

We consider the continued denuclearization of Africa desirable. We also are worried, as are the sponsors of the draft resolutions, that there does in fact exist in Africa a potential danger of proliferation of nuclear weapons. We agree with the demand for the application of full-scope safeguards in the Republic of South Africa. We would have liked to have seen in the draft resolutions a clear call upon the Government of South Africa to undertake unequivocal non-proliferation commitments. We share the concern of the sponsors with regard to the ambiguity of the Government of South Africa in respect to its nuclear policy. We are also worried about the reports of certain possible nuclear events in or near South Africa which still remain without satisfactory explanation.

It is against this background that my delegation has carefully weighed its position and has come to the conclusion that an abstention on both draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.15 and A/C.1/36/L.16 is indicated.

Finally, we hope that the co-sponsors of these two draft resolutions will see their way clear next year, at the next United Nations General Assembly, to enter into consultations with this delegation at a somewhat earlier stage in order to arrive at a text which we would be able to vote in favour of.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My explanation of vote relates both to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15 and to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16, which I assume we are about to consider.

The delegation of Argentina decided to vote in favour of both draft resolutions, essentially because we share the general sense of the two draft resolutions and the objective they pursue. That is the basic reason why the delegation of Argentina has decided to vote in favour of both draft resolutions. However, we wish to explain for the record that this does not mean that we agree with the language used in more than one place and, specifically, we do not agree with the language in some of the paragraphs of the two draft resolutions. In addition, the position of my delegation with respect to full-scale safeguards in the matter of the use of atomic energy is well known. For that reason, we enter an express reservation in connexion with the requirements relating to safeguards.

Mr. MENZIES (Canada): My delegation will abstain on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.15, on the nuclear capability of South Africa, and will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16, on the implementation of the declaration on the denuclearization of Africa.

My Government has repeatedly placed on record, in this body and in many public statements on the subject, its deep abhorrence of the oppressive system of apartheid. We thus find ourselves in sympathy with the condemnatory references to apartheid contained in A/C.1/36/L.15. We also support the general thrust of the draft resolution when it points out that South Africa has refused to conclude a comprehensive safeguard agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and calls on South Africa to submit its nuclear installations to inspection by the IAEA.

(Mr. Menzies, Canada)

I might add that, in the view of my delegation, this call could be extended with benefit to certain delegations which may vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15. Moreover, we support the over-all objective of this draft resolution and of that contained in document A/C.1/36/L.16, namely, the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa.

On the other hand, my delegation has difficulty with certain unsubstantiated claims regarding South Africa's nuclear capability contained in A/C.1/36/L.15. We do not think it accurate to indicate that certain specified countries have allegedly supported or collaborated with South Africa in this area.

My delegation also objects to the provision contained in operative paragraph 3 of A/C.1/36/L.15, which requests the Security Council to institute effective enforcement action. This, in our view, clearly impinges on the exclusive prerogative of the Security Council, because it is action on which the Council itself must decide to initiate consideration and decision. Moreover, we do not believe the action proposed would be effective in promoting progress for the desired objective of having South Africa subscribe to international nuclear safeguards as noted in operative paragraph 5 and to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Indeed, the action called for may even have the contrary effect.

The introduction of questionable assumptions, unsubstantiated allegations and the use of rhetorical and sometimes excessive language unfortunately does not contribute to the achievement of the worth-while objectives and goals of the draft resolution and its companion on the implementation of the Declaration of the denuclearization of Africa set out in A/C.1/36/L.16. Accordingly, we have decided to abstain on draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.15 and A/C.1/36/L.16.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): My delegation has asked to speak to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.15 and A/C.1/36/L.16, "Nuclear capability of South Africa" and "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa", respectively.

The United States supports in principle the creation of an African nuclear-weapon-free zone, consistent with our well-known position on the principles for establishing such a zone. The United States remains firm in its belief that an Africa free of nuclear weapons is a goal worth our collective energies and co-operation, and the Organization of African Unity deserves great credit for its early recognition of the importance of denuclearization of the African continent.

However, it is our view that these draft resolutions do not serve the purpose of non-proliferation and in fact discourage South Africa from implementing a non-proliferation policy. Moreover, my delegation believes that the intemperate tone and unproved allegations in the draft resolutions do not contribute to the goals of the draft resolutions themselves or to an improvement of the situation in South Africa, especially at a sensitive time when discussions are well under way leading, we hope, to a solution of the Namibian conflict.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

The United States has long recognized the danger of proliferation of nuclear weapons and has worked to strengthen and maintain the international non-proliferation régime. The operation by South Africa of an unsafeguarded uranium enrichment facility and the absence of a treaty obligation not to develop or acquire nuclear explosives are of great concern to us. It has been the long-standing policy of the United States that we would be prepared to supply nuclear fuel to South Africa if it adhered to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and accepted International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards on all its nuclear facilities. The United States non-proliferation Act of 1978 provides that a non-nuclear-weapon State have all its nuclear activities under safeguards as a minimum condition for the licensing of exports to it of nuclear fuel and facilities as defined in the Act. As a practical matter, the United States has not exported nuclear fuel or facilities to South Africa since 1975.

Since 1977 the United States has sought to engage in discussions with South Africa on nuclear safeguards and non-proliferation. Specifically, we have encouraged South Africa to accept safeguards on all its nuclear facilities and to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. We have indicated to South Africa that resumption of peaceful nuclear relations with us would be possible if there were co-operation in this area. The United States Government has not provided nuclear fuel to South Africa, nor has the United States supplied to South Africa nuclear materials which are not under the safeguards of the IAEA. We note that operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15 and operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16 recognize the importance of the application of full-scope safeguards by the IAEA, a principle which the United States strongly supports and is encouraging the South African Government and other governments to adopt. South African acceptance of such safeguards and adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty would be important steps towards our shared non-proliferation objectives.

The United States continues to believe that nuclear co-operation for appropriate peaceful uses under suitable international safeguards and controls

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

need not contribute to the proliferation of nuclear explosives. It is the judgement of the United States that implementation of the actions called for by operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of A/C.1/36/L.15 and operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of A/C.1/36/L.16, dealing with nuclear collaboration, could prevent co-operation of a kind that offers South Africa the best rationale for accepting appropriate non-proliferation controls. Moreover, we must reject efforts to broaden the existing arms embargo against South Africa to include all high-technology items, such as "computers, electronic equipments and related technology", in the words of the resolutions. While the United States supports and enforces the existing military embargo against South Africa as set forth in Security Council resolution 418 (1977) - I remind the Committee that the United States was the first major Power to extend a full arms embargo to South Africa, which it did in 1963, 13 or 14 years before the United Nations action. While we support the arms embargo we oppose the imposition of general economic sanctions against South Africa on the grounds that they are the wrong way to achieve the objectives which we all share in southern Africa.

Finally, as we noted at the outset, we must oppose the intemperate language of the resolutions at a time when the contact group is again directly engaged with the parties in trying to achieve a solution to the question of Namibia. The language of the draft resolution on the nuclear capability of South Africa is particularly unfortunate in this regard. That resolution, in addition, calls for "enforcement action" by the Security Council.

For those reasons, we shall vote against draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15 and abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16, even though we have serious reservations about portions of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16, which we shall deal with individually.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15.  
A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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 Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

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

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15 was adopted by 108 votes to 4, with

9 abstentions.\*

---

\* Subsequently the delegations of Cyprus and Morocco advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

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

Mr. BEKER (Israel): At the thirty-third session of the General Assembly Israel voted in favour of resolution 33/63, calling for the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. However, since then Israel has been singled out by name in the resolutions under that item and accused, along with some other unspecified Western countries, of allegedly collaborating with South Africa in the nuclear field.

This year both draft resolutions A/C.1/35/L.15 and A/C.1/35/L.16 refer to unfounded and false accusations in that regard. The ultimate absurdity of those allegations is nowhere clearer than in draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.15, which is predicated upon the report of the Secretary-General. That report, on the Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, was published on 9 September 1980 and circulated as document A/35/402. Its section entitled "Nuclear co-operation with other countries" reviews the record of official and unofficial co-operation, including the training of scientists and the exchange of sophisticated technologies between South Africa and numerous countries.

In the entire report, only one paragraph, paragraph 37, is reserved for a discussion of the allegations of nuclear co-operation between South Africa and Israel. It describes those charges as mere speculation, and concludes:

"Until specific examples of actual nuclear exchanges or transactions can be cited as clear evidence of such co-operation, this whole question remains in a state of uncertainty." (A/35/402, paragraph 17)

These conclusions were reaffirmed in another report of the Secretary-General, General Assembly document A/36/431, issued on 18 September 1981.

One wonders by what mysterious process the alchemist sponsors of these draft resolutions transmuted these speculations and uncertainties into absolutes and established facts which they included in their draft.

(Mr. Beker, Israel)

I would add that the reason that no specific examples have been cited in the Secretary-General's reports is that none have occurred. The clear and consistent position and practice of Israel was stated in the letter of 4 September 1979 from the Deputy Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations to the Security Council Committee established under Security Council resolution 421 (1977). In that letter he reported that Israel:

"will comply with Security Council resolution 418 (1977), and accordingly, Israel will not provide South Africa with arms or related material of all types, including the sale or transfer of weapons and ammunition, military vehicles and equipment..." (S/AC.20/17)

For those reasons Israel cannot support draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.15 and A/C.1/36/L.16. We regret that this year we cannot go along with the draft resolution on the denuclearization of Africa, but we believe that our friends in Africa know our position and they understand why we are unable to support it.

Ms. SKARSTEIN (Norway): The Norwegian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15. We consider the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa to be an extremely important step in efforts to limit the spread of nuclear arms and, in particular, to prevent the introduction of nuclear arms into the region of southern Africa.

My delegation has, however, serious reservations on some of the paragraphs in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15, amongst them the thirteenth preambular paragraph. This year there has been widespread concern about the nuclear activities and capability of South Africa. We feel that the language in this draft resolution does not sufficiently distinguish between the functions and the responsibilities of the different United Nations bodies as they have been defined in the United Nations Charter.

Mr. MOUÏROU (Benin) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Benin apologises for speaking so late in our discussion of agenda item 45. We are not speaking in explanation of our vote, but to announce that we have become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.15 and A/C.1/36/L.16.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): Ireland has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15 and will also vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16 on the nuclear capability of South Africa and the denuclearization of Africa because we wish to give expression to our traditional and long-term support for the fundamental principle of the denuclearization of Africa. At the same time, in casting its positive vote on both draft resolutions, Ireland has reservations on a number of elements in the draft resolutions which we do not feel to be either justified or necessary. Ireland is thinking in particular of the contentious singling out of certain Western States in the preambular portions of both draft resolutions and of the failure to distinguish, in the operative sections of both draft resolutions, between co-operation for peaceful purposes and co-operation for weapons purposes. Finally, we have reservations about the reference to the Security Council's role in the operative section of both draft resolutions.

Mr. ZELADA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): As in previous years, the Spanish delegation has voted in favour of the draft resolution on the nuclear capability of South Africa, contained in document A/C.1/36/L.15. We have done so and will do so also in respect of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16, because we continue to agree fully with the basic objective pursued by these draft resolutions in connexion with the item relating to the declaration on the denuclearization of Africa.

However, the Spanish delegation wishes to state for the record that the language of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15 in particular uses certain expressions that we find are too polemical and not totally accurate. I am referring in particular to the thirteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 1 and 3. This last paragraph in effect contains references to actions that are within the purview of the Security Council, which is the body competent to pronounce on the matter.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): The delegation of Finland voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15 and we are going to do the same when the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16 will be cast. My explanation of vote is therefore on both draft resolutions, A/C.1/36/L.15 and A/C.1/36/L.16.

Finland has consistently supported all efforts to strengthen the security of States on a regional basis and in particular the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Moreover, our record in the field of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons is well known. We continue to believe that the emergence of any additional nuclear-weapon State would threaten the security of the region and international security as a whole. Particularly alarming is the possibility of proliferation in regions where international peace and security are already in jeopardy.

While concurring with the main thrust of draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.15 and A/C.1/36/L.16 my delegation has serious misgivings about several paragraphs contained in them. This is particularly true concerning draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15. In our view the language contained in the last preambular paragraph and in operative paragraphs 3 and 4 is not in keeping with the provisions of the Charter on the respective powers of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Moreover, we regret that the draft resolution contains no reference to adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which we consider to be the fundamental pillar of any peaceful activity in the field of international nuclear co-operation. We note in this regard the difference between the sixth preambular paragraph of resolution 35/146 A and the ninth preambular paragraph of the present draft resolution.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): Sweden voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15, on the nuclear capability of South Africa. Further to that vote I wish to make an explanation on behalf of my delegation.

The Swedish Government warmly supports the general purpose of this draft resolution, which is to keep the African continent free from nuclear weapons. My Government also shares the worry that South Africa might acquire nuclear weapons. Such a development would constitute a major setback for the international efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. It would also no doubt contribute to a further aggravation of the present situation in that region.

While thus being strongly in favour of the general aim of this resolution, my delegation has reservations against certain formulations, and in particular the fifth and thirteenth paragraphs of the preamble regarding the attitudes of some countries. Since it has not been possible to establish whether the event referred to in the sixth preambular paragraph was in fact a nuclear explosion and, if so, what country was responsible for that act, we think that paragraph should have been worded more cautiously.

Mr. BRYLLE (Denmark): The Danish delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15, and we are going to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16, as well, because we agree with the objectives concerning the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear arms to Africa, and because we share the concern about all forms of nuclear co-operation with South Africa.

We have, however, serious reservations about certain points in the draft resolutions, such as the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 3 and 4 in A/C.1/36/L.15. In addition, we have reservations about operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16.

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey): In previous years the Turkish delegation wholeheartedly supported the resolutions introduced under this agenda item, and we have done so this year. In fact, Turkey fully abides by all of the United Nations resolutions concerning South Africa. As I said yesterday in the Namibian debate in the General Assembly, the Turkish Government does not engage in any kind of relations with South Africa, including in the diplomatic, political, economic, commercial and military fields. Furthermore, Turkey attaches great importance to the

(Mr. Ersun, Turkey)

strengthening of the international régime of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Consequently, we fully support the legitimate concerns expressed in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15; we think they are well founded and well justified. We think the text of this draft resolution is important. From this point of view it would be desirable and, indeed, feasible, to obtain the maximum possible support for this draft resolution.

However, the direct references made to Western countries, namely, the United States, the United Kingdom and France, such as in the fifth and thirteenth paragraphs of the preamble, seem unnecessary to us.

We shall vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16, as well, but the same considerations apply also to that draft resolution.

Mr. CALDERON (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): Bolivia voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15, and will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16. However, we wish to state that we have reservations about operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15 and operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now begin the voting procedure with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16, which relates to agenda item 45, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 30th meeting of the First Committee on 13 November 1981. This draft resolution has 28 sponsors, as follows: Algeria, Angola, Benin, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sao Tome and Principe, Sudan, Togo, United Republic of Cameroon, Zambia and Zaire.

Mr. KAMBIRIGI (Burundi) (interpretation from French): My country has always been one of the countries which have steadfastly condemned South Africa for its stubborn refusal to submit its nuclear facilities to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). If there is no objection on the part of the sponsors of A/C.1/36/L.16, my delegation wishes to join them as a co-sponsor of that resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: Burundi has expressed the desire to be a co-sponsor of this draft resolution. Since I do not hear any objection, draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16 now has 29 sponsors, including Burundi.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16 have suggested the adoption of this draft resolution without a vote.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States): We would like to call for a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16 and a separate recorded vote on operative paragraph 4 of that resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16. A separate vote has been requested on paragraph 4 of that draft resolution, which reads as follows:

"Calls upon such States, corporations, institutions and individuals, therefore, to terminate forthwith such military and nuclear collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa, including the provision to it of such related materials as computers, electronic equipments and related technology".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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 Cameroon, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16 was adopted by 101 votes to 6, with 16 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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 Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16 was adopted by 113 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

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

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): My delegation wishes to put on record that our vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16, just adopted, should not be construed as meaning that we are in agreement with the assertions contained in some of the paragraphs of the draft resolution, for which conclusive evidence is lacking.

Mr. MARTIN (New Zealand): This explanation relates to the two draft resolutions under agenda item 45, on which we have just voted. Last year, New Zealand voted in favour of both draft resolutions presented under the item entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa". Although we had misgivings about some aspects of the texts, those were outweighed by our support for the concept of the denuclearization of Africa as a regional arms control arrangement that would strengthen the non-proliferation régime and by our concern about South Africa's negative attitude towards safeguards.

We had hoped in the same way to be able to support both draft resolutions this year. In the votes just taken, however, although we voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16, we have had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15. With the latter draft resolution we had a number of difficulties in addition to those referred to in our explanation of vote on that item during the thirty-fifth session. The several changes made in the wording of resolution 35/146 A, the comparable resolution adopted last year, had the effect of making the text less accurate and more tendentious. We hope that at the next session early consultations may result in the presentation of a text that will enable a greater number of delegations to join in supporting these draft resolutions, both of which have as their broad objective the achievement of a state of affairs in Africa for which there is virtually unanimous support in the world community.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom would like to make the following points in connexion with draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16, which has just been adopted by the Committee. It is the right of all States to develop and apply programmes for the peaceful use of nuclear energy. That right is internationally recognized and is set out in a number of international agreements.

In our view, it would be wrong to seek to limit that right in individual cases in a discriminatory manner for political reasons. At the same time, the United Kingdom hopes that South Africa will come to realize the advantage of becoming a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, so as to reassure its neighbours and the world about its nuclear programme.

The United Kingdom's own contacts with South Africa are of a very limited nature, and are mainly restricted to the fields of safety, medicine and agriculture. We do not collaborate with South Africa in the development of its civil nuclear programme. We do not collaborate in any way with South Africa in the development of a nuclear weapon capability, nor do we supply nuclear materials, nuclear facilities and equipment, or related economic assistance directly towards that objective.

In the light of these points, the United Kingdom delegation voted against operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16, while abstaining in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. NOLAN (Australia): I wish to explain the vote of the Australian delegation on both draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15 and draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16. Because of the importance Australia places on the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and our growing concern about the negative attitude of some States on this question, the Australian delegation has traditionally voted in favour of both resolutions on the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. It has been Australia's long-standing view that South Africa should adhere to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, or at least accept full-scope safeguards on its nuclear industry.

As has been the case in previous years, there are some aspects of both draft resolutions which cause the Australian delegation serious misgivings. On draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16, had it not been for the overriding importance we give to nuclear non-proliferation questions, we would have felt compelled to abstain. We have, however, cast a positive vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15, on the other hand, unfortunately poses a number of major difficulties for Australia which have caused the Australian delegation reluctantly to cast an abstaining vote. That vote, however, in no way reflects any diminution in Australia's concern about the overriding question of nuclear non-proliferation.

(Mr. Nolan, Australia)

Amongst the major difficulties we find in those draft resolutions is the tendentious naming of States -- a practice to which we object in any resolution. In addition, we consider the draft resolutions deficient in that they fail to make the general distinction between peaceful and military applications of nuclear energy.

In saying that, however, the Australian delegation wishes to make perfectly clear that Australia does not permit the transfer of nuclear material between Australia and South Africa for any collaboration whatever in the nuclear field.

Mr. LEHNE (Austria): The Austrian delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.15 and A/C.1/36/L.16. We did so because we were motivated by our long-standing support for the denuclearization of Africa and our concern about the threat of a further proliferation of nuclear weapons posed by the unsafeguarded nuclear programme of South Africa.

Those draft resolutions, however, contain a number of provisions with regard to which we have serious reservations. I refer, in particular, to the ambiguous use of the term "nuclear-weapon capability", which, in some instances in the text, seems to imply the actual presence of nuclear weapons in South Africa, something which has so far not been established as a fact.

We believe that the draft resolutions do not reflect adequately the different functions and responsibilities of the General Assembly and the Security Council in the United Nations system. We are especially unhappy with the last preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15, which, in our view, is not in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations. We also regret the singling out of particular countries in the context of these draft resolutions.

Mr. KAPLLANI (Albania): As in previous sessions, the Albanian delegation has this time again voted in favour of the draft resolution entitled, "Nuclear capability of South Africa", contained in document A/C.1/36/L.15.

In so doing, we were prompted by our position of principle, which strongly condemns the savage policies of apartheid pursued by the racist régime of South Africa and the dangers posed by its nuclear armament.

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

We strongly condemn any kind of co-operation with the racist régime of South Africa in general and collaboration with it in the nuclear field in particular. That is why we also voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16. However, we wish to point out that we have reservations with regard to that draft resolution. These reservations are connected with the concept of the so-called nuclear-weapon-free zones. In this regard we have made our position abundantly clear on previous occasions, and we shall not go into further detail at this juncture.

Mr. TAVARES NUNES (Portugal) (interpretation from French): My delegation wishes to explain the reason for its abstentions in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.15, and A/C.1/36/L.16 relating to the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

The votes cast by the Portuguese delegation reflect the support my Government wishes to give to the principle of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We consider that the establishment of such zones constitutes a positive contribution towards the achievement of the final objectives of disarmament, especially by preventing nuclear proliferation. Hence my country supports all efforts of the international community aimed at the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa, including those designed to keep such weapons out of the continent of Africa pending the reaching of the necessary agreements to implement the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

In this context my delegation attaches fundamental importance to adherence by all States to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and, therefore, to application of the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to South Africa's nuclear facilities.

My delegation's votes also represent the condemnation of the apartheid régime by the Government of Portugal and Portuguese public opinion. However, my delegation considers the global condemnation of any co-operation with South Africa in the nuclear field excessive. In our view, co-operation for peaceful purposes should not be encompassed by that condemnation; it should cover only military co-operation. Indeed, global condemnation including even co-operation for medical purposes would be prejudicial to the interests of the African population.

(Mr. Tavares Nunes, Portugal)

Moreover, my delegation has some doubts about the soundness of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15 and operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16.

Before taking up the next draft resolution, I should like to inform the Committee that the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20 has expressed his wish for that draft resolution to be taken up tomorrow. Consequently, we shall take up next draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.28.

As I have been approached by a number of delegations expressing the desire to be informed once again as to the draft resolutions the Committee will be taking up today, I shall read out the list of the remaining draft resolutions for today. We shall take up draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.28, L.31, L.32, L.35, L.36/Rev.1, L.44, L.46, L.21 and L.30. Representatives may have noted that I did not mention draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.42. In this regard I was approached by the sponsor of that draft resolution, who expressed the desire that it be taken up as the last draft resolution on disarmament items.

We have been taking a rather flexible attitude in this regard and showing understanding for such requests. Hence, we shall be taking up draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.42 at the very end of the voting on the disarmament draft resolutions.

Mr. YANGO (Philippines): As the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.46, my delegation would very much appreciate it if, given that some of the draft resolutions at the top of the list have not yet been acted upon and will not be acted upon today, it would be possible to have draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.46 considered this morning.

The CHAIRMAN: This should not present any difficulty. We would first take up draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.28, as I announced, and then follow with draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.46.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my thanks to you for the spirit of understanding you have shown in respect of the difficulties delegations encounter and of which you have given proof in speaking of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.42.

In the light of the latest informal talks I have had with some of the representatives more directly concerned with the SALT talks, I venture to hope that by Monday afternoon at the latest we would already know definitely what the situation is in connexion with those negotiations. And therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would be very grateful to you, unless you have an objection, if you were to retain the formula you suggested, that is, that if necessary this should be the last draft resolution relating to disarmament to be dealt with, but that for the time being the deadline fixed for consideration and adoption of any draft resolution on the question dealt with in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.42 would be the first hour of the afternoon meeting next Monday, 30 November.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to share with the Committee some lack of information, in the sense that we do not know when we are going to conclude the consideration of the disarmament items, for the obvious reason that we have no information as to whether the relevant documents on some items will be available to the delegations. But I thought that we were going to take up this issue at a later stage, after the Secretariat was able to communicate to us when that particular document would be made available to us.

Thus, as of now I would, with the indulgence of the Committee, take note of the suggestion made by the representative of Mexico.

(The Chairman)

The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.28. This draft resolution has 19 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Canada at the thirty-third meeting of the First Committee, on 18 November. The 19 sponsors are: Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Canada, Denmark, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, the Philippines, Romania, Singapore and Sweden.

We shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.28. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.28 was adopted by 99 votes to 13, with 6 abstentions.\*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of their vote after the vote.

Mr. PROKOFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Soviet Union has frequently stated that the solution of the problem of the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes cannot be separated from the problem of the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons in all of their forms and the gradual reduction of their stockpiles until they have been completely eliminated, because such a separation would run counter to the aims of nuclear disarmament.

As is well known, the proposal of the group of socialist countries to begin negotiations on this question, which was put forward in the Committee on Disarmament and appears in document CD/4, specifically provided that at a certain stage of such negotiations it would be possible to consider also the question of the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. However, draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.28, as has previously been the case, separates this question from that of nuclear disarmament through appropriate negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament.

---

\* Subsequently, the delegations of Papua New Guinea and Rwanda advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Prokofiev, USSR)

In our view, such an approach on the part of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.28 runs counter to the cause of nuclear disarmament and the various relevant provisions of the Final Document of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in which the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes is closely linked with the cessation of the production of all forms of nuclear weapons as one of the ways to reduce stockpiles of nuclear weapons and bring about their complete elimination.

Guided by these considerations, the delegation of the Soviet Union voted against draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.28.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to state for the record that the words "appropriate stage of its work on the item entitled 'Nuclear weapons in all aspects'" appearing in the last paragraph of the draft resolution which we have just adopted and which my delegation voted in favour of, will be the stage at which it will be possible to consider and put into practice what is provided for in paragraph 50 (b) of the Final Document: cessation of the production of fissionable material jointly with cessation of the production of nuclear weapons. Therefore, as we see it, that "appropriate stage" will have to cover both objectives: cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery and cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. That is what we agreed on by consensus in 1978.

The CHAIRMAN: We now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.31, which relates to agenda item 44, "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 35/145 B". This draft resolution has 22 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 34th meeting of the First Committee on 18 November. The 22 sponsors are Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Canada, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, Ireland, Japan, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sweden and Thailand.

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, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia,

Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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 Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslav, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.31 was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

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

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union has constantly sought the conclusion of a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon testing. Towards that end, in 1977 the Soviet Union entered into negotiations with the United States and the United Kingdom and in a constructive spirit has fostered the continuation of those negotiations. We advocate their further continuation and are prepared to do our utmost to bring about their successful completion.

The Soviet Union also advocates that the Committee on Disarmament play an active role in the solution of the tasks involved in the cessation of nuclear-weapon testing and supports the establishment of a working group on nuclear-weapon tests with the participation of representatives of all the nuclear Powers within the Committee.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Since the draft resolution is designed to secure the most prompt solution to the problem of a complete and general nuclear-weapon test ban, we have voted in favour of it.

The Soviet delegation also notes that the draft resolution contains a number of provisions which have prompted certain reservations on our part. In particular, operative paragraph 4 contains an appeal to the participants in the tripartite negotiations to prepare a report on the state of those negotiations, and this is at variance with the provisions of paragraph 11<sup>4</sup> of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, especially as the question of the preparation of relevant information on the negotiations may be considered by the participants in those negotiations only after the resumption of such negotiations, and the efforts of the international community ought to be designed to secure just that end. Moreover, we wish to emphasize again that the determination of the mandate of subsidiary bodies of the Committee on Disarmament is exclusively the prerogative of the Committee itself.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Belgium has just voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.31 relating to the cessation of all nuclear-weapon testing. I wish to recall here the importance we attach to the principle of the prohibition of nuclear tests

However, we have some reservations about this text because it prejudices procedural decisions which the Committee on Disarmament will be in a better position to take as to how the question should be dealt with. We also fear that this draft resolution may complicate an already complex situation in so far as operative paragraph 9 could be used as a pretext to prevent any progress towards more limited temporary solutions that fall short of a global solution.

(Mr. Elliott, Belgium)

As for draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22, on which we abstained yesterday, it contains in particular certain formulations which are harmful to the consensus rule that is so indispensable in disarmament negotiations and which in themselves justify our opposition.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): By casting an affirmative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.31, the Brazilian delegation wished to stress the importance it attaches to a multilateral treaty on the prohibition of further testing of nuclear weapons. Although the draft resolution still does not reflect fully the preoccupations of the Brazilian delegation on the matter. It does, however, call for the complete cessation of nuclear-weapon tests and for the initiation of substantive negotiations on a multilateral treaty in the Committee on Disarmament, including through the establishment of a working group.

Brazil has long supported the position of the Group of 21 in the Committee on Disarmament and efforts deployed to achieve the start of multilateral negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty as a first step towards the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. Such a treaty would furthermore constitute an effective means to prevent vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons. In that context, the treaty should contain an unequivocal commitment to nuclear disarmament. To promote universal adherence, it must not be based on discrimination and must embody an adequate balance of obligations between nuclear and non-nuclear nations.

A meaningful and lasting treaty on the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests must, finally, adequately promote the freedom of access by all nations to the scientific and technological application of nuclear energy to peaceful purposes.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): The United States is of the view that arms control efforts in the nuclear field should be concentrated on negotiating balanced and verifiable nuclear arms reductions that will enhance international stability and reduce the risk of nuclear war. As regards draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.31, it also deals with the method of work in the Committee on Disarmament and is thus inconsistent with the arrangement recorded in paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, stipulating that the Committee is the master of its procedures. We regard it as inappropriate for the General Assembly to suggest how the Committee should handle its agenda items.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22, which was voted on yesterday, contains a number of additional provisions which the United States cannot accept -- in particular, a call for an unverified moratorium on nuclear tests.

It is for these reasons that the United States delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.31 and cast a negative vote on A/C.1/36/L.22.

Mr. KHIALACHEV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from Russian): The Bulgarian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.31. My country unswervingly supports the long-standing efforts of the majority of the Members of the United Nations to bring about a complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon testing. Towards that end, we have taken an active part in discussions on this matter in the Committee on Disarmament and in the special group of seismological experts.

We discern the general thrust of this draft resolution as being consistent with the general aim of bringing about a complete test ban. We do, however, have certain observations on individual provisions of the draft resolution, which we feel could be improved.

(Mr. Khalachev, Bulgaria)

Without touching upon all those observations, we think the draft resolution would better serve the goal of successfully completing negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament on a test ban if a clear distinction were drawn therein between the true positions of the nuclear Powers, particularly in respect to their willingness to hold negotiations on this problem, both on a restricted and a broad basis, and their readiness to conclude a relevant treaty.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded our action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.31.

We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.46, which is related to agenda item 55 F, General and complete disarmament, study on the relationship between disarmament and international security.

The draft resolution has three sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the Philippines in the thirty-sixth meeting of the First Committee, on 19 November. The sponsors are Cyprus, Ecuador and the Philippines.

I should like to inform the members of the Committee that the sponsors have suggested that A/C.1/36/L.46 be adopted without a vote. Before taking a decision, I should like to call on the Secretary of the Committee to make a statement.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The Budget Division has informed me that the expenses involved in producing the requested publication will be met through the existing resources for the publication programme of the Department of Conference Services.

The CHAIRMAN: If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.46 without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.46 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position with regard to the draft resolution.

Mr. SUMERHAYES (United Kingdom): I am speaking on behalf of the Ten member States of the European Community, who would like to make a few brief comments on the draft resolution, which concerns the report of the study group on disarmament and international security. The Ten are content to see draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.46 adopted by consensus. We consider the subject matter of the report, the link between disarmament and international security, to be of fundamental importance. However, there are some points in the report which might not be entirely satisfactory and upon which we should like to reflect further. We shall make our position on those points clear in the context of our submissions to the Secretary-General called for in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): Although my delegation has joined in consensus adoption of the draft resolution, such a vote should not be interpreted as a comment on the study itself. Rather, we consider the draft resolution to be entirely procedural in character. Regrettably, the study was made available for examination only last Thursday, and my Government has not yet had an opportunity to analyse it thoroughly. We reserve the right to provide our views on the study in accordance with operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, and expect to do so at a later date.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded our action upon draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.46.

The next item for action is draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.32, related to agenda item 51, entitled 'Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session'. The draft resolution is entitled 'World-wide action for collecting signatures in support of measures to prevent nuclear war, to curb the arms race and for disarmament'. The draft resolution, which has two sponsors, Bulgaria and Mongolia, was introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the 37th meeting of the First Committee on 20 November.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): We shall vote for the draft resolution on the understanding that the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament will adopt the necessary decisions to prevent its constituting a duplication of activities within the World Disarmament Campaign, which we adopted in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.11. The collection of signatures, which is mentioned in the draft resolution before us, could be a useful activity falling within the framework of the campaign which is to be directed and co-ordinated by the Secretary-General. We shall vote in favour of the draft resolution on that understanding.

Mr. HANDL (Czechoslovakia): The Czechoslovak delegation would like to voice its full support for the idea of world-wide action for collecting signatures in support of measures to prevent nuclear war, to curb the arms race and for disarmament. We hold the firm view that the adoption and consequent implementation of this draft resolution, which at this stage is basically of a procedural nature, would play an important role in preparation for, and implementation of, the results of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, by mobilizing world public opinion in favour of the noble aims that the second special session will be called upon to fulfil. There can be no doubt that such action would

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

help to create a favourable climate for curbing the arms race and for progress in disarmament, which, as we can witness almost every day, is called for by peace-loving people - men, women and youth - all over the world.

I shall give just one example. The World Congress of Women, held in Prague in the middle of October this year with the participation of women from all parts of the world, adopted a very important appeal and declaration to that end, which is contained in General Assembly document A/36/620.

For all those reasons, the Czechoslovak delegation will vote for the draft resolution proposed by the delegations of Bulgaria and Mongolia. We hope that it will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. DABO (Guinea) (interpretation from French): My delegation supports the draft resolution, because we believe that it will promote, in a very dynamic way, the task of informing world public opinion and the peoples of the world, who are those most interested in this question.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.32.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against: Brazil, Canada, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bhutan, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabor, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Malaysia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.32 was adopted by 68 to 3, with 46 abstentions.\*

---

\* Subsequently, the delegation of the United Arab Emirates advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

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

Mr. LIANG Yufan (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation is of the view that it would be more appropriate to have the world-wide action for collecting signatures in support of disarmament measures implemented by non-governmental and other private organizations. It would be necessary for the United Nations to be involved, therefore we did not participate in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.32.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): On the occasion of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, a large number of representatives of Japanese non-governmental organizations came to the United Nations carrying with them some 20 million signatures collected from men, women and children all over Japan who aspire to nuclear disarmament. These signatures were deposited with the Secretariat of the United Nations. It goes without saying that the collecting of these signatures was an entirely voluntary effort, sponsored by non-governmental organizations, and the Government of Japan was not involved in the matter. According to press reports, this performance is likely to be repeated next year on the occasion of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We consider that such matters should be left to private initiative and this is the view that the Government of Japan will undoubtedly be communicating to the Secretary-General under paragraph 1 of the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. MARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The mounting threat of nuclear war, the continuation and escalation of the arms race is confronting the whole of the world community with the need to carry out urgent measures to avert a nuclear catastrophe, which could well lead to the demise of mankind. Efforts should be directed towards such measures at all possible levels - at the highest political level, at the level of inter-governmental organizations, non-governmental organizations and at the level of all aware and sensible persons. The scope and importance of the task confronting mankind requires that those efforts should be united and, under present conditions, the idea of a world-wide campaign for the collection of signatures seems a very timely idea.

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

Mass demonstrations in many countries of the world have shown the rising concern of society about the future of mankind. The desire of people to influence their own fate is perfectly natural, and this is not the opinion of one side at all. This view is held by people from all kinds of countries with different social and economic systems, people of different ages, with different views, professions, religions. For example, recently, in addressing the United States Senate on the question of public concern over the nuclear arms race, Senator David Pryor, said in the New York Times of 12 November:

"I find today a genuine concern, not only in Europe but throughout the United States, and among people in all walks of life, at all social and economic levels and of diverse political persuasion."

The voice of world public opinion must be heard and the United Nations cannot stand aside from this, especially as the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament directly calls for the mobilization of world public opinion for disarmament. The United Nations already has experience in the proclamation and conduct of campaigns involving broad segments of society, for example, Disarmament Week, the days of solidarity against apartheid, International Women's Year, International Year of the Child, International Year of Disabled Persons and so on. We must also bear in mind that the draft resolution on which we have just voted provides for enquiring about the views of Governments on the campaign for collecting signatures and to support measures to curb the arms race, for disarmament and to prevent nuclear war. It also provides for the matter to be submitted to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In the light of all these considerations my delegation has voted in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): In the view of the Netherlands, draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.32 is redundant and propagandistic. The frequent mass demonstrations in many cities in Western Europe provide the best possible evidence that public opinion in the West is not in need of Government guidance or State incentives in order to mobilize in favour of peace and disarmament. As a matter of fact, I doubt whether the Dutch demonstrators would accept State-controlled action in this respect, since those demonstrations are precisely aimed at bringing pressure to bear on their own Government. This is where the tremendous difference in

AW/15

A/C.1/36/PV.41

59-60

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

principle and in spirit between an open society such as ours and a closed one becomes evident. Another practical problem would be: who is in charge of collecting the signatures, for instance, in the socialist countries, and who will verify them and how?

Mr. LEHNE (Austria): The Austrian Constitution guarantees freedom of expression, which includes the right to collect signatures in support of various causes. The collection of signatures is indeed frequently used by Austrian citizens who wish to influence governmental policies. Our Constitution even provides a means to initiate referenda on certain policy questions.

The proposal contained in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.32 however, implies that Governments take an active role in initiating and organizing the collection of signatures in support of disarmament.

The involvement of Governments in a practice designed to facilitate input into the political processes from the population at grass-roots level seems highly problematical to my delegation. Apart from this consideration of principle, the Austrian delegation doubts whether the proposed measures can in any way usefully contribute to the disarmament process. The Austrian delegation, therefore, cast an abstaining vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.32.

Mr. KRUTZSCH (German Democratic Republic): My delegation gave its full support to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.32 on world-wide action for collecting signatures in support of measures to prevent nuclear war, to curb the arms race and for disarmament. In that context, I would like to recall that two years ago in the German Democratic Republic a country-wide collection of signatures sponsored by the country's non-governmental organizations yielded 13 million signatures in favour of arms limitation and disarmament. That action resulted in a considerable mobilization of the people in our country for the maintenance of international peace and disarmament, and they expressed their free will in that direction. Many other countries have initiated similar actions on this subject.

We should bear in mind that in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament special emphasis was given to the problem of mobilizing world public opinion on behalf of disarmament. My delegation considers draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.32 as suitable means of eliciting the views and suggestions of the Member States of the United Nations concerning such a world-wide action. It will be a useful device to explore the opinion of the Member States on this project,

(Mr. Krutzsch, German Democratic Republic)

and to enable the Secretary-General to take into account the variety of opinions to be taken into consideration.

It would be especially useful to invite, in an appropriate way, non-governmental organizations to consider this problem. The report to be prepared by the Secretary-General on the most appropriate format and methods of carrying out such a world-wide action would enable the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament to take an appropriate decision.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.32 because we do not believe that it is incumbent upon the United Nations to engage in such activities.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): The delegation of Finland abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.32. My delegation fully shares the conviction that it is important to mobilize public opinion for the pursuit of the goals of disarmament. In line with this, we gave our support to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.11/Rev.1 on the World Disarmament Campaign.

Regarding the idea of a world-wide action for collecting signatures in support of disarmament, we consider that the question could have been more appropriately dealt with in the context of the World Disarmament Campaign. We also believe that great restraint should be exercised in increasing the number of draft resolutions debated annually in this Committee. Furthermore, this kind of activity would more appropriately fall within the field of activities to which non-governmental organizations give consideration.

Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan): My delegation fully shares the conviction that world public opinion must be mobilized in favour of disarmament, but we do not feel that it is necessary to have a specific resolution on the collection of signatures. We feel that such action can very appropriately be a part of the World Disarmament Campaign or form an element in the

(Mr. Ahmad, Pakistan)

Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. For these reasons we have abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.32.

Mr. MOEBER (Hungary): The Hungarian delegation wishes to make some comments to explain our vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

The Hungarian delegation welcomes the draft resolution aimed at world-wide action for collecting signatures in support of measures to prevent nuclear war, to curb the arms race and for disarmament. We voted for it because we considered that this resolution will be a valuable contribution to the Second Disarmament Decade and to the World Disarmament Campaign in mobilizing world public opinion on behalf of disarmament, as called for in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament. The resolution calls upon Governments to communicate their views on the subject. The second special session on disarmament will consider the question in its entirety and will take final action on it, which my delegation hopes will be a positive one.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): According to the time-table suggested by you, Sir, tomorrow we shall be voting on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2. In view of the provisions of rule 120 of the rules of procedure, which state that there must be 24 hours prior notice, in order to avoid any difficulty I should like to take this opportunity to determine whether it is possible to obtain a reply from the representative of the Soviet Union at this time. A few days ago I asked him whether his delegation would agree to the addition to operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2 of the words "the ultimate objective of which is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons".

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The last sentence of paragraph 4 would, therefore, read as follows:

"The nuclear-arms race must be stopped and reversed by joint effort, through negotiations conducted in good faith and on the basis of equality, having as their ultimate goal the complete elimination of nuclear weapons".

I hope that if the representative of the Soviet Union does not yet have instructions from his Government on this, he will be able to give us his reply by this afternoon's meeting so that we can remain within the provisions of rule 120 of the rules of procedure.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I confirm that the delegation of Mexico did some time ago contact the Soviet delegation and ask it to consider the possibility of adding some language to operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.1. Having consulted with the other sponsors of the draft resolution, I am able to say that we accept the additional words proposed by the delegation of Mexico. Thus, the final sentence of paragraph 4 would read as just indicated by the representative of Mexico.

In making this change, the Soviet delegation very much hopes that it will enable the Mexican and many other delegations to support draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the Secretariat to make available the newly revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.1 by the time we are to vote on it tomorrow.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

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

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): Document A/36/613, Report of the Secretary-General: Report of the Group of Experts to Investigate Reports on the Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons, is expected to be available in English in the later part of this afternoon. At that time copies will be available from the Committee room documents office.

In all other languages, the report is scheduled to be available tomorrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN: The information just submitted by the Secretary of the Committee opens the question of our programme of work following the Committee's final meeting tomorrow.

Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Am I correct in understanding that today we intend to consider only draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.35, L.36, L.44, L.21 and L.30 -- five draft resolutions in all? The question then arises of whether we need two further meetings today, in the afternoon and at night. If we do meet twice more, we ought perhaps to consider some of the draft resolutions scheduled for tomorrow, obviously with the agreement of the sponsors of the draft resolutions and the Committee as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN: It had been my idea too that we should act more or less in the way proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union, but I have just been informed by the Secretariat that because of another urgent meeting to take place this afternoon and evening we have been asked not to have a meeting tonight. Thus, our problem has been solved by someone else, which is always better.

As our schedule for tomorrow, Wednesday, 25 November, is therefore a heavy one, I have asked the Secretariat to provide for a possible meeting tomorrow night, but I am informed that we are on a waiting list owing to other committees also having requested such provision. Whether we are to have a meeting tomorrow night will thus be announced in due course.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.