

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FORTIETH SESSION

*Official Records**



1985

MAY 19 1987

FIRST COMMITTEE
41st meeting
held on
Monday, 18 November 1985
at 3 p.m.
New York

4/SA.1021.1014

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 41st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia)

CONTENTS

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

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

*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 IX.2.150, 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.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/40/PV.41
25 November 1985

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 AND 145 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This afternoon the Committee will take action on the draft resolutions in clusters 7 and 8.

Since no delegation wishes to make statements on the draft resolutions in cluster 7, I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions or votes before we take decisions.

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): I shall explain my delegation's position on both draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.11 and L.34.

During the past few years Brazil abstained in the vote on the draft resolutions submitted on the question of negative security assurances. As long as that question is approached by the nuclear-weapon Powers from the narrow point of view of their own security perceptions, it is our opinion that no progress can be made in the multilateral consideration of the matter. That is the position Brazil shares with the Group of 21 in the Conference on Disarmament.

The overwhelming importance attributed to such security perceptions by the nuclear-weapon Powers is at the root of the self-serving theories and doctrines through which they have endeavoured to legitimize their exclusive possession of nuclear weapons. In the process they have engaged in a further unbridled proliferation of such weapons in both the vertical and the geographical dimensions, thus endangering the security of all nations. All the while they have not taken into account the real needs of non-nuclear-weapon countries in this area. Through

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

unilateral declarations of guarantees which, with but one exception, contain qualifications and conditions that in fact render such declarations instruments of the policies and interests of the nuclear-weapon Powers themselves.

My delegation will therefore continue to abstain in the votes on such draft resolutions. Hence we shall do so in respect of draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.11 and L.34.

Mr. CAPPAGLI (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Argentina will abstain in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.11 and L.34, in keeping with the position it has shown on this issue at previous sessions of the General Assembly, since the value and credibility of negative guarantees are something on which we have reservations on the basis of past experience in my country. My delegation believes that, ultimately, the guarantees we pursue through these draft resolutions will be achieved only through nuclear disarmament and the elimination of weapons.

Draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.11 and L.34 in general reproduce the texts of resolutions adopted at the previous session of the General Assembly which have proved not to be the most appropriate way towards the urgent solutions required by this matter. Unfortunately, they have not promoted any progress. This exercise requires the real political will of its participants. It therefore seems unrealistic to expect negotiations under these texts to lead us to satisfactory agreements.

For all those reasons my delegation will abstain in the votes on them.

Mr. GONSALVES (India): The delegation of India will abstain in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.11 and L.34. It is my Government's considered view that the only credible assurance of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States is

(Mr. Gonsalves, India)

nuclear disarmament and the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. As long as the nuclear-weapon States have nuclear weapons in their arsenals and continue to predicate their security policies on the use of nuclear weapons, it will be futile for the non-nuclear-weapon States to seek assurances of security from them.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 7, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.11, which was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 30th meeting, on 7 November 1985.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, 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, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.11 was adopted by 122 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.34. It has 10 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the 33rd meeting on 11 November 1985. The sponsors are: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Mongolia, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.

*Subsequently the delegations of Bahamas, Djibouti, Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Burma, Chad, China, Colombia, Greece, Honduras, India, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Malaysia, Sweden, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.34 was adopted by 83 votes to 19, with 17 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote after the voting with regard to the draft resolutions in cluster 7.

Mr. WINGREN (Sweden): The purpose of my statement is to explain the votes of the Swedish delegation on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.11 and L.34 on effective international arrangements to ensure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

First, I should like to stress that satisfactory and effective negative security assurances, although sorely needed in the present situation, can represent

*Subsequently the delegations of Djibouti, Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates advised the secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Wingren, Sweden)

nothing but an interim measure pending effective nuclear disarmament. But since nuclear weapons exist, we certainly have to take them into account. The most fundamental element of an effective negative security assurance is obviously legally binding undertakings by the nuclear-weapon States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. Those States should not be obliged to make any further commitments than their positively declared choice to be and to stay nuclear-weapon free. That choice may have been or may be made by adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), to a treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone or in some other way to be defined, giving it international legal effect.

For that reason, my Government has reservations as to the idea of an international convention, which seems to imply further obligations to be imposed on non-nuclear-weapon States. My delegation therefore has abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.34, which clearly aims at the conclusion of such a convention - which is already mentioned in its title.

Although draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.11 also refers to the idea of a convention, it also gives consideration to other proposals designed to secure the objective of providing non-nuclear-weapon States with effective negative security assurance by the nuclear-weapon States. My delegation therefore supported draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.11.

Mr. IMAI (Japan): Japan voted against draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.34, "Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons". We note some improvements in that draft resolution compared with last year's resolution 39/57, such as the reference to a common approach that was not included in that resolution. However, the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution contain references to specific modalities of negative security assurances which

(Mr. Imai, Japan)

would seem to prejudge the work of the Conference on Disarmament. We also have considerable difficulties with some of the preambular paragraphs, which seem to contain one-sided assertions we cannot support. On the whole, we find draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.34 unbalanced and not objective, and we are therefore unable to change our previous voting attitude.

We voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.11. Although we have similar reservations about its references to a specific modality of negative security assurances in operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 5, we cast a favourable vote for that draft resolution because we believe it better reflects the work of the Conference on Disarmament, and we expect that continuous efforts will be made in the Ad Hoc Committee on negative security assurance in line with the common approach referred to in the draft resolution.

Mr. JESSEL (France) (interpretation from French): The delegation of France voted against draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.34. My country is against the approach envisaged in that draft resolution, for, on the one hand, it establishes a link between the granting of negative security assurances and the deployment of nuclear weapons on the territory of the State concerned and, on the other, it proposes that such assurances be included in a mandatory system that would govern relations between nuclear-weapon States, an approach we have rejected.

We consider that this represents a distortion of the concept of negative security assurances and that, as is already the case, such assurances can be offered by each nuclear-weapon State to non-nuclear-weapon States on an individual basis. In particular, we deplore the maintenance of the demand for non-deployment which, since 1978, has been an obstacle to the harmonization of the various formulas for negative security assurances.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take up the draft resolutions contained in cluster 8.

Since no delegation wishes to make a statement on the draft resolutions contained in this cluster, I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes before we take decisions on the draft resolutions in cluster 8.

Mr. PRIER (Israel): I should like to explain Israel's vote on two draft resolutions included in cluster 8: A/C.1/40/L.40 and L.63.

With regard to L.40, I should like to reiterate that Israel has no nuclear collaboration with South Africa. Israel will therefore be obliged to vote against L.40 because of its tenth preambular paragraph.

With respect to L.63, members have heard some of the 21 sponsors of the draft resolution. They are the most eloquent witnesses to the situation which Israel faces and has faced since its beginnings irrespective of subsequent events. One will seek in vain any opening for peace or negotiation in this draft resolution. We have never had this privilege on the part of the sponsors on the present issue or on any other. They seek no peace with Israel on any terms and deny its existence, to the point of denying it a name. We shall vote against the draft resolution and submit that many members of the Committee feel likewise and should register their convictions.

On the operative paragraphs of this draft resolution, we briefly recall our comments. On operative paragraph 1, we cannot relate to the report of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research for two reasons: first, Israel was singled out for investigation from among all the countries considered technically advanced in the nuclear field and non-parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and, secondly, the expert team was enjoined to consult with the League of Arab States, whose express business it is

(Mr. Prier, Israel)

and has been to co-ordinate military, economic and political action against Israel. No State would acquiesce in such treatment, nor will Israel.

On operative paragraph 2, Israel has declared that it will not be the first State to introduce nuclear weapons into the Middle East.

On operative paragraph 3, no country can accept, nor can Israel, that it can be told how best to serve the cause of non-proliferation, to which Israel subscribes. Israel has proposed, and continues to propose, a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, freely negotiated among the States of the region. The Tlatelolco and South Pacific precedents, and the recommendations of the Palme Commission, point the way. The negotiations leading to mutually binding arrangements and the joint administration of a nuclear-weapon-free zone inhibit local conventional wars; the NPT, for all its merits, does not, and the cessation of local wars with Israel, and irrespective of it, is a credible precursor of a credible nuclear-weapon-free zone in our region.

On operative paragraph 4, we all know the list of non-NPT States which are technically advanced. There cannot be one standard for them and another for Israel.

On operative paragraph 5, the reason for this injunction cannot be other than the attempt by the sponsors to coerce Member States and organizations to downgrade relations with Israel, as they try to do on any grounds and everywhere.

On operative paragraph 6, as I have said, no such collaboration in the nuclear field exists with South Africa. In fact, the sponsors would resolve that the earth was flat if Israel proposed that it was a sphere.

In conclusion, I submit that the passage of anti-Israel resolutions over the years by the sponsors and their associates has not served the cause of accommodation or peace. It has instead emboldened the sponsors and their

(Mr. Frier, Israel)

associates to engage the United Nations in the pursuit of their quarry. We have to resist these attempts and invite the United Nations not to acquiesce in the role assigned to it, but shift its pressure to the sponsors and challenge them to take up negotiations for a nuclear-weapon-free zone on the pattern to which the United Nations has given its repeated sanction and blessing.

Mr. GONSALVES (India): This Committee is once again about to take a decision on the proposal for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, which has become an annual ritual. My delegation has gone along with proposals for nuclear-weapon-free zones in certain regions because they enjoy the support of all the States of those regions, although we have at the same time expressed reservations about the efficacy of such partial nuclear disarmament measures, particularly in the context of the now well-authenticated nuclear winter findings.

(Mr. Gonsalves, India)

In regard to the nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, we would further elaborate our position of principle with the support of the provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which enjoys the unanimous support of the membership of the United Nations. That document stipulates categorically that nuclear-weapon-free zones can be established exclusively on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of a region and taking into account the characteristics of each region.

In their statements in this Committee, several delegations have taken care to recall these vital criteria. So far as South Asia is concerned, it has been abundantly evident that no consensus exists on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in that region. A reiteration, and support for this proposal, thus amounts not only to overlooking this critical criterion but also to putting the cart before the horse.

In regard to the characteristics of the region, it must be emphasized that in areas immediately adjacent to the proposed zone, nuclear weapons exist and continue to proliferate in menacing numbers both on land and at sea. In such a security environment, my Government remains totally unconvinced by seemingly related proposals for negative security assurances.

The proposal covered by draft resolution L.10 must, in realistic terms, be viewed in terms of a regional and global arms and nuclear weapons perspective, as also in terms of the process of regional confidence-building on which the States of the region continue to be engaged. It should be only too obvious that the establishment of a climate of mutual confidence must constitute the basis for, and necessarily precede, a variety of rhetorical proposals for arms limitation.

For the various weighty reasons I have cited, my delegation will vote against the proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia

(Mr. Gonsalves, India)

contained in L.10. It is our earnest hope that all delegations which have unreservedly subscribed to the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will, while voting on this proposal, bear fully in mind their solemn commitments to the proposition that a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia can be established only if and when all the States of the region have successfully and freely arrived at arrangements for the establishment of such a zone and that the characteristics of the region being proposed for a nuclear-weapon-free zone can objectively be seen as justifying the establishment of such a zone in South Asia. That is manifestly not the case under existing circumstances.

Mr. DHANAPALA (Sri Lanka): I should like to explain Sri Lanka's affirmative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.10 before the vote.

My delegation's support for the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones has been consistent. We would recall that paragraph 60 of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament recognized that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned constitutes an important disarmament measure. We therefore welcomed the conclusion this year of the South Pacific Nuclear-Free-Zone Treaty and have repeatedly expressed our support of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. We shall therefore vote for L.10, which concerns our own region. We are mindful, however, that paragraph 61 of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament requires that in the process of establishing such zones the characteristics of each region should be taken into account. Thus the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia must recognize the inherent characteristics of this region, and no model of such a zone anywhere else

(Mr. Dhanapala, Sri Lanka)

can be transplanted to this region. Nuclear-weapon-free zones must also evolve out of the expressed wishes of the countries of the region through consultations. They cannot be successful without the full consent and co-operation of all the States of the region. That has been very evident in the process that will culminate in December of this year with the Summit of South Asian Regional Co-operation to be held in Dacca.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other delegations wish to explain their votes before we take decisions, on the draft resolutions in cluster 8, we shall now proceed to take action beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.3/Rev.1. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Finland. There has been a request that this draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.3/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.10. It was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 30th meeting of the First Committee on 7 November 1985. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bhutan, India, Mauritius

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Poland, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Norway, Suriname, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.10 was adopted by 90 votes to 3, with 40 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.38. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mauritius on behalf of the Group of African States at the 35th meeting on 12 November 1985. The sponsors have requested that this draft resolution be adopted without a vote.

Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): We would request a vote on this draft resolution, please.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, 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, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.38 was adopted by 130 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.40. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mauritius on behalf of the Group of African States at the 35th meeting on 12 November 1985.

A recorded vote has been requested.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, 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, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

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

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.40 was adopted by 117 votes to 4, with 12 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.61. It has 18 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 32nd meeting on 8 November 1985. The sponsors are: Bahamas, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago and Uruguay.

A recorded vote has been requested.

* Subsequently the delegations of Zaire and Zimbabwe advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, 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, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Chad, Cuba, France, Guyana, Ivory Coast, Mali

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.61 was adopted by 126 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.63. This draft resolution has 23 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Iraq at the 36th meeting on 13 November 1985. The sponsors are: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen.

Separate recorded votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution. The Committee will first proceed to vote on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.63.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Malawi, Nepal, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Uruguay, Zaire

Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.L/40/L.63 was adopted by 85 votes to 23, with 19 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.L/40/L.63. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

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

Abstaining: Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Greece, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Mexico, Nepal, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Uruguay, Zaire

Operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.63 was adopted by 86 votes to 23, with 19 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.63, as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, United States of America

*Subsequently the delegation of Haiti advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.63, as a whole, was adopted by 92 votes to 2, with 40 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote after the voting on the draft resolutions in cluster 8.

Mr. JANKU (Albania): The Albanian delegation did not participate in the voting process on numerous draft resolutions related to various disarmament problems and on the strengthening of international peace and security. We should like to take this opportunity to place on the record the fact that our delegation dissociated itself from the consensus when those draft resolutions were adopted by consensus.

However, that does not mean that our country is against disarmament or the strengthening of international peace and security. On the contrary, our position is just and crystal-clear; it has been expressed in our statements both in the General Assembly and in this Committee. We share the concern and join our voice to the appeal of peace-loving peoples and countries for peace, international security and genuine disarmament.

On this occasion, the Albanian delegation would like once again to reiterate its reservations with regard to the aforementioned draft resolutions. As in the past, we continue to hold that it is the two super-Powers, American imperialism and Soviet socialist imperialism which by defying demands of world public opinion and challenging the resolutions of the United Nations and other international forums in conformity with their aggressive and hegemonistic policies, are continuously intensifying the arms race, which has now been extended to outer space.

(Mr. Janku, Albania)

For those reasons, we also did not participate in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60 because the United States of America and the Soviet Union may sit down and talk together, but as of now the facts have shown that the most they can agree on is to make deals at the expense of the peoples. In the view of the Albanian delegation any overestimation or illusion that the problems facing mankind will be solved by negotiations and agreements between the two super-Powers is fraught with grave consequences.

Nevertheless, we wish to point out that our delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.38 and 40, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa" and "Nuclear capability of South Africa," as well as draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.63, "Israeli nuclear armament." As we have made clear on earlier occasions, we reiterate today that our positive votes on these draft resolution is in line with our determined position in support of the struggle of the African peoples against the racist régime of South Africa and of the Arab peoples against the Israeli Zionists.

We should like, however, to stress that our support for those draft resolutions does not in any way affect our well-known and principled attitude regarding the establishment of so-called zones of peace or nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Mr. FISCHER (Federal Republic of Germany): The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany has voted, as it did last year, affirmatively on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.38. Our positive vote is designed to express the continuation of the high degree of identification with the objectives of the draft resolution, both as regards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa as a whole and the particular admonitions to the Republic of South Africa to refrain from any nuclear-weapon-related activities.

(Mr. Fischer, Federal Republic
of Germany)

Yet our doubts pertaining to the specific language of the draft resolution remain the same as last year's. In the second preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 1 the confines of the future nuclear-weapon-free zone are taken to comprise both the continent of Africa and "its surrounding areas". That term continues to give us difficulties, since it is ambiguous. It is unclear whether the "surrounding areas" would include additional territories or only sea areas, and what the extent of those areas would be. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany will, in any event, continue to give the strictest possible interpretation to that clause.

As regards paragraphs 3 and 4, we agree with the general thrust of the language intended to keep Africa free from nuclear weapons, and the Federal Republic of Germany will certainly do its utmost, within the limits of its legal possibilities, to contribute to that end. However, it should be noted that the language of those paragraphs is very broad. The reservations my Government has hitherto expressed with regard to possible broader interpretations will therefore remain valid.

Mr. HAUGE (Norway): I should like to explain the votes of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden and my own country, Norway, on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.38, on the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, and L.40, on the nuclear capability of South Africa. It is a highly deplorable fact that the situation in South Africa over the last year has gone from tense to explosive. Every day brings more news of violence, arrests and riots in a rising spiral of confrontation. The responsibility for these tragic developments rests firmly with the Government of South Africa, which is based on a political system that violates the most fundamental concepts of human rights, justice, freedom and democracy.

(Mr. Hauge, Norway)

In today's interdependent world, this practice, based on notions of racial supremacy, is not only morally wrong but is also a source of constant tension, representing a threat to international peace and security. In this situation, we share the deep concern that South Africa might acquire nuclear weapons. Such a development would constitute a major breach of the nuclear non-proliferation régime and pose a grave threat to international security.

Against that background, and in accordance with the Nordic countries' stand against the system of apartheid, as clearly demonstrated by the recently extended and strengthened joint Nordic programme of action against South Africa, we voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.38 and L.40.

As we have pointed out on previous occasions, we do, however, have some reservations on matters of principle caused by certain formulations in the draft resolutions. The Nordic countries do not support the arbitrary singling out of individual countries and groups of countries. Such statements can only make it more difficult to maintain an international consensus in dealing with the question of South Africa.

We must also reserve our position with regard to formulations which fail to take into account the proper division of competence between the main organs of the United Nations. It is our firm belief that the provisions of the Charter should be strictly adhered to.

Finally, I should like also to add that we have reservations concerning paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.38.

Mr. OKELY (Australia): The decision of the delegation of Australia to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/40/L.40, a draft resolution dealing with the issue of the nuclear capability of South Africa, should in no way be interpreted as condoning apartheid or as countenancing the thought of

(Mr. Okely, Australia)

a South Africa armed with nuclear weapons. Indeed, at the recent General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Australia voted in favour of resolution GC(XXIX)767/Rev.1, on South Africa's nuclear capability, which, inter alia, called on member States to halt all nuclear collaboration with South Africa and to take steps to halt the trade in Namibian uranium, and demanded that South Africa cease mining and exploiting Namibian uranium.

Australia's abstention is based on the fact that the draft resolution calls upon the Security Council to perform actions which, we believe, are beyond its constitutional powers, and on its making a condemnation of a specific State, a practice we consider to be generally unacceptable in the resolutions of the United Nations.

I should like to make it clear that Australia fully supports the intention of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.40, and endorses strongly the call on South Africa to become a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to place all its nuclear installations under IAEA safeguards.

Australia has chosen also to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.63, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament". We have done so principally for two reasons. The first relates to paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, which calls upon the Security Council to investigate Israel's nuclear activities and the collaboration of other States, parties and institutions in these activities. It is the clear view of my delegation that such action is beyond the competence of the Security Council. Indeed, such action, if it were to be carried out, could well involve, inter alia, an examination of Israel's relationship with the International Atomic Energy Agency, which would most definitely be outside the competence of the Council.

(Mr. Okely, Australia)

The second reason for Australia's abstention in the vote on this draft resolution lies in the call in paragraph 5 upon all States and organizations that have not yet done so to discontinue co-operating with and giving assistance to Israel in the nuclear field. It is the assessment of my delegation that the thrust of that paragraph could well have implications for Israel's rights and privileges of membership of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

While it is of lesser moment, the assumption in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution of continuing nuclear collaboration between Israel and South Africa, in our view, has not been substantiated.

Mr. ALI (Bangladesh): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.10, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. My delegation firmly believes that no effort for effective disarmament will ever be successful unless measures are taken to relax international tension and build confidence. It is in that context that at previous sessions my delegation has expressed its conviction that regional and international peace and security would be promoted through the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world. It is on the basis of that conviction that my delegation, as it has done with regard to similar draft resolutions in the past, voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.10.

It is, however, our sincere hope that necessary contacts and consultations will take place among the countries of the South Asian region to ensure unanimity on this issue, to define the limits of the zone and to deal with other important issues. We should like also to emphasize the need to undertake extensive consultations among all countries of the region with a view to evolving a consensus on this issue, without which the purpose of the draft resolution cannot be achieved.

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): I should like to explain briefly my delegation's votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.3, L.10, L.38, L.40, L.61 and L.63.

We have adhered to the consensus on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.38 and L.40, dealing with the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa and the nuclear capability of South Africa, respectively. The specific features of the African continent have been taken into account in formulating our final stand on those two texts.

We also joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.3 on the study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all their aspects and hope that the study will be completed in the near future, on the basis of all the views and opinions expressed. We are grateful to the sponsors of that draft resolution for having taken into account suggestions made to them by my delegation.

We abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.10, as we have done on previous occasions, because it fails to attract unanimous support in the region.

With reference to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.61 on the Treaty of Tlatelolco, Brazil has renewed its affirmative vote for it, because that Treaty is an international instrument which my country has signed, ratified and endeavoured to strengthen.

Brazil has again abstained in the separate vote on operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.63 on the question of Israeli nuclear armament. We believe that those paragraphs request the Security Council to undertake actions which go beyond the constitutional powers of that organ. Despite that, we have voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, as we have done on previous occasions.

In this connection I should like to sum up Brazil's position on the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We attach the utmost importance to the requirements

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

set forth in paragraphs 60 to 62 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament for the establishment of such zones. Other concerns have also arisen in view of the attitude of the nuclear-weapon Powers, particularly the continuing vertical and geographical proliferation of nuclear weapons in which they are engaged. Special attention must be paid to effective compliance by the nuclear-weapon Powers with the commitments that they have undertaken towards nuclear-weapon-free zones. Their compliance with those commitments must be strictly verified, so that the zones are genuinely free of nuclear weapons. Verification provisions should not be made to apply only to non-nuclear-weapon countries. Those considerations guided our attitude on the six draft resolutions on which we have just taken action.

Miss NIELSEN (Denmark): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.10 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. My delegation abstained in the vote on it. While fully subscribing to the thrust of the draft resolution, we consider a prerequisite for establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone, as recommended in it, that all countries in the region should agree to the establishment of such a zone. This view is also in accordance with paragraph 60 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly. We hope that it will soon prove possible to reach the required agreement within the region of South Asia.

Mr. ZHARKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union has consistently supported the efforts of the States of Africa to create a nuclear-weapon-free zone on that continent. We vigorously condemn any attempt by the racist Pretoria régime to acquire nuclear weapons and share indignation in connection with the activities of certain Western States and Israel, as well as transnational corporations, in being accomplices to South Africa's nuclear preparations.

(Mr. Zharkov, USSR)

Guided precisely by those considerations of principle, the Soviet delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.38. At the same time, in connection with its operative paragraph 1, the Soviet delegation would like to state that the creation of a nuclear-free zone on the African continent should be in keeping with the universally acknowledged principles of international law, in particular the principle of freedom of navigation on the high seas.

Mr. IMAI (Japan): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.10 and L.38. It has always been my delegation's view that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, Africa or any other region will contribute to the overall objective of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and to peace and security of the regions in question.

However, my delegation reiterates its view that the establishment of such a zone, if it is to strengthen the region's security, would require the fulfilment of a number of conditions, among them, for example, that it should be freely agreed upon by all the countries concerned, including a nuclear-weapon State as the case may be, and that it is based on the initiatives of the countries in the region. My delegation also considers it highly desirable for the realization of nuclear-weapon-free zones that all the countries in the region concerned adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.38 as a whole, my delegation also wishes to place on record that our vote in favour should not be construed as meaning that we are in full agreement with the assertions contained in some of its paragraphs which, in our view, are not necessarily based on conclusive evidence.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I should like to explain why the United Kingdom delegation was unable to support draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.38 and L.40, which were just adopted by the Committee.

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. While we note that South Africa has announced its intention to abide by the spirit of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), we believe that South Africa should accede to that Treaty at the earliest opportunity in order to reassure its neighbours and the world about its nuclear programme.

As we have stated on previous occasions, the United Kingdom does not collaborate in any way with South Africa in the development of its civil nuclear power programme; still less, of course, in the development of a nuclear-weapon capability. None the less, all States have the right to apply and develop programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. That right is internationally recognized and set out in a number of international instruments. It continues to be our view that it would be wrong to seek to limit this right in individual cases for political reasons.

Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): I have asked to be allowed to speak to explain my Government's position on several of the draft resolutions on which we have just voted that address the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones, specifically draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.10 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, A/C.1/40/L.61 on the Treaty of Tlatelolco, A/C.1/40/L.38 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, and A/C.1/40/L.40 on the nuclear capability of South Africa.

(Mr. Lowitz, United States)

In general, the United States supports the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones as a non-proliferation measure when consistent with the following criteria. The initiative for the creation of the nuclear-weapon-free zone should come from the States in the region concerned. All States whose participation is deemed important should participate in the zone. The zone arrangements should provide for adequate verification and compliance with the zone's provisions. The establishment of the zone should not disturb existing security arrangements to the detriment of regional and international security. The zone arrangements should effectively prohibit the parties to it from developing any nuclear explosive device for whatever purpose. The zone arrangements should not seek to impose restrictions on the exercise of rights recognized under international law, in particular the principle of freedom of navigation on the high seas and in international air space and in straits used for international navigation and the right of innocent passage through territorial areas. The establishment of a zone should not affect the existing right of its parties under international law to grant or deny transit privileges, including port calls and overflight to other States. Those are the criteria by which the United States judges the effectiveness of any nuclear-weapon-free zones. We believe that effective nuclear-weapon-free zone, negotiated and supported by States of the region, can enhance the security of those States as well as reinforce non-proliferation goals on a regional basis.

We believe, moreover, that nuclear-weapon-free zone arrangements must effectively preclude the conduct of any nuclear explosions.

In addition, I have asked to speak in order to explain the vote of the United States on draft resolution L.63 on "Israeli nuclear armament". This draft resolution, much like those of previous years on the same subject, is discriminatory. It singles out one Member State for criticism and condemnation, while it patently ignores a number of other States which have neither become parties

(Mr. Lowitz, United States)

to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) or placed their nuclear facilities under the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The United States, whose support for the NPT and IAEA safeguards is second to none, would welcome a balanced resolution calling for all non-nuclear-weapon States which have not yet done so to request the IAEA, pursuant to article III A. 5 of its statute, to apply safeguards continuously to all their nuclear facilities. The application of safeguards to all peaceful nuclear activities in a State contributes significantly to increased confidence among neighbouring States as well as other States regarding the peaceful nature of such activities. My Government could support an approach along these lines and hopes that the sponsors of L.63 will approach this question in a more constructive way next year.

Mr. EKEUS (Sweden): Sweden has a fundamentally positive attitude towards the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones. With regard to concrete proposals for such zones, one basic prerequisite must, however, be the acceptance and co-operation, with regard to a zone initiative, of all States in the region. As a consequence, the lack of such full support by all States in the region of South Asia, Sweden had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.10. Sweden, however, would like to encourage further efforts by the States concerned to explore the possibilities of the realization of the objectives of draft resolution L.10. Efforts to that end would have a confidence-building effect, as well as having a positive influence on the political climate, and would also greatly enhance the security situation in the area.

Mr. JESSEL (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to indicate the reasons for several votes cast by the French delegation on some of the draft resolutions adopted this afternoon.

First, the French delegation joins in the consensus on draft resolution L.3; I should like to add that we, for our part, regret the failure of the study undertaken under the chairmanship of the Mr. Tornudd, the Finnish Secretary of State, to whom we wish to pay a tribute for the efforts which he has made over a two-year period with a view to reaching consensus in the group of governmental experts. There seemed to be two main reasons for the difficulties which were met with. The experience of the Treaty of Tlatelolco no doubt responded to political and historical features of the South American continent; transposing it to another region of the world does not seem possible and perhaps even not desirable. Moreover, instead of merely describing factually the various drafts envisaged, in the group of experts it was tempting to draw up a general theory of denuclearized zones. That could only deny the fact, which is recognized in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, that denuclearized zones can be useful and of scope only in terms of the characteristics of the zone in question and with the agreement of all the States concerned. In the case of the study, as in the case of the study on the implications of development and research, problems arose again with regard to the cost of such studies and the use of incomplete work. On the first point we believe that it is necessary to make an effort at rationalization, and we would propose an approach in that direction. On the second point our position remains very clear; it seems to me that it is in keeping with the practice of the United Nations, namely, that in the absence of agreement among all the experts, the incomplete text can be neither used nor published.

(Mr. Jessel, France)

It is with deep regret that the French delegation had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution L.38 and voted against draft resolution L.40. The Government of France fully concurs with the basic objectives contained in these two draft resolutions: the denuclearization of Africa and the prevention of the acquisition by South Africa of a military nuclear capability.

Furthermore, the French Government shares the concerns of the African States with regard to the use of force and attempts at destabilization conducted by South Africa against countries of the region.

(Mr. Jessel, France)

France supports the principle according to which all States should refrain from any action that would promote the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It also believes that South Africa should place all its nuclear installations under the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

On those points the Government of France is in full agreement with all the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.38 and L.40, but it also attaches great importance to the necessary distinction between the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and its use for military purposes. It seems to us that this distinction is not sufficiently clear in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.38. We furthermore believe that the expression of views on South Africa's possession and development of nuclear capability perhaps goes beyond what we would consider useful.

With reference to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.40, the essential distinction between military applications and civilian use does not appear at all. We also believe that L.40 gives rise to serious objections in the institutional area with regard to the respective competence of the major United Nations bodies, particularly in paragraph 8, in which the Security Council is requested to take enforcement measures.

The Security Council is already seized of various aspects of the situation in South Africa. It has adopted measures on that issue, and we think that this appeal is not in keeping with the provisions of the Charter dealing with the allocation of responsibilities and powers among the main organs of the United Nations.

Lastly, France had to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.61, on the ratification of Additional Protocol I to the Treaty of Tlatelolco. We cannot accept that France should be singled out when some countries in the Treaty's area of application have not signed or ratified it or have not yet made use of the

(Mr. Jessel, France)

clause that permits the entry into force of the Treaty in their particular case even before all the countries of the region have become parties to the Treaty.

The Government of France will in due time take an appropriate decision with regard to the ratification of Additional Protocol I, taking into account the status of ratification of the Treaty itself.

Mr. de KLERK (Netherlands): The Netherlands delegation wishes to place on record its considerations regarding draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.38, concerning the denuclearization of Africa, and L.40, concerning the nuclear capability of South Africa.

On 10 September 1985 the countries of the European Community, together with Portugal and Spain, decided on a number of measures against South Africa, among them the prohibition of all new collaboration in the nuclear sector. We believe that those measures illustrate that those countries are convinced of the necessity of putting pressure on the South African régime to bring about a change in its policy of apartheid. Thus the Netherlands can support the main thrust of both of the draft resolutions I have mentioned.

However, my delegation has a few objections to the texts, mainly that of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.40. We cannot agree with the request in paragraph 8 that the Security Council take enforcement measures. Nevertheless we continue wholeheartedly to support the request contained in paragraph 9 that the Security Council look into the matter of strengthening the arms embargo against South Africa. The formulation "frenzied acquisition of nuclear weapon capability" in paragraph 1 is in sharp contrast to the report of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, which according to the draft resolution must be the basis for consideration of South Africa's nuclear capability in the United Nations Disarmament Commission next year. While that report describes the continued

(Mr. de Klerk, Netherlands)

development of South Africa's overall nuclear capability, it provides no new information regarding South Africa's capability to manufacture nuclear weapons.

Although these reservations to a certain extent also pertain to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.38, my delegation cast a positive vote on it, while it abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.40.

Mr. WISNOEMOERTI (Indonesia): The Indonesian delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.10, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Indonesia has consistently held the view that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world, as a regional approach to nuclear non-proliferation, constitutes a most effective means of preventing proliferation. However, it is also Indonesia's well-established position that a proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should be initiated by the States of the region concerned, based on voluntary participation and common agreement, with all arrangements being freely arrived at among them.

On the basis of my Government's position, which I have just set out, and despite our support for the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.10, as it has in votes on similar draft resolutions in previous years.

Mr. RIVERO ROSARIO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.61.

As has been stated previously, Cuba recognizes the merit of creating nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world since it considers, as is stated in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, that the establishment of such zones is an important disarmament measure and no doubt is a valuable contribution to putting an end to the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Rivera Rosario, Cuba)

With regard to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, we continue to see obstacles that prevent Cuba from being a party to the Treaty. Since the hostilities and provocations of the only nuclear Power on the continent against our country maintains a climate of threat and pressure in the zone, Cuba chooses to use whatever means of defence are appropriate to defend its sovereignty and its territory. Furthermore the United States occupies part of the Cuban territory with a naval base, against the wishes of the people and the Government of Cuba. That is why we abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

Mr. MIGLIORINI (Italy): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.38 because we support the general thrust of that draft, but I wish to put on record that we have specific reservations on the last preambular paragraph and on operative paragraphs 1 and 3.

The Italian delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.40. Had there been a separate vote on the tenth preambular paragraph, we would have voted against it.

The CHAIRMAN: As there are no further speakers, we have completed action on draft resolutions contained in clusters 7 and 8, the programme of work that had been set for this afternoon.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: Rather than begin action on a new cluster of draft resolutions, I should like to suggest that we adjourn the meeting and that we begin tomorrow morning with taking action on cluster 4, which we have so far held in abeyance. Upon completion of action on the draft resolutions in cluster 4, we shall continue taking up the next clusters - 9, 10 and so on - in sequence.

I hope that the time made available by adjourning earlier today will be used by delegations to continue consultations and preparations in general to allow us to start tomorrow morning with renewed vigour.

Tomorrow, in the course of the day, we shall also take up the remaining draft resolution that was deferred from cluster 5 - namely, L.54 - on which I understand a revision has been submitted and will be available tomorrow morning.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.