

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



FIRST COMMITTEE
37th meeting
held on
Monday, 9 November 1987
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 37th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69
(continued)

LETTER FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

* 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 DC-2500, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON AGENDA ITEMS 48 to 69

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : This afternoon the Committee will take decisions on the draft resolutions in clusters 4 a n d 5 as they appear in the wor k programme presented by the Chair. In cluster 4 it will consider draft resolutions A/C. 1/42/L.8, L.15, L.24, L.52, L.63 A and L.63 B. In cluster 5, it will consider draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.21, L.25, L.27, L.49 and L.57. In cluster 5, we will defer consideration of draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.2 a n d A/C. 1/42/L. 10, which are still being discussed.

Before proceeding to take decisions on these draft resolutions, I will call on the representatives of Australia, the United States of America, and the Islamic Republic of Iran, who wish to make statements.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia) : I t is my honour to introduce, under agenda item 61, "Chemical and Bacter iological (Biological) Weapons", the draft resolution contained in document A/C. 1/42/L. 67/Rev.1, entitled "Measures to uphold the authority o f the 1925 Protocol a n d to support the conclusion of a chemical weapons convention".

The following 26 Member States have joined Australia in sponsoring this text: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, C o s t a Rica, Denmark, France, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Cote d'Ivoire, Japan, Netherlands, N e w Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Br itain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Zaire.

You will recall that on 27 October 1987, Australia submitted draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.67 on this subject, in its own name. The draft resolution reflected the Australian Government's commitment to the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare; reflected our concern that all States observe the principles and objectives of that Protocol; our commitment to the early and successful conclusion of a convention for the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling, transfer and use of all chemical weapons and on their destruction; our support for the inclusion of detailed provisions in that convention for the on-site verification of compliance with it, and our belief in the importance of the role which the Secretary-General performs in support of the principles and objectives of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and in carrying out investigations into reports that chemical and bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons may have been used in violation of the Protocol.

Our draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.67 called for the unanimous endorsement by the General Assembly of this particular and important responsibility which has been entrusted to the Secretary-General.

The draft resolution built upon and called for the further elaboration of - though in only modest respects - the existing modalities available to the Secretary-General to carry out his investigations.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

In addition to the Australian draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/42/L.67, two other draft resolutions relating to aspects of chemical-weapons use have been submitted. These were draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.71, sponsored by the United States of America and a large number of other States, and draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.34, sponsored by Iran.

In the period since the submission of those draft resolutions there have been intensive and constructive consultations between the principal sponsors of each and with a wide range of other delegations aimed at producing a single resolution on the subject of chemical-weapons use. I am very pleased to be able to report to the First Committee today that those efforts have been successful. The result is contained in draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.67/Rev.1, which I shall now formally introduce.

In effect, this revised draft retains all the provisions of the Australian text in document A/C.1/42/L.67 to which I have already referred. It now includes, however, some additional elements which have been drawn from the other two draft resolutions on aspects of chemical-weapons use. The revised draft resolution registers the collective views of all the sponsors.

Its preambular paragraphs record the significance of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and other relevant rules of customary international law; refer to the necessity for adherence by all States to the biological-weapons Convention; express concern over reports that chemical weapons have been used and over indications of their emergence in an increasing number of national arsenals, as well as over the growing risk that they may be used again; note with satisfaction that the Conference on Disarmament is actively engaged in negotiating a comprehensive chemical-weapons convention which will include detailed provisions for the on-site verification of compliance; express support for the early and successful conclusion of that convention; note that prompt and impartial investigation of reports of possible use

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

of chemical and bacteriological weapons would further enhance the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol; and express appreciation for the work of the Secretary-General and note the procedures available to him in support of the principles and objectives of the Geneva Protocol.

I turn now to the operative paragraphs in which we renew the call on all States to observe strictly the principles and objectives of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and condemn all actions that violate this obligation; urge all States to be guided in their national policies by the need to curb the spread of chemical weapons; recognize the need, upon the entry into force of the chemical-weapon convention, to review the modalities available to the Secretary-General for the investigation of reports of the use of chemical weapons; and request the Secretary-General to carry out investigations, in response to reports that may be brought to his attention by any Member State, concerning possible use of chemical and bacteriological (biological) or toxin weapons that may constitute a violation of the 1925 or other relevant rules of the customary international law, in order to ascertain the facts of the matter, and to report promptly the results of any such investigation to all Member States.

The remaining operative paragraphs are intended to build upon and strengthen the procedures which are available to the Secretary-General in carrying out investigations of the possible use of chemical and bacteriological weapons and to encourage Member States and relevant international organizations to co-operate fully with him in this work.

The draft concludes by requesting the Secretary-General to submit a report to the General Assembly at its forty-third session on the implementation of the resolution.

I wish to emphasize that this single resolution in document A/C.1/42/L.67/Rev.1. on the role of the Secretary-General in investigating reports

(Mr. Butler, Australia

of possible use of chemical and bacteriological (biological) or toxin weapons and which reflects other aspects of the subject of chemical-weapons use to which the international community attaches importance has been the result of wide consultations with many delegations.

My delegation wishes to express its deep appreciation to the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C. 1/42/L. 61 and A/C. 1/42/L.34 and to the numerous delegations representing all the political groupings within the United Nations for their co-operation and the constructive approach which they brought to attaining the objective of a single resolution on this subject.

I have been asked to announce that Kenya and Portugal have joined the 26 sponsors mentioned at the beginning of my statement; therefore, we are now 28.

We believe that this co-operative work has constituted a fine example of the harmonization of views which is called for in the Charter of the United Nations. For this reason it will succeed in strengthening international co-operation on a subject of deep concern to all of us.

Australia and the other 27 sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.67/Rev.1 commend it to the Committee. We believe it reflects the interests of all delegations. We believe it is widely supported and, therefore, a vote on it should not be necessary. We appeal for its adoption by consensus when the First Committee acts on it later this week.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America) : In the opening statement of the United States delegation in this Committee on 16 October, Ambassador Okun referred to our concern for the urgent questions of the use and spread of chemical weapons. Later, in the United States statement on 22 October, the Honourable David Emery again addressed these questions. Today, I want to expand briefly on

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

their remarks and to comment on the chemical-weapons draft resolution that the United States has submitted in document A/C.1/42/L.71, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons".

For the past three years the General Assembly has voted by large margins to condemn any and all use of chemical weapons and any other such actions in contravention of existing relevant international accords and customary international law. The resolution on this issue last year was adopted without any opposing votes. Despite such serious expressions of concern by this body, however, instances of the use of chemical weapons continue. My delegation believes that the United Nations should not relent - that it cannot afford to relent - in its efforts to halt the illegal use of such abhorrent weapons.

Equally important, my delegation believes that the United Nations should also reiterate its appeal for the halting of the disquieting spread of these horrible weapons. Over the past 25 years there has been a 400 per cent increase in States possessing a chemical-weapons capability. The risks posed to the world by such proliferation cannot be ignored, nor can they go unchecked.

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

My delegation is convinced that these events - the actual use of chemical weapons, and the actual proliferation of such weapons - are of such serious import that they merit condemnation in a chemical-weapons resolution devoted exclusively to that end. For this reason my delegation was inclined to take A/C.1/42/L.71 to a vote. But we are mindful of, and indeed we have strongly supported, efforts to consolidate resolutions in this Committee in order to enable the Committee to concentrate better its efforts and manage its time. We have also been persuaded by assurances of other delegations, including interested socialist and neutral and non-aligned States, that the message of A/C.1/42/L.71 will not be lost in a consolidated draft.

It is for this reason that my delegation worked with other delegations to reduce the number of resolutions on chemical weapons. We believe that the revised draft resolution just introduced by the representative of Australia under the symbol A/C.1/42/L.67/Rev.1 reflects fully the key points initially sought by the United States in its draft resolution. In summary, it condemns the use of chemical weapons and seeks to discourage those who have done so from doing so again; it encourages nations to take appropriate action to restrict the export of chemicals with potential for use in chemical weapons; and it serves to broaden the role of, and support for, the Secretary-General in his investigation of the suspected use of chemical weapons.

For these reasons, the United States has decided to withdraw its own draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.71 from consideration. At the same time we strongly urge all States to give the greatest support possible to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/42/L.67/Rev.1, which in our opinion represents an important step in protecting mankind from the horrors of chemical and biological warfare.

Mr. MASHHADI-GHAHVEHCHI (Islamic Republic of Iran) : Following intensive consultations with other delegations - in particular with Sweden, whose representative is Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, and with

(Mr. Mashhadi-Ghahvehchi,
Islamic Republic of Iran)

Australia - the Islamic Republic of Iran, in a spirit of co-operation and compromise, did its best to arrive at an agreed text on the use of chemical weapons. The reasons behind draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.34, which the Islamic Republic of Iran proposed, were, first, the importance of reaffirming the validity of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and the need for its strict observance by all Member States; secondly, the need for the elaboration of international instruments, with emphasis on in particular the role of the Secretary-General in carrying out investigations of reported violations of the Protocol; thirdly, the need for decisive action by the international community to prevent the use of chemical weapons; and fourthly, the need to condemn the repeated violations of the Geneva Protocol.

During our consultations, efforts were made to merge these ideas with those of others in a single draft resolution. We are happy to see now that a single draft resolution has been produced, taking into account our considerations as well. This compromise has been made to facilitate adoption of a single draft resolution by consensus, although our concerns are not met completely. Accordingly, we should like to express our support for the draft resolution introduced by the representative of Australia and we should like to see its adoption by consensus.

In conclusion, while withdrawing our draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.34, I should like to express our thanks to the delegations of Sweden and Australia for their untiring efforts in arriving at such a text.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : We shall now proceed to entertain explanations of vote or of the position of delegations before we proceed to take decisions on the draft resolutions in cluster 4.

Mr. FREIER (Israel) : The First Committee will presently be voting on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.15, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament". Most delegations will by now have made up their minds on how to vote, and any remarks

(Mr. Freier, Israel)

addressed to the Committee at this stage are unlikely to alter the balance of votes appreciably, if at all.

It would be a waste of the Committee's time were I to address my remarks to the sponsors and supporters of the draft resolution. They would readily have you unleash the panoply of condemnation and punishment against Israel without even bothering to reason their case. Arguing one's draft resolution is the convention of this Committee, and the sponsors of the draft resolution have paid their tribute to that convention. They have introduced the draft resolution with distorted facts and imputations of designs in order to lend an appearance of respectability to their unconditional hatred.

It is not to them but rather to those delegations which consider abstaining that I wish to explain what message they would be conveying to Israel. It is a message of acquiescence in all the draft resolution stands for. It is a message of neutrality between the threats - in word, deed and capacity - which the sponsors brandish against Israel and the absence of any threat from any responsible quarter in Israel. It is a message of neutrality between Israel's invitation to the States of the region to negotiate a nuclear-weapon-free zone and bolster such a zone by mutual arrangements, as sanctioned by the United Nations, and the Arab refusal to accept either - negotiation and mutual arrangements - and thereby to retain the option of waging wars against Israel, also in the future.

It is a message of neutrality between demands made on Israel, which no other State would be expected to accept, and Israel's exercise of its sovereign rights, which are not questioned with respect to any other State.

It is important for the First Committee to understand well the message conveyed by its votes. Israel is invited to have faith in international sponsorship for negotiations of a Middle East settlement. Members of the Committee will realize that abstention conveys the messages I have just touched upon.

Abstention is not a propitious augury for the international promotion of peace in

(Mr. Freier, Israel)

the Middle East. It rather tends by default to exacerbate the situation. It tends to encourage Arab intransigence and diminish Israel's confidence in the equity of the international community. Is this the message which this Committee wishes to convey?

Lastly, as I have said on previous occasions, Israel invites the Committee to register its objections on the draft resolution as a whole. The vote on the draft resolution as a whole is the only message conveyed by this Committee to the outside.

Mr. TEJA (India) : I wish to express my country's views on agenda item 52 and draft resolution A/C.1/42/L. 24, on which we are about to vote.

This year, once again, the Committee is about to take a decision on the proposal for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. This resolution has become an annual ritual. My delegation will *vote against* the draft resolution since it does not take into account the provisions contained in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. My delegation has supported certain proposals for nuclear-weapon-free zones in specific regions because they enjoyed the support of all the States of those regions. However, we have at the same time expressed our reservations about the efficacy and relevance of such potential measures, particularly in the light of the new universally authenticated finding of the nuclear winter studies.

I would therefore further state our position of principle based on the Final Document, which stipulates that nuclear-weapon-free zones can be established exclusively on the basis of *arrangements freely arrived at* among the States of the region and taking into account the characteristics of the region.

In so far as South Asia is concerned, it is evident that no consensus exists on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in that region. Therefore, the reintroduction of this proposal can only be described as a ritual in a completely unrealistic framework. In view of the characteristics of the region, it should be kept in mind that, adjacent to the proposed zone, nuclear weapons exist and continue to proliferate.

In such an environment, my delegation remains unconvinced of the relevance or the efficacy of the proposal contained in the draft resolution under consideration. It is our hope that all delegations which have subscribed to the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will, while voting on this proposal, bear in mind their solemn

(Mr. Teja, India)

commitment to the proposition that a nuclear-weapon-free zone can be established only by consensus and taking into account objectively the characteristics of the region. That is manifestly not the case in the proposal under consideration. My delegation is therefore once again compelled to vote against the draft resolution.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Sri Lanka): The delegation of Sri Lanka would like to explain its vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/42/L.24. Our traditional support for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia has been on the basis of the desirability of encouraging and supporting the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world with the ultimate aim of obtaining a world entirely free of nuclear weapons.

Paragraphs 60 to 63 of the Final Document of the first special session Of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament have dealt with the subject and so has the Declaration of the Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries at Harare, both conscientious pronouncements.

We realize that an effective zone can be established by consultation and on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at, among the States concerned in the region. The special characteristics intrinsic to each specific region or zone must, of course, be taken into account. The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia can reach fruition through the efforts primarily of the States in the proposed zone and we hope for a confluence of views on the concept.

We have noted the many comments made in respect of this initiative and on specific proposals which are referred to in the preamble to draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.24. Sri Lanka has already expressed its views in considerable detail to the Secretary-General, as have some other South Asian States, as reflected in the last paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution under discussion. We hope these will contribute significantly to the development of this initiative.

Mr. RABGYE (Bhutan) : The problem of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia has been under consideration by the General Assembly for several years now.

My delegation has in the past welcomed the reports of the governmental expert group on comprehensive study on the question of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in all its aspects. These and other reports have confirmed our belief that this is a complex matter and one that deserves careful consideration. My delegation has explained its position on the subject in this Committee at previous sessions of the General Assembly. We have always supported the draft resolutions in this Committee on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, particularly when all the members directly concerned have, after prior consultation, agreed to it. We believe that such a zone should be established with clear understanding, taking into account all the relevant factors that reflect a consensus on the part of the States directly concerned. Indeed, it should also be the result of a free agreement among the members concerned without external influence. Unfortunately, there have thus far been no prior consultations among Member States of the South Asian region, of which my country is a member.

We all appreciate that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone is important to all the Member States but security conditions must exist which differ from region to region. We recognize the complexity of this matter and the need for adequate prior consultation and agreement among the members directly concerned. Without which it will not be realistic and practical to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

In view of this, my delegation will vote against the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : The Committee will now vote on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 4.

(The Chairman)

Under agenda item 51, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", the representative of Egypt introduced draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.8, at the 21st meeting of the First Committee. Egypt is the sole sponsor of this draft resolution and it was his hope that the Committee would adopt it without a vote. May I take it that the Committee adopts this draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.8 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): This brings us to agenda item 68, "Israeli nuclear armament". The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.15 on this item, which was introduced by the representative of Iraq at the 26th meeting of the First Committee, on 30 October 1987. The sponsors of this draft resolution are: 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.

(The Chairman)

A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the seventh paragraph of the preamble.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahir iya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, Central African Republic, Dominican Republic, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malawi, Malta, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire

The seventh paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 80 votes to 10, with

33 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the tenth paragraph of the preamble.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Japan, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Spain, Togo, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaïre

The tenth paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 73 votes to 23, with

25 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, 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, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Ireland, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Nepal, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Solomon Islands, Togo, Uruguay, Zaire

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 76 votes to 20, with 27 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 4.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, 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, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, 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, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Jamaica, Lesotho, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Nepal, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Solomon Islands, Turkey, Uruguay, Zaire

Operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 72 votes to 25, with 24 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): A separate recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 5.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Ben'in, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Jamaica, Lesotho, Malawi, Malta, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Togo, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire

Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 74 votes to 24, with 25 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): We will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.15 as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahir iya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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 Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, Portugal, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.15, as a whole, was adopted by 86 votes to 3, with 44 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): We shall now proceed to agenda item 52, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.24, sponsored by Bangladesh and Pakistan, was introduced by the representative of Pakistan on 6 November 1987.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaïre, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Bhutan, India, Mauritius

Abstaining: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.24 was adopted by 95 votes to 3, with 33

abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): We shall now proceed to agenda item 48, entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/45 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)". Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.52 on this subject was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 31st meeting of the Committee, on 3 November 1987. The following countries have become sponsors of this draft resolution: Bahamas, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, 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, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, France, Guyana

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.52 was adopted by 127 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Let us now proceed to agenda item 58, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa". Parts A and B of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.63 have been introduced by the representative of Madagascar on behalf of the members.

Before proceeding to a decision on this draft resolution, I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): On behalf of the Secretary-General, I am pleased to make the following statement with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.63.

(Mr. Kheradi)

By operative paragraph 9 of Part A of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.6? the Secretary-General would be requested to provide all necessary assistance that the Organization of African Unity (OAU) may seek regarding the modalities and elements for the preparation and implementation of the relevant convention or treaty on the denuclearization of Africa.

On the basis of consultations with the sponsor and with other representatives of the Group of African States, it is the understanding of the Secretariat that any such request for assistance that may be forthcoming will not have financial implications in 1988.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French, : The Committee will now

proceed to vote on part A of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.63, entitled

"Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.63 (A) was adopted by 129 votes to none, with

4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : The Committee will now proceed to vote on part B of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.63, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.63 B was adopted by 113 votes to 4, with

14 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : I shall now call on those

- speakers who wish to explain their vote.

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel) : With regard to the draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.8, Israel is once again pleased to be able to join the consensus on the draft resolution adopted under agenda item 51. This is, as in the past, subject to the position of the Government of Israel communicated by the Permanent Representative of Israel to the Secretary-General on 13 June 1985 and published in document A/40/383 and incorporated by the Secretary-General into his report A/40/442, as well as in the letter of the Permanent Representative of Israel dated 6 May 1986, published in the 1986 report of the Secretary-General on this item, A/41/465 and Add. 1.

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

With regard to part B of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.63, my delegation, unfortunately, was unable to vote for the proposed draft resolution because of the unfair naming of Israel in paragraphs of the preamble.

We have on many occasions, both in this Organization and in other forums, made known our abhorrence and total condemnation of apartheid and South Africa's régime of racial discrimination. Twice this year the Israeli Government has adopted a series of decisions, the purpose of which was drastically to curtail its relations with South Africa. As far as the alleged nuclear collaboration is concerned, my

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

Government has often categorically rejected that allegation. This is borne out by the statement of the Secretary-General, which I mentioned earlier in the debate, in his report of 1981:

"With regard to the question of a possible nuclear collaboration between Israel and South Africa . . . until specific examples of actual nuclear exchanges or transactions could be cited as clear evidence of such co-operation, the whole question remained in a state of uncertainty."

(A/36/431, para. 13)

Subsequent reports - A/40/520 of 9 August 1985 and A/42/581 of 16 October 1987 do not revert to the subject. That is very logical: since there has been no nuclear collaboration between the States, there were no specific examples to find and nothing to report.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish to explain my delegation's vote regarding the consensus on draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.8, presented by the delegation of Egypt. Iraq is convinced that the first essential step towards the creation of a nuclear-weapons-free zone in the Middle East is for all the States of the region, especially Israel, whom reports confirm as a possessor of significant nuclear facilities and the actual capability to produce and possess nuclear weapons, to declare their renunciation of the possession of nuclear weapons and their acceptance of accession to the non-proliferation Treaty, or agreement to place all of their nuclear facilities under international safeguards

Our support for the creation of a nuclear-weapons-free zone in the Middle East has led us to join the consensus.

Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom): I should like to explain why the United Kingdom was unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.63 A on the

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa and A/C.1/42/L.63 B on the nuclear capability of South Africa, which have just been adopted.

The United Kingdom fully supports the Governments of the independent States of Southern Africa in their efforts to guarantee and safeguard their territorial integrity and national sovereignty. We believe that South Africa should accede to the non-proliferation Treaty at the earliest opportunity, since it is in the interest of all, especially that of the population of South Africa and its neighbours, that there should be no nuclear weapons in the region.

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

We note the South African Government's recent statement on **its** decision to open discussions with a view to signing a non-proliferation treaty and its reference to a subsequent safeguards agreement with IAEA. We hope that it will now take steps to implement that.

As we have stated on many occasions, the United Kingdom does not collaborate in any way with South Africa in the development of its civil nuclear power programme. We, together with the other member States of the European Community have prohibited all new collaboration with South Africa in the nuclear sector. There is absolutely no question of our providing the South African Government with assistance in the development of a nuclear-weapon capability. Nevertheless, all States have the right to apply and develop programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, a right that is internationally recognized and set out in a number of international instruments.

WO also note that these resolutions contain judgements which either are insufficiently substantiated or are more properly matters for the Security Council.

Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish) : I should like briefly to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.15, on the subject of Israel's nuclear capability. Venezuela abstained on the seventh paragraph of the preambular. This position is consistent with the position of my country at the thirty-first session of the General Conference of IAEA in connection with resolution GC(XXXI)/RES/470 of the General Conference, which is referred to in that paragraph. We abstained on that resolution, and we have abstained on this.

Secondly, Venezuela abstained on the tenth preambular paragraph, which refers to "the declared Israeli policy of attacking and destroying nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful purposes" as part of the nuclear armament policy of that country. In our opinion, there is an omission here, as no reason is given for this. If Israel had a deliberate policy of attacking nuclear facilities devoted to

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

peaceful purposes, we should be the first to denounce it, but I think a stand by the General Assembly such as the one taken here should be fully substantiated.

We also abstained on operative paragraph 5. Last year we abstained on a paragraph with exactly the same wording, in what became General Assembly resolution 41/93. Our vote on this paragraph is consistent with the position that my country took at the General Conference of IAEA. We feel that in view of the treatment given to this question the subject has been adequately considered.

With the reservations we have just stated, we voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, because it is consistent with earlier General Assembly resolutions on the same subject, of which my delegation voted in favour.

Mr. MLLOJA (Albania) : The Albanian delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.24, A/C.1/42/L.52 and A/C.1/42/L.63. At the same time we joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.8. Our votes in favour of these draft resolutions are in line with the principles and consistent stand of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania against the frenzied nuclear arms race and its extension to various regions of the world, threatening peace and security.

We have always been against the escalation of that race and the deployment of nuclear arms far and wide over our planet. Sharing this common concern, the Albanian delegation is of the opinion that it is for the peoples and Governments of the countries concerned to decide upon the creation of such nuclear-free zones. However, the Albanian delegation has reservations concerning the effectiveness of such zones, because of the huge existing nuclear arsenals possessed by the two super-Powers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union. We hold that the non-possession of such weapons by a country, a region or a continent does not reduce the threat posed by the potential of 50,000 nuclear warheads of the super-Powers. Their use would be no less catastrophic for those that do not possess such weapons.

(Mr. Mlloja, Albania)

We hold that peace and genuine security can be achieved by ending the arms race once and for all, dismantling and removing United States and Soviet missile bases from foreign countries, and halting all other projects that increase the danger of atomic war or other wars.

Mr. ANDERSEN (Iceland): I have taken the floor to explain the votes of Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden and my own country, Iceland, on parts A and B of resolution A/C.1/42/L.63, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa".

Our countries' strong condemnation of apartheid in all its forms and manifestations has been voiced on many occasions. This condemnation is based on the traditional Nordic concepts of justice, freedom and democracy and on our belief in the equality and dignity of every human being. Apartheid is a fundamental violation of these values. The position of the Nordic Governments has recently again been demonstrated in the economic and other measures against South Africa taken by all Nordic Governments further to restrict co-operation with South Africa in order to increase international pressure on the South African Government.

The Nordic countries also share the concern expressed in these resolutions that South Africa might acquire nuclear weapons. Such a development would be a major set-back for the international efforts with a view to non-proliferation and would add to the already grave threat to international peace and security caused by the policy of apartheid.

For these reasons, our delegations have voted in favour of the two draft resolutions. However, in doing so our delegations had reservations because of some of the formulations used in both those draft resolutions. First, because of the strict adherence of the Nordic countries to the provisions of the Charter, we must in general reserve our position with regard to formulations which fail to take into account the proper division of competence between the Security Council and the

(Mr. Andersen, Iceland)

General Assembly. Secondly, the Nordic countries deplore the inappropriate and selective mentioning of individual countries or groups of countries. This makes it more difficult to reach an international consensus in dealing with the question of South Africa. Thirdly, the General Assembly, being composed of delegations representing Member States, should address itself to Governments rather than to private citizens and enterprises.

These are the considerations on which most of our reservations are based. A 8
regards specific paragraphs, I should like to add that we have reservations concerning operative paragraph 7 of part A, "Implementation of the Declaration".

M K. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish) : My delegation wishes to explain its abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.52, "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/45 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)".

Cuba welcomes the efforts of the Government of Mexico that led to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America, which is covered by the Treaty of Tlatelolco. We also welcome the efforts to ensure that that zone is respected by everyone. Cuba is not opposed to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, we support the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of agreements which are freely entered into by the States of the various regions and which ensure that these zones are really free of nuclear weapons.

In the case of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, however, there are very precise circumstances that continue to make it impossible for Cuba to adhere to that instrument. Cuba cannot give up its right to defend its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity by using whatever weapons it deems appropriate, when the only nuclear Power in our hemisphere maintains on Cuban territory a military base that has been imposed against the will of the people and the Government of Cuba and when, moreover, it maintains its attitude of hostility and military, political and economic aggression against Cuba.

Mr. YAMADA (Japan) : I should like to explain my vote on some draft resolutions under cluster 4 .

Japan voted in favour of the draft resolution (A/C.1/42/L.24) on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, as well as the draft resolution (A/C.1/42/L.63 A j) on the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

It has been the view of my Government that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in South Asia and in Africa, or in any other region for

(Mr. Yamada, Japan)

that matter, would be conducive to the objective of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and to the peace and security of the region in question. My delegation, however, would reiterate its view that the establishment of such a zone requires the fulfilment of a number of conditions. Some of the important conditions are: that it should be agreed upon on the initiative of the countries in the region and by all the countries concerned, including the nuclear-weapon States, as the case may be; and that it should strengthen the peace and security not only of the region but of the world. My delegation also considers it highly desirable that all the countries in the region concerned should adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Japan abstained on the draft resolution (A/C.1/42/L.15) on Israeli nuclear armament, because it contains several paragraphs on which we have reservations or on which we cannot make a judgement owing to the lack of objective information.

We have listened carefully to the accusations as well as the defence on the question of Israeli nuclear armament. Japan, as an ardent supporter of the Non-Proliferation Treaty régime, is disturbed over the persistent news of the Israeli nuclear armament. Japan earnestly hopes that the Government of Israel undertakes the legal commitment of not acquiring nuclear weapons by acceding to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and thus removes the apprehension of the international community.

MR. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): The United States delegation was pleased to have joined in the consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.8, concerning the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons in the Middle East.

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.8 contains a preambular paragraph that emphasizes the need for appropriate measures on the question of the prohibition of military attacks on nuclear facilities. Regarding the general question of the prohibition of military attacks on nuclear facilities, which arises in a number of draft resolutions addressed by the Committee, including this one, I should like to take this occasion to note that the nuclear facilities of nations at peace are protected by the provisions of the United Nations Charter concerning the use of force; and that when nations are engaged in active hostilities, long-standing laws and customs of war prohibit attacks against facilities which are not legitimate military objectives, as well as attacks which would cause disproportionate civilian casualties. In our view, States should comply with existing international obligations. We continue to believe that the question of additional legal protection against attacks on nuclear facilities should be considered separately from the question of a ban on radiological weapons.

The United States is a strong, long-time supporter of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, and we have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.52, which the delegation of Mexico put forward on the subject. I should like to offer, however, an observation on the draft resolution and on the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

The draft resolution that has just been adopted singles out the one country eligible to join Tlatelolco's Additional Protocol I that has not yet done so. At the same time, there are States in the region that are eligible to join the Tlatelolco Treaty for which the Treaty is not in force. Moreover, some of these States are developing sensitive nuclear technologies outside of international safeguards.

The draft resolution that has been adopted states that it is not fair that the peoples of certain territories in the nuclear-free zone are deprived of the

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

benefits of denuclearization available to them under Protocol 1. Is it any less fair to the regional States that have brought the Tlatelolco Treaty into force not to have legally binding, concrete and verifiable assurances that their neighbours' nuclear activities are dedicated exclusively to peaceful purposes? We do not think

We would urge those States that have not yet brought the Treaty and Protocol I into force to do so. For only when the Treaty of Tlatelolco and its Protocols are in force for all eligible States can it make its full contribution to regional and hemispheric security.

Mr. MOLANDER (Sweden) : I should like to explain the Swedish delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.24, concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

As is well known, Sweden has on several occasions expressed its positive attitude with regard to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Such zones could have confidence-building effects as well as a positive influence on the political climate and the security situation in the region.

(Mr. Molander, Sweden)

The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone requires the non-possession of nuclear weapons by zonal States and the absence and non-deployment of nuclear weapons in such States. Another essential element is the commitment by the nuclear-weapon States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against targets within the zone. As to concrete proposals for such zones, one basic prerequisite must, however, be acceptance and co-operation with regard to zone initiative by all States in the region.

In line with this principle, Sweden has had to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.24 regarding the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, as it was apparent that not all States concerned were prepared to support that draft resolution.

Mr. WAYARABI (Indonesia): The Indonesian delegation wishes to explain briefly its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.24 concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia which the Committee has just adopted. My delegation's position regarding the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is well known. We fully subscribe to paragraph 33 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which states that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones constitutes an important disarmament measure.

However, in order to ensure that such zones are genuinely free from nuclear weapons and are respected by the concerned zonal States and nuclear-weapon States alike, paragraph 33 rightly stipulates that their establishment should be based on agreements or arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the zone concerned and full compliance with those agreements or arrangements. Since countries in the region of South Asia are still in the process of achieving agreement on this issue, my delegation believed that it should abstain on the draft resolution.

Mr. de LA BAUME (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation in its turn would like to explain its vote on some of the draft resolutions that have just been adopted. First of all, my delegation had to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.52 on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/45, concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol 1 of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. France cannot agree to be specifically referred to when other countries situated within the area of application of the Treaty have not signed or as yet ratified the Treaty, or have not as yet made use of the clause which makes it possible for the Treaty to come into effect immediately with respect to them before all the countries which are to ratify the Treaty or its Protocols become parties to those instruments. The French Government will therefore, in due course, take the necessary decision regarding the ratification of Additional Protocol 1 in the light of the state of the ratification of the Treaty itself.

My delegation also wishes to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C. 1/42/L.63 A and A/C. 1/42/L.63 B, which deal with the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. It was with great regret that the French delegation found itself compelled to abstain on draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.63 A and to vote against draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.63 B. The French Government fully agrees with the fundamental purposes of those draft resolutions: the denuclearization of Africa and preventing South Africa from acquiring a nuclear military capability. It shares the concerns of African States about the use of force and the destabilization attempts by South Africa against countries in the region. France supports the principle that all States should refrain from any action that would further the proliferation of nuclear arms. Lastly, we believe that South Africa should place all its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. Therefore, the French delegation is fully

(Mr. de La Baume, France)

in accord with the • poneore of draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.63 A and draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.63 B. But at the same time, we attach great importance to the necessary distinction between the peaceful use o f nuclear power and its use for military purposes, and we do not believe that this distinction has been made sufficiently clear in draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.63 A. Furthermore, we feel that the views expressed regarding the possession and development of military capability by South Africa go beyond what we would have considered useful.

Concerning draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.63 B, we find that that indispensable distinction between civilian and military uses of nuclear power is not mentioned in it a t all, and in view of the importance we attach to that distinction, we were forced to vote against the draft resolution this year, as we have done in previous years with similar draft resolutions.

Mr. van SCHAIK (Netherlands) : My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.52 concerning the Treaty o f Tlatelolco. The Kingdom of the Netherlands attaches great importance to efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear arms, o n the basis of nuclear-weapon-free zones in certain regions of the world. The countries of Latin America deserve our praise for having succeeded in agreeing o n a Treaty to which 23 sovereign States are already parties. A s has been recalled in the draft resolution, three States with territories inside Latin America - among which is the Kingdom of the Netherlands - have become parties to Additional Protocol I. In this way the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba are also entitled to receive the benefits deriving from the Treaty.

In the draft resolution mention is made of the fact that a fourth country should also take the opportunity to seek accession to the Protocol. Permit me to add that m y Government is also disappointed at the fact that the Treaty has not entered into force for two countries on the Latin American continent, in particular

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

because those countries possess developed nuclear technologies. As long as the zone of application of the Treaty does not cover the entire area, its effectiveness runs the risk of being undermined.

Permit me in this context to quote from the report of the General Secretary of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (OPANAL), Dr. Antonio Stempel Paris, to the tenth session of OPANAL, which was held at Montevideo from 27 to 30 April 1987:

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

"It is not necessary to restate the reasons by which it is indispensable that the zone is integrated as soon as possible, nor to add on the negative effects on the efficiency of the Treaty produced by the fact that this instrument is not yet in force for a reduced number of States. Again, it is convenient to point out that a joint effort by all Governments of Member States is required to achieve the final step of this process, particularly now that nuclear weapons proliferation represents a growing danger and that some countries in the region have attained spectacular accomplishments in the field of nuclear technology."

My Government hopes that soon all States concerned will become parties to the Treaty or as the case may be to the Additional Protocol I.

Mr. MASHHADI-GHAHVEHCHI (Islamic Republic of Iran) : Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.8, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, was introduced by Iran in 1974, and we are glad to see that it has gained the support of the international community.

The Islamic Republic of Iran believes that because of the importance and sensitivity of our region, the possession of such weapons poses a grave threat to the peoples of the region as well as a menace to international peace and security. The international community must exert pressure on Israel to make it abide by the safeguards set by the International Atomic Energy Agency and in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

By the same token, my country supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all parts of the world. As one of the sponsors of the resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South-East Asia in 1974, we believe that establishment of such regions will contribute to the easing of tension and prevent further proliferation of nuclear weapons throughout the world.

Mr. ROWE (Australia) : I wish to explain the Australian vote on two draft resolutions in cluster 4.

First, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.15, on Israeli nuclear armament, Australia abstained on the draft resolution as a whole because of several paragraphs which caused us concern.

In particular operative paragraph 5, in requesting the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to suspend scientific collaboration with Israel, and operative paragraph 4, in calling upon all States and organizations that have not yet done so to discontinue co-operation with and giving assistance to Israel in the nuclear field, could have implications for Israel's rights and privileges of membership in IAEA. This is contrary to Australia's belief in the universality of membership of international organizations. Accordingly, we voted against these two operative paragraphs.

Moreover, the tenth paragraph of the preamble implies that it is Israel's policy to attack and destroy nuclear facilities developed for peaceful purposes and that this forms part of an Israeli nuclear armaments policy. We have no evidence of such an Israel policy at the present time. Accordingly, we also voted against that paragraph.

While Australia abstained on the draft resolution as a whole, I wish nevertheless to state for the record that we are concerned at the failure of Israel, and a small number of other countries, to become a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons or at least to accept full-scope safeguards on their nuclear facilities.

In relation to the two parts of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.63 on "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa", Australia abstained on part B. Our decision to abstain on this draft resolution was determined by several aspects of the draft with which we could not agree. Foremost among them was a reference, in the thirteenth paragraph of the preamble, to

(Mr. Rowe, Australia)

"certain Western states and Israel". This singling out of States by name should not in our view be an acceptable practice in a draft resolution such as this and it is, we consider, unhelpful.

In the ninth paragraph of the preamble, the sponsors of this draft resolution made reference to "South Africa's nuclear weapon capability". We have heard many such unsubstantiated assertions in the past. My delegation does not therefore regard this reference as being at all helpful in the Committee's consideration of this important matter.

For these reasons, we abstained, as I said, on this draft resolution.

Mr. BRACEGIRDLE (New Zealand) : New Zealand has been pleased to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.24, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

As a party to the Treaty declaring the South Pacific a nuclear-weapon-free zone - the second nuclear-weapon-free zone covering an inhabited area of the globe's surface - our belief in the utility of such zones in suitable areas is strong. As our positive vote will have made clear, New Zealand supports the proposal that the States of South Asia should make all possible efforts to establish such a zone.

New Zealand welcomes the declarations by South Asian States, referred to in the fourth paragraph of the preamble, reaffirming their undertaking to devote their nuclear programmes exclusively to the economic and social advancement of their peoples. In that regard, New Zealand's support for this draft resolution is without prejudice to its view that proven mechanisms exist to ensure confidence in, and facilitate development of, peaceful nuclear programmes. As a firm supporter of the Treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and a system of safeguards agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency, New Zealand commends these measures to all States.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : The Committee can now take decisions on the draft resolutions in cluster 5, omitting A/C.1/42/L.2 and A/C.1/42/L.10, on which consultations are still in progress. Therefore, we shall take decisions on the other drafts, A/C.1/42/L.21, L.25, L.27, L.49 and L.57.

I now call on the representative of Ghana for an explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. DUMEVI (Ghana) : I wished to comment on draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.2 and A/C.1/42/L.10. Now, since the consultations on these draft resolutions are continuing, I wish to defer my delegation's explanation to an appropriate time.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : The Committee will now proceed to take a decision, first, on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.21, submitted under agenda item 62 (d) entitled "General and complete disarmament" and subtitled "Nuclear disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of China at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee, on 4 November 1987. It has only one sponsor, China.

May I also draw the Committee's attention to the fact that the sponsor of the draft resolution has expressed the hope that this resolution will be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I will take it that it is so agreed.

The draft resolution was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : The Committee will now consider agenda item 66 (j), which is entitled: "Review of the implementation and recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament". The Committee has before it draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.25, which was introduced by the representative of Argentina at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 3 November 1987. It is sponsored by the following countries: Argentina, Bangladesh, Cameroon, German Democratic Republic, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Romania, Sweden, United Republic of Tanzania and Venezuela.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, 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, Zaïre, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Denmark, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Spain

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.25 was adopted by 110 votes to 13, with 7 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The Committee will now consider draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.27, which was introduced by the representative of India at the 32nd meeting of the Committee, on 4 November 1987. It is submitted under agenda item 63 (d), entitled "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly" and subtitled "Freeze on nuclear weapons". It is sponsored by India and Romania.

A recorded vote has been requested.

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

A recorded vote was taken?

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, 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, Japan, Spain

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.27 was adopted by 113 votes to 12, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.49, submitted under agenda item 62 (f) entitled "General and complete disarmament" and subtitled "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 33rd meeting of the Committee, on 4 November 1987. It is sponsored by the following countries: Algeria, Austria, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Botswana, Cameroon, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Norway, New Zealand, Netherlands, Philippines, Romania, Samoa, Sweden and Uruguay.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour Albania, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladorh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Niger ia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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 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.1/42/L.49 was adopted by 125 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The last draft resolution in cluster 5 on which the Committee is to take action is A/C.1/42/L.57, submitted under item 63 (g), entitled "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly: implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/61 on a nuclear arms freeze". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 36th meeting of the Committee, on 9 November 1987. It is sponsored by the following countries: Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Romania and Sweden.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote has been requested.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, 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, Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: China, Spain

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.57 was adopted by 114 votes to 13, with

2 abstentions*

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : We have therefore concluded consideration of votes in clusters 4 and 5 scheduled for this afternoon.

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

Mr. YAMADA (Japan) : I should like to explain my vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.27 for a freeze on nuclear weapons and draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.57 on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/60 I on a nuclear-arms freeze. Japan abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.27 and voted against draft

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

(Mr. Yamada, Japan)

resolution A/C.1/42/L.57. We have done so because we have serious reservations about the practicability or meaningfulness of these nuclear-arms freeze proposals. I must, however, 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. Japan has been engaged in such efforts at the United Nations, the Conference on Disarmament and at various other international forums, and takes an active interest in such issues as the nuclear-test ban.

We welcome the prospect of a treaty, to be concluded shortly between the United States and the Soviet Union, on the elimination of the intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles and continue to urge the two Governments to make progress soon in other areas, including a 50 per cent reduction in strategic nuclear-offensive arms. In the process of the realization of nuclear disarmament, we cannot - and should not - overlook the situation where the balance of military capability plays a role in maintaining an equilibrium at a higher level.

Nuclear freeze, unless immediately followed by firm and dedicated reconstructive arrangements for a balanced reduction in nuclear arms, can lead to the preservation of a real or perceived nuclear superiority of one side over the other. Such an outcome could bring about a destabilization of the basic subject of international security.

It must also be pointed out that verification, the vital importance of which is now widely recognized, is extremely difficult to apply to nuclear freeze. These are the basic reasons why we could not support the two draft resolutions.

Mr. de L a BAUME (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to explain why my delegation voted against the two draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.27 and A/C.1/42/L.57 on a nuclear-arms freeze. Our objections are well known. They concern the very concept of a freeze, on which our position has often been put forward.

(Mr. de la Baume, France)

First, we believe that a freeze, by definition, would make permanent existing situation8 and, therefore, any imbalance at the present time would be perpetuated, as would risks for the States concerned. A freeze would also give any State that had significantly increased its weapons a lasting advantage over those countries that had not made such an effort.

Furthermore, it would be very difficult to verify a freeze and the negotiations to establish one would be just as long and complex as negotiations on the reduction of weapons. Moreover, a freeze, since it might benefit one Power, could hinder negotiations and therefore undermine the willingness of a country to engage therein.

These are the reasons why my delegation voted against draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.27 and A/C.1/42/L.57.

Mr. BRACFGIRDLE (New Zealand): New Zealand has been unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.25 on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament. We have particular difficulty with two of the preambular paragraphs in the draft resolution which are critical of the doctrine of nuclear deterrence. We recognize that those two paragraphs comprise quotations from other documents and are not assertions contained in the draft resolution directly. Nevertheless, the language in those paragraphs is strong.

In New Zealand's view, the problem underlying the nuclear-arms race is not deterrence, as such. Deterrence has underpinned the security policies of a number of States and alliances since the Second World War and New Zealand respects and recognizes the reasons that have led to that situation. Rather, the problem seems to us to lie in the quantity of nuclear weaponry that has built up over the years. There is clearly too much nuclear weaponry and it needs to be reduced through mutual, balanced and verifiable agreements which ensure that security is preserved at each step of the way.

(Mr. Bracegirdle, New Zealand)

New Zealand has been very pleased, accordingly, to observe and give encouragement to the progress that has been made by the two major nuclear-weapon States in their negotiations to reduce their stockpiles of nuclear weapons. We hope that these negotiations will succeed in reaching their first goal next month when a treaty on intermediate and short range nuclear weapons is expected to be signed leading to further substantial reductions in the level of nuclear weaponry in due course. New Zealand would hope that this Committee would focus its attention on that particular problem, the level of nuclear weaponry. New Zealand has, therefore, been obliged to abstain on that draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I should now like to announce the programme for tomorrow.

As regards the group of draft resolutions in cluster 6, the sponsors have asked for a little more time because they wish to conduct negotiations on this subject until Friday, 13 November, so the Committee will not be in a position to consider cluster 6 tomorrow.

As regards cluster 8, since a revised draft resolution has just been introduced by the representative of Australia, and since a document spelling out the financial implications of that draft resolution is to be prepared, the Committee will not be in a position to consider cluster 8.

What I suggest is that we turn to cluster 7, that is, draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.7, L.26 and L.28. Then I suggest we turn to cluster 9, which includes draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.23, L.30, L.46, L.50, L.58/Rev.1, L.62, L.65 and Corr.1, and L.72. We shall also be considering cluster 10, which includes draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.12, L.18, L.35 and L.73. There is a revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.12, which will be circulated tomorrow morning.

We shall also be taking up cluster 11, which contains draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.22, L.42, L.48, L.54 and L.66.

If we have enough time, we shall also take up cluster 12, which includes draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.40 and L.54.

LETTER FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): You will recall that on 19 October 1987, a document entitled "Letter dated 12 October 1987 from the Chairman of the Fifth Committee addressed to the Chairman of the First Committee"

(The Chairman)

was circulated to the First Committee under the symbol A.C.1/42/6. It concerns the request to Main Committees, including the First Committee, to communicate to the Fifth Committee their views on the document entitled "Some perspectives on the work of the United Nations in the 1990s", included in the note by the Secretary-General on the preparation of the next medium-term plan, document A/42/512, together with a summary of the preliminary views expressed by members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, in keeping with paragraphs 86-99 of document A/42/16 (Part II). This is part of the process of ensuring the full participation of Member States in the preparation of the introduction to the next medium-term plan, as mandated by the General Assembly in resolution 41/213.

This matter was subsequently brought to the attention of the open-ended Group of the Friends of the Chairman and, following discussions in that Group, the Committee's Bureau also addressed the issue.

At a meeting this morning of the informal open-ended Group of the Friends of the Chairman, the Group endorsed the recommendation of the Committee's Bureau with respect to the text of a letter to be transmitted on the subject by the Chairman of the First Committee to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee.

At this stage, I should like to call upon the Secretary of the Committee to read into the record of the Committee the text of the letter to which I have just referred.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The substantive part of the text of the letter to which the Chairman has just referred would read as follows:

"I have the honour to refer to your letter, dated 12 October 1987, requesting the First Committee to communicate to the Fifth Committee its views on the paper entitled 'Some perspectives on the work of the United Nations in the 1990s', included in the note by the Secretary-General on the preparation

(Mr. Kheradi)

of the next medium-term plan (A/42/512), together with a summary of the preliminary views expressed by members of the Committee on Programme and Co-ordination (A/42/16, (Part II), paras. 86-99), as part of the process of ensuring the full participation of Member States in the preparation of the introduction to the next medium-term plan, as mandated by the Assembly in resolution 41/213.

"I wish to inform you that the content of the communication received from you was brought to the attention of the First Committee (A/C.1/42/6).

"In view of the importance and sensitivity of the subject-matter involved, and due to the forthcoming third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which is expected to set up further guidelines in the field of disarmament, the Committee is not, at this stage, in a position to express definitive views. Further, the members of the Committee would like to have more time at their disposal in order to give greater consideration to this issue and to consult their respective capitals. It has been agreed that the Committee will be in a better position to assess the situation more fully at the forty-third session of the General Assembly next year."

The letter is signed by the Chairman of the First Committee and is addressed to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): May I take it that the First Committee authorizes its Chairman to transmit to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee the text which has just been read into the Committee's records?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : I shall now call on those delegations which wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply, in keeping with the generally accepted procedure already agreed upon.

Mr. de La BAUME (France) (interpretation from French) : My delegation cannot leave unanswered the statement made before the Committee on 6 November by the representative of Samoa on behalf of the countries of the South Pacific Forum, Members of the United Nations.

Everyone has known for some years now that French nuclear tests are conducted under conditions of total security and safety and that their effects are harmless both to the population and to the environment. The conclusions of experts, both national and international, who have studied those effects, particularly the mission sent out in 1903 by Dr. Atkinson, the Director of the National Laboratory of Irradiation of Christchurch in New Zealand, are perfectly clear on that point. I should like to record, furthermore, that those tests are carried out on Mururoa Atoll, which is an integral part of the territory of the French Republic. That being so, the questioning of our nuclear tests by countries situated some thousands of kilometres distant from where they are carried out has absolutely no scientific justification and is manifestly inspired by purely political concerns.

Finally, my country does not intend to give up its legitimate right to carry out, on French territory and within the framework of its sovereignty, actions which are necessary for its security, and which are in no way prejudicial to peace in the region, to the security of the States situated therein, to the health of the populations which live there, or to the environment.

Ms. MAUALA (Samoa) : The statement we have just heard from the representative of France, on its nuclear-weapon-testing programme in the Pacific, did nothing to alter the facts. There are no words that he can say that will alter

(Ms. Mauala, Samoa)

the facts. There are no words that will guarantee the safety of our region and make it immune from these tests. We who live in the South Pacific reject and oppose France's testing of its nuclear weapons in our region. It should stop those tests now.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.