



President: Mr. Jorge E. ILLUECA (Panama).

Programme of work

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before we consider the agenda item for this afternoon, I should like to make an announcement regarding the programme of work for next week. On Monday, 14 November, in the morning, the General Assembly will begin consideration of agenda item 25, entitled "Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)", which will be continued on Tuesday, 15 November. On Monday, 14 November, in the afternoon, the Assembly will begin consideration of agenda item 37, entitled "Question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia", which will also be continued on Tuesday, 15 November. On Wednesday, 16 November, in the morning, the Assembly will hear a statement by the President of Israel and then will begin consideration of agenda item 32, entitled "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa". It is hoped that consideration of that item will be completed on Friday, 18 November.
2. I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.
3. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): I had indeed been wondering whether we were going to have a Falklands debate one day, and I am glad to have heard you announce it.
4. I may have misunderstood what you said, but I did not hear you say anything about suspending the meetings of the General Assembly in order that the petitioners might appear before the Fourth Committee. I had thought—and I had reason to suppose that this was so—that the General Assembly would not meet on Monday afternoon next, but the Fourth Committee would meet to hear the petitioners and that the debate on the Falklands would continue on Tuesday afternoon.
5. Was I mistaken in my understanding?
6. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of the United Kingdom has made a correct statement. It is quite true that the items will be taken up as he indicated in his point of order. Consideration of the item entitled "Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)" will begin in a plenary meeting on Monday morning. Monday afternoon the Fourth Committee will hear petitioners, and we trust we shall have a report from that Committee on Tuesday, when we shall continue consideration of the item "Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)".
7. I trust the representative of the United Kingdom will accept that this was an inadvertent omission; I should have stated the position as he correctly defined it.
8. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): Thank you, Mr. President, for that helpful clarification. I take it, therefore, that the General Assembly will not be sitting on Monday afternoon.
9. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): As I stated, on Monday afternoon, while the Fourth Committee hears the petitioners, the General Assembly will meet to consider agenda item 37.
10. On Tuesday, one of the two plenary meetings—depending on whatever is more convenient for our work—will be devoted to the item "Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)" and consideration of that item will continue until it is concluded.
11. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): I had hitherto understood that it was the intention of the President to follow the same procedure as was adopted by the General Assembly last year on the same item. Delegations will recall that that procedure involved no meeting of the General Assembly while the Fourth Committee was hearing the petitioners. Is it your intention, Mr. President, to depart from last year's procedure?
12. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have consulted on the question raised by the representative of the United Kingdom and there have been cases in which we proceeded in the way I have mentioned—the case of the question of Cyprus is an example.
13. On Monday afternoon we will have the opportunity to make progress on another item of the agenda, and since we have a rather busy schedule—indeed, we are running behind schedule—I ask the representative of the United Kingdom to take into account that that is what prompted me to suggest that on Monday afternoon we take up the item on South-East Asia. There is no real conflict with regard to consideration of the item "Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)", which will be continued on Tuesday. As I have explained to the representative of the United Kingdom, we wish to give it full consideration so that it can be concluded without interruption once the discussion is resumed.
14. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): I understand from what you have just said, Mr. President, that you do intend to depart from the procedure that was followed last year. This is a surprise to my delegation, which had hitherto understood that the intention was to follow the same procedure as last year in respect of this item.
15. I have great sympathy with you in the difficulties that have been piled upon you by many unexpected circumstances, such as much larger numbers of speakers than had been expected. I particularly sympathize in that we lost the whole of last Monday through the cancellation of two meetings of the General Assembly which had been announced in the *Journal*. I am of course in your hands, Mr. President, as you are in the hands of the General Assembly, and if you find that this coming Monday is different from last Monday then of course my delegation will have full sympathy with you.
16. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I feel that basically we shall be following the same procedure as at last year's session, for there will be an initial plenary meeting on the item, followed by a meeting of the Fourth Committee for the hearing of the petitioners,

and then the next day consideration of the item in the Assembly will continue.

17. I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for his clarification, which has been very helpful to the Assembly.

18. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): I note, Mr. President, that the procedure this year will be basically the same as last year. I hope it will be understood that this does not constitute a precedent. Could you please clarify that?

19. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Similar practices have been followed in other cases. There have been hearings of petitioners in the Fourth Committee at the same time as the Assembly was holding plenary meetings; the hearings in the Fourth Committee on Namibia, *apartheid* and Cyprus took place while the General Assembly was holding plenary meetings.

20. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): I should like it to be noted that for the future my delegation would appreciate being consulted on such matters.

21. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of the United Kingdom may rest assured that the President will be very pleased to meet him very frequently, as has happened in the last few days. We hope that these friendly and cordial relations will continue in the future.

AGENDA ITEM 142

The situation in Central America: threats to international peace and security and peace initiatives (*continued*)

22. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall call on the representative of Nicaragua, who will introduce draft resolution A/38/L.13.

23. Mr. CHAMORRO MORA (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): After the very wide-ranging debate on the item before us, it is clear that there is universal concern over the position of the people of Central America. Many representatives have said that the peoples and Governments of the world are in favour of the restoration of peace and justice in Central America and wish to remove from that part of the world the militaristic adventurism aimed at placing a quasi-colonial yoke on the people there, which goes against the current of history and is unlawful.

24. Strengthened by this general sentiment of the international community, we are pleased to introduce draft resolution A/38/L.13, which has been distributed and was submitted to delegations a number of days ago for their consideration. During these days of intense negotiations, our delegation has again received the generous support of the Contadora Group, which, in addition to its observations, has in a very frank and forthright manner transmitted to us the concerns of other delegations. This final draft reflects many of the concerns, observations and aspirations, especially those relating to the strengthening of the rules and principles of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the role of the Contadora Group.

25. Our condemnation of imperialism and the military adventurism of those who represent it is clear and unflinching, as is our people's determination to fight to the end to defend their rights as a State in the international community. Accordingly, we have received with flexibility and appreciation the expressions of world opinion in support of peace and law. These expressions are reflected in the draft, which is submitted after long, in-depth meetings with many delegations.

26. From its first preambular paragraph the draft resolution strengthens the Contadora peace process and the mission entrusted to the Contadora Group by the Security Council in its resolution 530 (1983) of 19 May this year. The draft recalls and reaffirms the principles and rules of international law, which strengthen the role of the Contadora Group and its mission to have law replace force in relations between the countries of the area. A vote for the draft resolution would give the Contadora Group the legal backing of the General Assembly. On the other hand, any measure to gain time, to exert pressure to dilute the moral and legal value of the draft resolution, would in effect take away from the Contadora Group the moral and legal force that would be given by the clear and effective support of the General Assembly.

27. The preambular part of the draft resolution also mentions the historical, political and economic causes of the situation in Central America, and expresses the profound concern of the international community at the worsening of tensions and conflicts and the increase in outside interference and acts of aggression. In addition, it expresses the need to contribute to peace and the establishment of a genuine democratic process, with respect for human rights and effective development. It notes with justified concern the increase in number and intensity of armed incidents, acts of terrorism and sabotage, traffic in arms and destabilizing actions, as well as the military presence of countries from outside the region and the use of the territories of other countries to perform unlawful acts against neighbouring countries. It notes with appreciation the efforts of the Contadora Group, and stresses the joint Cancún Declaration on Peace in Central America and the Document of Objectives, which provide a basis for understanding in the area.

28. The operative part of the draft resolution mentions the principles and norms of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations, which are binding and must be observed by all States.

29. Paragraphs 1 and 2 reaffirm the right of all countries in the international community to decide their own future, free from all outside interference or intervention, whatever pretext may be adduced. They also reaffirm the need for respect for the sovereignty, independence and integrity of all the Central American States.

30. Paragraph 3 merely repeats something that the Assembly, the Security Council, the international community and the American people know very well, because the matters to which it refers—and others—have been widely denounced in the American press. It says that there must be no more acts of aggression against the Central American countries, particularly attacks from outside on my Government.

31. Paragraph 4 urges the States of the region and other States to refrain from initiating military actions or manoeuvres intended to exert political pressure on the people of the Central American region and which—as is logical—would only aggravate the already critical situation in the region and hamper the serious and praiseworthy efforts of the Contadora Group.

32. Paragraphs 5 and 6 express full appreciation of the painstaking and difficult work carried out by Colombia, Venezuela, Mexico and Panama in the past 10 months in the search for peace in Central America, through their efforts to put an end to the guerrilla warfare option as a means of solving the problems in the region and through dialogue and negotiations to bring about understanding among the peoples of Central America and the development of the region, without foreign intervention of any kind.

33. Paragraph 7 reaffirms the mandate given by the Security Council to our Secretary-General and requests him to keep the Council regularly informed about developments and progress, in compliance with resolution 530 (1983), to which I have already referred.

34. Paragraph 8 requests the Secretary-General to submit to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly a report on the implementation of the present draft resolution.

35. Paragraph 9 decides to keep under review the grave situation prevailing in Central America—a region which, as is widely known, is one of the most serious sources of tension in the world today—as well as threats to peace and security in the region and the progress made in peace initiatives.

36. In conclusion, my delegation would like to take this opportunity to express appreciation to the countries members of the Contadora Group for their hard work and perseverance over the past few days in attempting to improve and strengthen the draft resolution which I have just introduced. Their efforts have made it possible for me to introduce this draft resolution, which we trust will, like Security Council resolution 530 (1983), make a significant contribution to strengthening and making more effective the initiative of the Contadora Group.

37. We believe that if this draft resolution is adopted by the overwhelming majority of the members of the international community it will make those countries which pay lip-service to peace initiatives, but continue to lead the Central American peoples and region towards ever more threatening wars, give more mature thought to the situation. At the same time, I should like to ask formally, on behalf of my delegation, that this draft resolution be put to the vote first thing tomorrow morning.

38. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution which has just been introduced: Congo, Ethiopia, Guyana, Sao Tome and Principe and Upper Volta. The vote on draft resolution A/38/L.13 will take place tomorrow morning.

39. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply. I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first statement and five minutes for the second.

40. Mr. LOEB (United States of America): Yesterday, at the 50th meeting, in the course of otherwise predictable remarks on the situation in Central America, the representative of Cuba saw fit to refer to the American electoral process. He asserted that United States policies and actions regarding Central America were a function of that process. He apparently regards this as a sinister phenomenon and thinks that his remarks constitute a scathing criticism of the United States.

41. It would appear that the representative of Cuba is in need of some instruction. He has made a promising start by recognizing that there is an electorate in the United States. The American Government, in both its executive and its legislative manifestations, is responsible to that electorate and must pay attention to its opinions, however shocking that state of affairs might seem to be to the representative of Cuba.

42. I hope and presume that the speaker to whom I refer reads the American press. I hope he looks out of the windows and doors here. If he does so, he is aware that there are varieties of opinion in the United States on almost all subjects and that those opinions are freely expressed. Our Government, unlike his, does not exercise monopoly control over public information. It must

explain itself to the public, subject its actions to scrutiny and uninhibited criticism, and persuade a majority that it is accurately reflecting their wishes.

43. Its ability to do so is tested periodically through a procedure known as free elections, a procedure unknown in Cuba and repugnant to Cuba's allies.

44. The record of the American electorate in foreign affairs speaks for itself. It has consistently supported actions, even very costly actions, in defence of freedom, human rights and economic and social justice. On the other hand, it has shown itself very cautious and sceptical when it was not convinced that these values were at stake or when it concluded that they were not being served. Upon such a public is American foreign policy based.

45. These ideas are admittedly revolutionary. They would be extremely dangerous if introduced in Cuba, and I can well understand why Cuba views them with alarm.

46. Mr. ROA KOURÍ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall not need to use my full 10 minutes to reply to the inanities of the would-be schoolmaster who has appeared in the United States delegation. First, I wish to tell that would-be schoolmaster that I am very familiar with the Constitution of the United States and its operation. I have lived in this country long enough to know that its famous democracy is nothing more than an oligarchy based on the power of the monopolies.

47. When in my statement at the 50th meeting I said that President Reagan had made use of the invasion of Grenada and of threats against Central America in his election campaign, I did so precisely to underscore how these gentlemen who would teach us about democracy use public opinion and manipulate it in order to use misfortunes in other countries—one example of which is the invasion of Grenada, which is a clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations—to gain an electoral victory for their candidate: the candidate of the Republican Party and the incumbent President, Mr. Reagan. It is that and that alone that I was talking about.

48. I wish to tell the United States representative that I do, of course, read the press, and that I see how this free United States press conceals the crimes committed by the United States in various places, just as it hides from the people the truth about invasions and threats of aggression on the part of the United States, and the crimes committed by the allies of the United States, such as Israel and South Africa.

49. That gentleman stated that here his Government has no monopoly control over the press. No, the Government does not have a monopoly control—not directly. The press is controlled by the United States monopolies, the capitalist United States monopolies which also control the Government. That is a big difference. In Cuba there are no monopolies. We eliminated them, and, what is more important, we also threw the Americans out of our country forever in 1959. Thus, our press serves the interests of the Cuban people, not the interests of Yankee monopolies, as the United States press does.

50. I have been in this country long enough even to know its textbooks; at one time it was my lot to study them. I remember very well that in these textbooks—which certainly are manuals of democracy and exemplars of free thought—the Cuban war of independence is called the Spanish-American War and that the 10 years in the last century, from 1868 to 1878, when the Cuban people fought against Spanish colonial power are forgotten. Cuba's 1895 war of independence is forgotten. Thus, I am very familiar with the freedom which exists in this country. I have many black, chicano and Puerto Rican friends in the United States, and I know very well the

kind of freedoms they enjoy. They are second-class citizens. Obviously, the representative of the Government of monopolies is a first-class citizen, and he does not hesitate to come here and speak on behalf of the class he serves.

AGENDA ITEM 28

Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)*

51. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/38/L.7/Rev.2. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, 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, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Barbados, Chile, Colombia, Fiji, Guatemala, Haiti, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Malawi, Paraguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 123 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions (resolution 38/9).¹

52. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on representatives who wish to explain their votes.

53. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Israel voted against the resolution just adopted for the reasons set out in our statement at the 42nd meeting. However, I wish to place on record that, had a separate vote been taken on paragraph 6, my delegation would have voted in favour of it, in keeping with Israel's position, as reflected also in the said statement, that

"Israel has no policy of attacking nuclear facilities, and its views on the substance of the issue have been amply

stated and hardly need to be reiterated. Moreover, Israel fully supports international efforts to arrive at an early arrangement regarding the status of nuclear facilities." [42nd meeting, para. 66.]

54. Mr. HUMFREY (United Kingdom): My Government has always made clear its view that the Israeli military attack of June 1981 on Iraq's nuclear installations was a grave violation of international law having serious implications for international relations, including relations on nuclear matters. Because of this and because we supported its general thrust, we voted in favour of the resolution on this item. But we nevertheless have certain reservations on it. The last preambular paragraph is, in our view, too categorical in its assertions. We have some reservations also on the wording of paragraphs 2 to 6. We do not, for example, regard paragraph 6 as either prejudicing the issue of whether further legal measures to prohibit armed attacks against nuclear facilities are needed or prejudging the forum in which discussion of the subject should take place. Finally, we recall our remarks of last year on the risks of this item becoming just another subject of ritual debate on the General Assembly's agenda.

55. Mr. TRUCCO (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): When it voted in past years on a draft resolution on this same item, my delegation said that there can be no international peace and security if nations do not strictly refrain from the use of force.

56. We have also expressed our serious concern over any violation of the territorial integrity or sovereignty of States.

57. Today my delegation reiterates that unchanging conviction and states that we strongly favour an effective, universal system of safeguards for the use of nuclear technology. We believe that such a regime would be the sole sure guarantee that would protect us from the risk of the uncontrolled use of nuclear energy for non-peaceful purposes.

58. Chile expressed regret over the Israeli armed attack against the Iraqi nuclear facilities and supported the action taken by the Security Council in resolution 487 (1981). However, my delegation had to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution just adopted, even though we agree with many of the principles contained in it, because we feel that many of its paragraphs go beyond the item under discussion or presuppose intentions that are not sufficiently supported. We reiterate our belief that it is for the Security Council to decide whether further action is needed on this subject and we do not believe that the item should be kept permanently on the agenda of the General Assembly if it is to be solved.

59. Mr. WERNDL (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation again voted in favour of the resolution just adopted. We have done so because we continue to consider the consequences of the attack on Tamuz on 7 June 1981 a matter of legitimate concern to the international community. This concern is shared by the Federal Republic of Germany.

60. We have cast a positive vote in spite of a certain number of objections and reservations we have about the text of the resolution. Generally speaking, we consider the approach taken in the resolution just adopted as too complex to lead to constructive and useful work, and we believe that other international bodies will provide a framework more suitable for discussions on the subjects of this resolution.

61. In particular, my delegation continues to hold the view that repeated condemnation of Israel is not likely to promote conditions in which the problems resulting from an event that took place two and a half years ago

*Resumed from the 44th meeting.

could eventually be solved. We do not see a need for a constant repetition of such condemnations which would aim at perpetuating the elements I have just described.

62. I should also like to point out that the positive vote of my delegation does not indicate complete approval of the last preambular paragraph as well as of paragraph 6.

63. While it is true that the destruction of certain nuclear facilities by military attacks could, under certain assumptions, have disastrous consequences, my delegation has doubts regarding the concept of radiological warfare as contained in the last preambular paragraph of the resolution.

64. The reservation of my delegation regarding paragraph 6 stems from the fact that the Committee on Disarmament, in the framework of its efforts to ban weapons of mass destruction, is at present engaged in the search for a solution to the question of prohibition of military attacks on nuclear facilities, including the scope of such prohibition. The outcome of this work should not be prejudiced by action in other bodies.

65. Mr. SERRY (Netherlands): My delegation again voted in favour of the resolution just adopted because we support its general thrust.

66. The Netherlands has strongly condemned the Israeli attack of June 1981 on the Iraqi nuclear installations and fully supports Security Council resolution 487 (1981). We continue to urge Israel to state in unambiguous terms that it will not repeat its attack on nuclear installations in Iraq or in any other country.

67. At the same time, however, we wish to express some strong reservations on the wording of this resolution, in particular its last two paragraphs. My delegation wishes to stress once more that it considers a continued annual deliberation of this matter in the General Assembly undesirable because it tends to reduce this issue into another subject of ritual debate. In this connection we would like to point out that the Security Council is already seized of this question by virtue of paragraph 7 of its resolution 487 (1981) and that IAEA is also fully competent to deal with the matter.

68. In the absence of further important developments, we hope that the sponsors of the resolution will give our observations their careful consideration for the future.

69. Mr. DEBOUTTE (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): Belgium has just voted in favour of the resolution. The vote is justified by the general content of the resolution. However, Belgium would like to indicate certain reservations with respect to it, in particular as concerns the preambular part, which pointlessly makes reference to problems which have nothing to do with the action which we condemn. Furthermore, my country sees no necessity of reopening next year a debate on the subject of this attack which we already condemned several times.

70. Miss GERVAIS (Canada): At the time of the Israeli bombing of the Iraqi nuclear facility called Tamuz, the Canadian Government issued a strong condemnation. When this item was dealt with at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly and again at the thirty-seventh session, my delegation reiterated this condemnation. We do so once again by casting a positive vote on the resolution just adopted.

71. Through a productive process of negotiation, an element which was contained in the earlier version of the draft resolution and which was totally unacceptable to my delegation has been removed. This was the inferred questioning of Israeli membership in IAEA. Other evaluative and extreme references have also been deleted or modified to make the text more balanced.

72. Accordingly, the tone and thrust of this year's resolution have improved over General Assembly resolution 37/18 of last year. In particular, references to "acts of aggression", which if taken in connection with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations can have extremely severe consequences, have been omitted from this year's draft.

73. Despite our positive vote, my delegation wishes to enter a strong reservation on paragraph 9 calling for consideration of this question at the thirty-ninth session.

74. The group of experts appointed by the Secretary-General has reported comprehensively to the Assembly on the consequences of the Israeli attack. Two and a half years after the event there is no further examination required. Furthermore, the resolution that we have just voted on received almost complete endorsement from the Assembly. International public opinion has therefore been adequately recorded.

75. There is therefore absolutely no reason why the item should remain on the Assembly's crowded agenda. We would strongly urge the initiators to consider its removal by next year.

76. Mr. JOHANSEN (Norway): Norway voted in favour of the resolution just adopted. We are in general agreement with and support the main thrust of the text. The Israeli military attack against the Iraqi nuclear installations has been condemned repeatedly and in the strongest possible terms by the world community.

77. While recognizing the seriousness of that armed attack, it is my delegation's view that it would serve no useful purpose if this issue were to become a permanent item on the agenda of the General Assembly.

78. Mr. HANSEN (Denmark): Denmark voted in favour of the resolution just adopted because we are in general agreement with its thrust. The Israeli military attack on Iraq's nuclear installations in June 1981 has been condemned repeatedly and in the strongest terms by the international community, including my own country.

79. While we realize the seriousness of that act, it is however my delegation's view that it would serve no useful purpose if this issue were to become a permanent item on the agenda of the General Assembly.

80. Mr. LOEB (United States of America): The United States has voted against this resolution since it is our opinion, as it is that of others, that it serves no useful purpose. The draft resolution just approved goes far beyond the content of Security Council resolution 487 (1981), which represented the unanimous views of the Security Council and was voted on shortly after the incident in question. To adopt this measure two and a half years later is both unnecessary and unproductive. It also detracts from the attention that we should be giving to a practical and realistic search for a peaceful settlement to the problems of the region, including the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

81. Our vote also reflects our view that the study of the incident, authorized last year and recently submitted by the Secretary-General, was superfluous. We believe it was unnecessary to spend over \$340,000 for such close scrutiny in order to be able to pass judgement on this matter. Certain aspects of the report, moreover, are seriously open to question. The subject of the study is considered as if it had been isolated in time and space; no regard whatsoever is given to the historical, geographical and political context. In particular, the existence of a state of war between the two protagonists is treated in the most cursory fashion. Finally, the concluding paragraph refers to a certain expressed Israeli "threat", which is not mentioned previously in the study and without

reference to specific Israeli declarations on this subject which are part of the United Nations record.

82. The study was not required in order to deal with this matter, nor was another resolution. Judgement was appropriately passed in June 1981 on the basis of the facts then at hand. Security Council resolution 487 (1981) continues to reflect the views of my Government.

83. Mr. LAUGEL (France) (*interpretation from French*): The French delegation wonders about the usefulness of an exercise consisting in repetitive examination of an agenda item that has already been treated abundantly in the Security Council and the General Assembly. However, we voted in favour of the resolution just adopted and should like to recall in that connection that, like all other members of the Security Council, we voted in favour of resolution 487 (1981) condemning the Israeli attack against the Iraqi nuclear installations.

84. Furthermore, France would like to specify that it cannot accept the use in the future of certain elements of the operative part of this resolution to harm the principle of the universality of the United Nations.

85. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call now on the representative of Iraq, who has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

86. Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq): A number of representatives who have just explained their vote pointed out that they would not like to see this item included again in next year's agenda, that they would consider it an unnecessary repetition of the debate, and that this issue should not become a permanent item on the agenda. I assure them that it is not our intention to make this issue a permanent item on the agenda of the General Assembly.

87. There is a reason behind the request that this item be included again. The Israeli armed attack against the Iraqi nuclear facility was not an isolated act. There has been a threat, officially stated a number of times, to repeat that act. It is the duty of the General Assembly to see to it that that threat is not carried out. It is the duty of the Assembly to see to it that that threat is withdrawn in a meaningful way, not in the senseless statement to the effect that Israel has no policy of attacking nuclear facilities. That is one reason for having the item included again in the Assembly's agenda.

88. The other is the fact—despite what the representative of the United States has said—that the Security Council did not adopt a resolution merely condemning that act. The Security Council asked that a number of other things be done by Israel, but Israel has adamantly refused to comply with the Security Council's requests. It is for the United Nations to see to it that the Security Council resolution is followed up and action taken accordingly.

89. We do not seek a repetition of condemnation. That is not the point of this resolution or of the inclusion of the item in the agenda. Action must be taken to make Israel realize that it cannot with impunity carry out, or threaten to repeat, such an attack.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.

NOTE

¹The delegations of the Islamic Republic of Iran and of the Seychelles subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.