

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records



**97th
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 12 December 1984,
at 3.55 p.m.

NEW YORK

**President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA
(Zambia).**

AGENDA ITEM 29

Question of Namibia (concluded):*

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;**
- (b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;**
- (c) Reports of the Secretary-General**

1. The PRESIDENT: May I remind representatives that the debate on this item was concluded on 4 December. In this connection, the Assembly has before it, in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/39/24, part four, chap. I], five draft resolutions recommended by the Council, and a series of amendments to those draft resolutions, contained in documents A/39/L.23 to A/39/L.25.

2. I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to introduce the draft resolutions.

3. I call upon the representative of Zambia, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa".

4. Mr. KUNDA (Zambia): The cause of Namibia's independence has been supported by the overwhelming majority of States since the early years of the Organization. Since then, the momentum has been kept up by the termination of the Mandate 18 years ago; by the historic advisory opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice on 21 June 1971;¹ and by Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and many other resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

5. Over the years, the international community has, however, been frustrated in its efforts to implement the United Nations plan for Namibia by the intransigence of the Pretoria régime, backed by its allies, which has created impasse after impasse, all of them familiar to those assembled here.

6. The racist régime has tried all kinds of manoeuvres to hoodwink the international community. I refer here to attempts by South Africa and the United States to link the question of Namibian

independence to irrelevant and extraneous issues, such as the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

7. The Security Council has only recently rejected South Africa's insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues as incompatible with resolution 435 (1978), other decisions of the Security Council and resolutions of the General Assembly on Namibia, including General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960. By its resolution 539 (1983), the Security Council decided that, in the event of continued obstruction by South Africa, it would consider the adoption of appropriate measures.

8. South Africa's intransigence remains the major hurdle in the way of Namibian independence. It is in this context that the draft resolution that my delegation has the honour to introduce is to be seen. It is a draft resolution that has been recommended by consensus to the Assembly by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

9. The draft resolution begins by reaffirming once more the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and national independence in a united Namibia, while reaffirming the mandate given to the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for that territory until independence. The draft resolution further reaffirms the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people by all means, including armed struggle, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], their sole and authentic representative.

10. After laying down these basic principles reiterated year after year by the Assembly, the draft resolution proceeds to condemn South Africa for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and for obstructing the implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), which remain the only basis for the internationally recognized peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia.

11. The draft resolution firmly rejects the persistent attempts by the United States and South Africa to establish any linkage or parallelism between the independence of Namibia and, in particular, the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola, and emphasizes unequivocally that any such attempts are designed to delay the decolonization process in Namibia and constitute interference in the internal affairs of Angola.

12. In view of the recent South African threats to proceed with yet another so-called internal solution in Namibia, such as the establishment of yet another puppet institution in the form of the so-called Multi-Party Conference, the draft resolution strongly condemns this latest direct violation of Security Council resolution 439 (1978), aimed at perpetuating its domination of the Territory.

* Resumed from the 84th meeting.

13. The draft resolution condemns the recent imposition of military conscription of all Namibian males between the ages of 17 and 55 into the occupying colonial army in yet another sinister attempt by the illegal occupation régime to suppress the national liberation struggle of the Namibian people and to force them to kill one another. In this regard, the draft resolution declares that South Africa's attempts to enforce military conscription in Namibia are illegal, null and void.

14. The draft resolution also denounces the establishment of the so-called Liaison Office of the United States Government in Windhoek in direct violation of relevant resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, in particular Security Council resolutions 283 (1970) and 301 (1971), and in total disregard of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice,¹ and calls for its immediate closure and withdrawal.

15. The draft resolution urges the United Nations Council for Namibia, in its capacity as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence, to consider the promulgation of additional decrees and other legislation in order to protect and promote the interests of the people of Namibia and effectively implement such legislation.

16. The draft resolution welcomes the release of the patriot Andimba Toivo ya Toivo, Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization, and of other leaders of that organization and considers it a victory for the international campaign.

17. The draft resolution condemns the increased assistance rendered by the major Western countries and Israel to South Africa in the political, economic, financial and military fields.

18. The draft resolution condemns South Africa for its military buildup in Namibia and its use of Namibian territory to launch armed attacks against independent African States of the region, particularly its continued unprovoked attacks against and occupation of Angola. Furthermore, it expresses grave concern at the acquisition of nuclear weapons capability by the Pretoria régime as constituting a further attempt on its part to terrorize the independent States of the region while also posing a danger to international peace and security. In this regard, the draft resolution condemns the continuing military and nuclear collaboration of certain Western countries and Israel with the racist régime, which is in violation of the arms embargo imposed against South Africa under Security Council resolution 418 (1977).

19. The draft resolution also deals with South Africa's attempts to thwart the work of the Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference and it calls upon all States and the United Nations agencies to render all possible assistance to the Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference in its efforts to promote regional economic co-operation. The draft resolution declares that all activities of foreign economic interests in Namibia are illegal under international law and that all foreign economic interests operating in Namibia are liable to pay damages to the future lawful Government of Namibia and calls upon the Governments concerned to take appropriate measures to ensure the implementation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.²

20. The draft resolution reiterates its request to all States, pending the imposition of mandatory sanc-

tions against South Africa, to take legislative, administrative and other measures, unilaterally and collectively, to isolate South Africa and requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to continue to monitor the boycott of South Africa.

21. Finally, the draft resolution calls upon the Security Council to adopt the necessary measures to tighten the arms embargo against South Africa and ensure strict compliance by all States and, in the light of the serious threat to international peace and security, urges the Security Council immediately to impose on South Africa comprehensive mandatory sanctions, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

22. It is my sincere hope that this draft resolution will receive the full support of the Assembly.

23. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Guyana, who wishes to introduce draft resolution B, entitled "Implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)".

24. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution B, on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)—a resolution which is so well known to members of the Assembly that it hardly requires any introduction or description.

25. Representatives will recall that it was little more than one year ago—in October 1983—that the Security Council addressed itself to the question of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). On that occasion it adopted resolution 539 (1983), in which it once again expressed its indignation at South Africa's refusal to comply with its resolutions, in particular at the racist régime's insistence on an irrelevant and extraneous issue of "linkage", which obstructed the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The Council also reiterated that resolution 435 (1978) was the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question.

26. The General Assembly, for its part, made a similar determination in its resolution 38/36 B, and demanded the immediate and unconditional implementation of resolution 435 (1978) without qualification, modification or amendment or the introduction of extraneous and irrelevant issues of "linkage", "parallelism" or "reciprocity" insisted upon by the United States of America and South Africa.

27. South Africa's intransigence, along with the support extended to it by its collaborators, remains the only hurdle in the way of Namibian independence.

28. The draft resolution which my delegation has the honour to introduce to this Assembly is succinct and to the point. After reaffirming the need to proceed without any further delay with the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia and after taking note of the consultations which have been held with a view to achieving the early implementation of the plan, it strongly condemns South Africa for obstructing the implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978), 439 (1978), 532 (1983) and 539 (1983) and for its manoeuvres, in contravention of those resolutions, designed to consolidate its colonial and neo-colonial interests at the expense of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people to genuine self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia.

29. It proceeds to reaffirm that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations until independence and reiterates that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. In paragraph 8, it formally rejects the persistent attempts by the United States of America and South Africa to establish any linkage or parallelism between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

30. The draft resolution strongly condemns racist South Africa for sabotaging the Namibian independence talks held in 1984 at Lusaka and Mindelo by insisting on the notorious "linkage" pre-condition and introducing new insidious subterfuge as alternatives to resolution 435 (1978).

31. The draft resolution requests the Security Council to exercise its authority with regard to the implementation of its resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978), 532 (1983) and 539 (1983) so as to bring about the independence of Namibia without further delay, and to act decisively against any dilatory manoeuvres and fraudulent schemes of the South African administration in Namibia aimed at frustrating the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people for independence. In this connection, the draft resolution urges the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter, in order to ensure the total cessation of all co-operation with that régime, particularly in the military and nuclear fields, by Governments, corporations, institutions and individuals.

32. The concern of draft resolution B is purely and simply the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and nothing else. It is the implementation of what is the only internationally accepted framework for a settlement of the Namibian question, a framework unanimously adopted by the Security Council in discharge of its solemn obligation. For, so long as resolution 435 (1978) continues to be unimplemented, the suffering of the people of Namibia continues. As we consider this draft resolution, let us keep uppermost in our minds the well-being, the interests and the future of the people of Namibia and, accordingly, give this draft resolution our whole-hearted support.

33. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Yugoslavia, who will introduce draft resolution C, entitled "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia".

34. Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): I have the honour to introduce, for the consideration and adoption of the Assembly, draft resolution C, entitled "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia".

35. The United Nations Council for Namibia was established by a General Assembly resolution as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until its independence and as the policy-making organ of the Assembly on the question of Namibia. We in the United Nations Council for Namibia consider that the proposed programme of work of the Council for the next year will contribute to the effective and fruitful fulfilment of the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly.

36. The programme envisages that the Council will continue to represent Namibia and protect the interests of the people of Namibia in the international arena, including conferences, intergovernmental

organizations and meetings of the specialized agencies and of non-governmental organizations. It will also continue to consult with Governments and seek their support for efforts of the United Nations designed to bring about a settlement of the question of Namibia.

37. The Council will also contact Governments and corporations in order to persuade them to cease any dealings with South Africa regarding Namibia and, particularly, to stop the exploitation of the natural and human resources of Namibia. It will consider the activities of foreign economic interests operating in the Territory of Namibia with a view to recommending appropriate policies to the United Nations General Assembly.

38. During 1985, the Council will take further steps to implement Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,² which it enacted on 27 September 1974. In this regard, the Council will consider legal action in the domestic courts of States and other appropriate bodies.

39. The Council will also continue to review and report on the progress of the liberation struggle in Namibia and to monitor the voluntary boycott of South Africa. It will, for these purposes, continue to gather information from governmental and non-governmental sources and to prepare comprehensive reports on developments concerning Namibia. It will hold a series of plenary meetings and continue to carry out hearings, seminars and regional symposia to obtain information and mobilize international action in support of the cause of the independence of Namibia.

40. In implementing its programme of work, as well as in any matter of interest to the Namibian people, the Council will continue its close co-operation and consultation with SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia. It will also continue to co-operate with the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and with the Organization of African Unity [OAU] on the question of Namibia.

41. The Council will undertake its programme of work with the intention of effectively increasing and intensifying international support for the speedy withdrawal of the illegal South African administration from Namibia and for the immediate independence of Namibia.

42. The Council is convinced that its activities for the next year will contribute to keeping the question of Namibia at the forefront of international attention and concern and that they will be instrumental in translating into concerted action the support of the international community for the speedy implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

43. We feel in the Council that at this moment, when South Africa is rejecting all attempts to implement the United Nations plan for Namibia, the programme of work of the Council has become even more important and essential. Therefore, we are submitting draft resolution C to the General Assembly for its adoption, convinced that the activities of the Council will significantly contribute to the early attainment of independence for Namibia.

44. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Bulgaria to introduce draft resolution D, entitled "Dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of Namibia".

45. Mr. YOSSIPHOV (Bulgaria): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution D entitled "Dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of Namibia".

46. The formulation of the draft resolution has been motivated, as indicated in the preamble, by the urgent need to mobilize international public opinion on a continuous basis with a view to assisting effectively the people of Namibia in the achievement of self-determination, freedom and independence in a united Namibia and, in particular, to intensify world-wide and continuous dissemination of information on the struggle for liberation being waged by the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative.

47. In pursuance of that goal, the United Nations Council for Namibia is requested to consider ways and means of increasing the dissemination of information relating to Namibia. The Secretary-General is requested to ensure that the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat, in all its activities of dissemination of information on the question of Namibia, follows the policy guidelines laid down by the United Nations Council for Namibia and assists, as a matter of priority, the Council in the implementation of its programme of dissemination of information.

48. Over the years, it has become increasingly clear that the mere recognition by the United Nations of the right of the Namibian people to self-determination, freedom and independence, the repeated condemnations of racist South Africa's brutal colonialist policy of *apartheid*, repression and aggression, the appeals by the world Organization for the immediate cessation of that policy and for granting independence to Namibia, although being of utmost significance, cannot by themselves bring about the withdrawal of Pretoria from the illegally occupied Territory. On the contrary, in blatant defiance of numerous United Nations resolutions, the racists have continued and expanded their aggressive colonial war against the people of Namibia, who, under the leadership of their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, are waging a heroic and just struggle for independence. The aggression of Pretoria long ago crossed the borders of South Africa and Namibia.

49. Therefore, draft resolution D contains, in paragraph 5, a decision to intensify the Council's international campaign "in support of the cause of Namibia and to expose and denounce the collusion of the United States of America, certain other Western countries and Israel with the South African racists", and to this end the Council is requested to formulate a programme of activities on the dissemination of information, including the organization of an international conference at United Nations Headquarters in order to mobilize and strengthen further international support for the just cause and heroic struggle of the Namibian people, led by their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO.

50. In recognition of the very important role that non-governmental organizations have to play in our common struggle for the liberation of Namibia, the draft resolution would further strengthen their co-operation with the United Nations Council for Namibia and urge them to intensify their efforts for the mobilization of public support and solidarity with the struggle of the Namibian people.

51. In addition, the draft resolution contains other provisions aimed at strengthening the co-operation of the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat with the United Nations Council for Namibia, and also requests the Council to continue to organize journalists' encounters prior to the activities of the Council during 1985. Member States are requested to broadcast programmes and publish material about the situation in and around Namibia and the obligation of Governments and peoples to assist in the struggle of Namibia for independence.

52. The dissemination of information on Namibia represents a very important aspect of the overall efforts of the United Nations to achieve freedom and independence for Namibia. In spite of the long years of illegal occupation of Namibia, the public in some countries is still not sufficiently aware of the true nature of the problem. The media of certain countries either do not publicize sufficient information on the problem of Namibia or publicized information is biased in accordance with specific political interests.

53. The Council also expresses grave concern at the increasing South African media propaganda and "psychological warfare" on independent African countries and SWAPO. The Council also deplores the deliberate abuse of the mass information media in some countries for the purpose of waging that same "psychological warfare" under the guise of the concept of "free flow of information, ideas and people". That concept has been misused to brand as terrorists the fighters for national independence in Namibia while condoning genuine acts of terrorism.

54. To render assistance and to bring human dignity to the oppressed peoples of Namibia, the United Nations must increase its support to the media organs, especially those of independent African countries, for the purpose of nullifying the adverse effects of Pretoria's destabilization campaign.

55. Therefore, dissemination of information is an important activity and it is a most important means for bringing pressure to bear on Pretoria and its allies for their compliance with the will of the Namibian people and the resolutions of the United Nations on the granting of independence to Namibia without further delay.

56. I therefore have the honour and pleasure of recommending draft resolution D to the General Assembly for adoption.

57. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Venezuela, who will introduce draft resolution E, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia".

58. Mr. GRIFFIN (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution E, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia".

59. The United Nations Fund for Namibia was established in 1970 [*resolution 2679 (XXV)*] on the termination of South Africa's Mandate to administer the Territory, and the United Nations thus assumed direct responsibility for Namibia until its accession to independence. The United Nations entered into the solemn obligation to help the Namibian people in its struggle to achieve independence, and therefore the United Nations should provide the people of Namibia with the material assistance it requires until independence.

60. At the outset, the sphere of activities and assistance provided in the context of the United Nations Fund for Namibia was restricted, but when

the struggle for liberation was stepped up the need for assistance increased and at the end of the 1970s, the Fund was composed of three accounts: the General Account, which provided educational and social assistance and relief aid to Namibians; the Nationhood Programme Account, which provided assistance for comprehensive development programmes, including those that would be carried out during the period just prior to independence and those that would be carried out after it; and the United Nations Institute for Namibia Account which provides financial resources for training functions and research functions in the United Nations Institute for Namibia in Lusaka, Zambia.

61. Therefore, the magnitude and the variety of the assistance provided under the United Nations Fund for Namibia has grown as the years have passed.

62. I have pleasure in reporting to the Assembly that the activities financed by the Fund are proceeding satisfactorily and all the available funds in the three accounts have been allocated. However, the Namibian people's need for material assistance considerably exceeds financial resources available, therefore several proposed projects have not been implemented, and requests from Namibians who are candidates for scholarships have had to be rejected because of the scarcity of resources.

63. Note has been taken of the fact that, as in previous years, it is necessary to subsidize the United Nations Fund for Namibia from the regular budget of the United Nations. Therefore, in the draft resolution the Assembly would decide to allocate a sum of \$US 1 million for 1985.

64. However, most of the activities carried out within the context of the United Nations Fund for Namibia are financed by voluntary contributions from Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and individuals. I should like to emphasize the urgent need for those donors to increase their contributions to the Fund in order to enable the United Nations Council for Namibia to continue to expand its humanitarian and development activities for the Namibians.

65. In this connection, I should like in particular to stress the need for additional contributions to enable the Council to provide assistance to those Namibians who wish to acquire practical experience in the place of work. A growing number of Namibian young people are finishing their theoretical work and also carrying out practical work within the context of various programmes of assistance; but, in order to make a productive and effective contribution to the socio-economic development of Namibia in the period following independence, it is necessary to make it possible for Namibians who have been trained in various disciplines to be accepted in various institutions, particularly in Africa. Therefore, this programme will require additional funds from donor countries as well as job opportunities in host countries. This effort is essential and the United Nations Council for Namibia must make it in order to ensure proper training of Namibians for independence.

66. Draft resolution E refers not only to the direct financing of projects within the context of the United Nations Fund for Namibia, but also to measures necessary to prepare a programme of assistance for Namibian people by carrying out projects which are financed jointly by Governments and non-govern-

mental organizations. In this connection, I draw attention to the fact that effective co-ordination in all areas of assistance is necessary. We must call upon specialized agencies and other institutions of the United Nations system to implement those projects for Namibians rapidly and on the basis of procedures that reflect the role that the United Nations Council for Namibia plays as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia.

67. Increased contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia and effective utilization of other available resources, would put the United Nations Council for Namibia in a better situation to alleviate the situation of Namibians who have escaped the repugnant system of *apartheid* and to prepare them for the extremely important task of the reconstruction and administration of their country after it has acceded to independence.

68. Having made this brief introduction, I hope draft resolution E will be adopted unanimously.

69. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the United States of America to introduce the amendments contained in A/39/L.23 to L.25.

70. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): As we hope everyone in this chamber is aware, the United States, in co-operation with partners in the contact group and with our colleagues in the front-line States, has been engaged in the effort to bring independence to Namibia through the elimination of the illegal South African occupation of that Territory. Our effort has not slackened. On the contrary, it has intensified markedly of late, as the exchanges between the United States and various parties in southern Africa have mounted in intensity.

71. The United States Government has tried hard to demonstrate at the highest levels our continuing commitment to good relations with Africa and in particular to achieving the independence of Namibia in the shortest possible time, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). President Reagan has underscored the fact that this is a major goal of his Administration. We hope that, with the continued co-operation of our friends and partners in and outside the region, the goal will be achieved. Because of the sensitive nature of our involvement in this effort, we have consistently held the view that it is inappropriate for the United States Government to take a position on the substance of the draft resolutions before us. We shall therefore abstain on these draft resolutions again this year.

72. The citation by name of Member States, and in particular of the United States, in certain sections of those draft resolutions constitutes an unfair and regrettable exception to the long established practices and norms of the United Nations and of the General Assembly. The United Nations was founded to promote peace and greater mutual understanding among nations, despite their differences. It was founded to promote discussion. In pursuit of those goals, it is essential that the Assembly consistently respect basic principles of civility, fairness and factual accuracy. We feel very strongly that direct, hostile, unfair and inaccurate references to particular Member States in United Nations resolutions are contrary to those basic principles and detrimental to our common purposes in the Organization. We have therefore moved to strike out such language from those draft resolutions, as the Fourth Committee did in similar instances. Our amendments received the

support of the majority of the Fourth Committee, and we hope that the important principle involved will receive similar support now.

73. Some delegations have asked us how we can oppose such a phrase as "on account of the veto of the United States of America". Is this, they ask, not simply a statement of fact? It is a fact that the United States exercised its veto on 31 August 1981, as it is a fact that other States have exercised vetoes to defeat Security Council resolutions since then. Yet the names of those States have not been cited in resolutions before this body, despite the fact that blatant and continuing aggression in Afghanistan and Kampuchea were involved. More objectionable still is the argument made in the same paragraph that, as a result of the veto of the United States, armed aggression against Angola continues. That is to say, the draft resolution maintains that the United States is the direct cause of that aggression. That is not true. That assertion is not only demonstrably untrue, it ignores the successful efforts undertaken by the United States to achieve an end to the South African intervention.

74. Another paragraph which similarly ignores these efforts and which we have proposed to delete, denounces the establishment of the United States Liaison Office at Windhoek as a violation of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. Delegations should be aware, however, that the United States Liaison Office was opened as a direct result of the agreements entered into between Angola and South Africa at Lusaka in February of this year. According to the communiqué of that meeting, the parties agreed that a small number of American representatives would participate in the activities of the joint monitoring commission at the request of the parties in order to facilitate the withdrawal of South African troops from southern Angola. To this end, and with the agreement of the Governments directly involved, the United States Government opened a small office which had to be near enough to the disengagement process to work effectively with the parties involved. Though located in Windhoek, this office is in no way accredited either to the South African Government or to the authorities in Namibia. It has no diplomatic or consular function; it implies no recognition of the legitimacy of the South African presence in Namibia. Our action is therefore entirely consistent with the resolutions passed by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

75. The issue posed by our proposed amendments is in fact quite a simple one. Does the General Assembly wish to see its resolutions on the serious and urgent matter of Namibia abused for purposes which not only make no contribution to the effort to bring about Namibian independence but which are calculated to discourage those engaged in that effort? Our amendments aim to eliminate just this abuse. We have not proposed to alter in any way the substance of the draft resolutions before us. Therefore, whatever a Government's substantive views may be, whether your Governments wish to support the draft resolutions, abstain or vote against them, you should feel free to support these amendments. We appeal to all, therefore, to join together in reaffirming our respect for the principles of civility, basic fairness and respect for accuracy which have shaped our accepted practices and which should govern all our deliberations and decisions here.

76. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Guyana to speak on a point of order.

77. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): My delegation has asked to speak on a point of order to address itself to the amendments just presented by the delegation of the United States of America to the draft resolutions recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia in its report [A/39/24, *part four, chap. I*]. Those amendments are contained in documents A/39/L.23 to L.25.

78. It goes without saying that Guyana recognizes and supports the right of the delegation of the United States of America to present those amendments. My delegation has considered them with the same seriousness and thoughtfulness which characterize our approach to any other matter on the agenda of the Assembly.

79. In our approach to the amendments in question, we were of course inspired by our concern for truth, for "factual accuracy", to use the words of the representative of the United States. My delegation believes that the wealth of data available to Members of the Assembly relating to Namibia and to relations of other States with Namibia, quite independently of that prepared by the United Nations Council for Namibia itself, fully substantiates the statements advanced in the Council's report, to which objection is being made by the representative of the United States.

80. At any rate, and without in any way wishing to derogate from a position which, in terms of substance, is unassailable, my delegation would like to direct attention to another aspect of this question which we consider to be of equally fundamental importance. It is a commonplace within the United Nations to see the case of Namibia as a unique one in the history and practice of the Organization. The aspects of this uniqueness do not need to be detailed here by me since they were so extensively alluded to in the recently concluded debate on the question of Namibia.

81. The rules of procedure of the General Assembly reveal yet another aspect of the uniqueness of Namibia. Namibia is the only non-independent territory which is the object of specific consideration by those rules of procedure. Delegations will recall that in 1954, at its ninth session, the General Assembly had adopted a special procedure for the examination of reports and petitions relating to Namibia, then the Territory of South West Africa [*resolution 844(IX)*]. That special rule is contained in annex III of the rules of procedure, special rule A. It will be noted that special rule F says:

"Decisions of the General Assembly on questions relating to reports and petitions concerning the Territory of South West Africa shall be regarded as important questions within the meaning of Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations."

Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter reads:

"Decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting."

82. Now, if we were to turn to rule 84 of the rules of procedure, we would see set forth the procedure for dealing with amendments to important questions. Rule 84 reads:

"Decisions of the General Assembly on amendments to proposals relating to important questions, and on parts of such proposals put to the vote separately, shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting."

83. It therefore seems clear to my delegation that, in accordance with an unequivocal provision of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia is an important question and that, accordingly, the amendments proposed by the United States of America to the draft resolutions in the report of the Council require for adoption a two-thirds majority of members present and voting. I submit this to the Chair out of a concern for order, for legality, for consistency and for fidelity to the procedures which the Assembly, in its wisdom, had set out three decades ago for dealing with reports relating to Namibia, then South West Africa, and I request that you, Mr. President, guide the Assembly accordingly.

84. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Guyana has drawn attention to special rule F of annex III of the rules of procedure, which reads:

"Decisions of the General Assembly on questions relating to reports and petitions concerning the Territory of South West Africa shall be regarded as important questions within the meaning of Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations."

85. The General Assembly's position regarding the character of decisions concerning Namibia is clearly established. In accordance with rule 84 of the rules of procedure, which reads:

"Decisions of the General Assembly on amendments to proposals relating to important questions, and on parts of such proposals put to the vote separately, shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting",

the amendments proposed to the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia are important questions requiring for adoption a two-thirds majority of those Member States present and voting.

86. Accordingly, the Assembly will now proceed to vote on the amendments contained in documents A/39/L.23 to L.25, it being understood that they require for adoption a two-thirds majority of members present and voting. That is the ruling of the President. If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

87. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the first amendment in document A/39/L.23, which relates to the seventeenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A, "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal,

Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, 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, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Equatorial Guinea, Haiti, Malawi, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela.

There were 55 votes in favour, 65 against and 25 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

88. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the second amendment in document A/39/L.23, which concerns the twentieth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Egypt, Gambia, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Venezuela.

There were 57 votes in favour, 63 against and 22 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

89. The PRESIDENT: I next put to the vote the third amendment in document A/39/L.23, which concerns paragraph 21 of draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon,³ Equatorial Guinea, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Malawi, Maldives, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Yemen.

There were 56 votes in favour, 60 against and 29 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

90. The PRESIDENT: Next I put to the vote the fourth amendment in document A/39/L.23, which concerns paragraph 38 of draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand,

Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Honduras, Jordan, Lebanon, Malawi, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Venezuela.

There were 45 votes in favour, 65 against and 32 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

91. The PRESIDENT: Finally, I put to the vote the fifth and last amendment in document A/39/L.23, which concerns paragraph 49 of draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan,⁴ Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania,

Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Haiti, India, Lesotho, Malawi, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Rwanda, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Venezuela.

There were 54 votes in favour, 66 against and 23 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was rejected.

92. The PRESIDENT: After some consultations, in order to guide the Assembly, I should like to explain that we have dealt with all the amendments to draft resolution A. We have not yet dealt with the amendments to the other draft resolutions. I think it will be best if we deal with draft resolution A first, and once we have disposed of that and have heard explanations of vote before and after the voting, we can move on to draft resolution B.

93. I call on the representative of Spain, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

94. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): With reference to the last vote, I thought that we were voting on paragraph 5 (a) in document A/39/L.23, concerning paragraph 49 of draft resolution A. Had my delegation realized that we were voting on paragraphs 5 (a), (b) and (c) together, it would have voted in favour. I would ask that these clarifications be included in the verbatim records.

95. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly has taken a decision on amendments to draft resolution A only. Some delegations have expressed the wish to explain all their votes before the voting on draft resolution A. Of course, the General Assembly is its own decision-maker, but I suggest that perhaps we could dispose of one draft resolution at a time in order to avoid confusion. Thus, we could hear explanations of vote before the voting on draft resolution A, take the vote on the draft resolution, and then hear those who wish to explain their votes after the voting. Having disposed of draft resolution A, we would then move on to draft resolution B, taking the amendments first and following the same procedure as on draft resolution A.

96. I call on the representative of Somalia on a point of order.

97. Mr. OSMAN (Somalia): My delegation had the impression, with regard to the last amendment that was voted on, the fifth amendment in document A/39/L.23, that paragraphs 5 (a), (b) and (c) would be taken separately. Since the three amendments were voted upon together, we would like it to appear in the record of the meeting that had we participated in the voting process we would have voted against.

98. The PRESIDENT: Does the Assembly agree to follow the procedure I have outlined?

99. I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on a point of order.

100. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. President, I understand that you have made a decision. If this is not an arbitrary decision of the President, then I would like to know whether the point you have just mentioned is a part of the rules of procedure, or is it just a choice which can be changed?

101. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly is master of its own decisions. I was merely trying to

help the General Assembly. The President cannot dictate to the Assembly. Therefore, I leave it to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to come forward with some bright ideas.

102. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Yesterday, when we were voting on the draft resolutions regarding Palestine [*95th meeting*], we voted on three draft resolutions and then the explanations of vote were given after the voting on all of them. Could we not follow the same procedure today?

103. The PRESIDENT: May I ask the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to make a formal proposal?

104. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I request, Mr. President, that we complete the voting on the amendments in documents A/39/L.24 and L.25 and then give representatives the opportunity to explain their votes.

105. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran has formally proposed that we deal with the amendments in documents A/39/L.24 and L.25, and after that hear explanations of vote before the voting. We would then vote on the draft resolutions and hear explanations of vote after the voting. If there is no objection to that procedure, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

106. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now proceed with the vote on the first amendment in document A/39/L.24, which concerns the third pre-ambular paragraph of draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Poland, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei

Darussalam, Burma, Haiti, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Malawi, Maldives, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal,⁵ Solomon Islands, Somalia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Yemen.

There were 57 votes in favour, 60 against and 30 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

107. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on the second amendment in document A/39/L.24, which relates to paragraph 3 of draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Gambia, Jordan, Lebanon, Malawi, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Yemen.

There were 53 votes in favour, 67 against and 27 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

108. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the third amendment in document A/39/L.24, which concerns paragraph 8 of draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia,

Luxembourg, Malta, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Poland, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Lebanon, Malawi, Maldives, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Yemen.

There were 55 votes in favour, 62 against and 30 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

109. The PRESIDENT: Finally, I put to the vote the fourth and last amendment in document A/39/L.24, which relates to paragraph 9 of draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia,⁶ Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Poland, Qatar, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania,

Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Egypt, Haiti, Jordan, Lebanon, Malawi, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Venezuela, Yemen.

There were 59 votes in favour, 54 against and 29 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

110. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the first amendment in document A/39/L.25, which relates to the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution D. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Egypt, Gambia, Jamaica, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Venezuela.

There were 52 votes in favour, 66 against and 26 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

111. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the second and last amendment in document A/39/L.25, which relates to paragraph 5 of draft resolution D. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon,

Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Jamaica, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Venezuela.

There were 61 votes in favour, 63 against and 21 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the amendment was not adopted.

112. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has completed its action on the amendments. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on any or all of the five draft resolutions contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/39/24, *part four, chap. I*]. Representatives will also have an opportunity to explain their votes after all the votes have been taken.

113. Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): I have the honour to make a statement on the draft resolutions on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community.

114. In their statements in the course of the general debate on the question of Namibia, the Ten stressed their unwavering commitment to the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence by means of free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, in accordance with the United Nations settlement plan, which has been accepted by both South Africa and SWAPO. The Ten have consistently supported efforts aimed at bringing about a just and peaceful solution to the Namibian question in accordance with the terms of that plan. The Ten do not accept that the settlement plan, endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978), should be delayed or set aside for extraneous reasons or for arrangements inconsistent with resolution 435 (1978).

115. The Ten are disappointed that once again draft resolutions on the question of Namibia have

been presented in a way which cannot attract the unanimous support of the Assembly.

116. The attitude of the 10 member States of the European Community to the endorsement of armed struggle in resolutions of the General Assembly has been frequently expressed in the Assembly and is well known. The Ten are conscious that the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa suggests to many that it will be ended only through armed struggle. The United Nations, however, has, above all, the obligation to encourage peaceful solutions.

117. The Ten regret that in certain respects the draft resolutions before the Assembly do not appear to take fully into consideration efforts which the Ten have consistently supported—such as those of the Secretary-General—aimed at bringing about a just and peaceful solution to the Namibian question in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

118. The Ten's commitment to the Charter of the United Nations and its division of competences remains unchanged.

119. The people of Namibia have the right to choose their own Government through free and fair elections. In the view of the Ten, none of the participants in these elections should therefore be designated in advance as the sole and authentic representative of the people.

120. The Ten reject all arbitrary and unjustified attacks on individual Member States or groups of countries.

121. The Ten wish to reiterate here the concern which they have expressed in the Fifth Committee about the financial implications of some of the resolutions before us. They feel that in the present financial climate a more judicious approach to the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia could have resulted in reduced financial implications without detracting from the attainment of the Council's objectives.

122. The Ten remain firm in their commitment to the independence of Namibia. They will continue to work for and support all efforts aimed at the urgent implementation of the United Nations settlement plan, which alone embodies a universally accepted framework for the peaceful transition of Namibia to independence in a manner which is guaranteed by the Organization to be free and fair.

123. Mr. MONTEIRO (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): During the last few years, the Portuguese delegation has stressed here its opposition to any act likely to delay the process designed to ensure the Namibian people free determination of the political future of their country. Moreover, during the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April 1983, my delegation reaffirmed that the situation in southern Africa was all the more deplorable since it increased the feeling of failure, given the obstacles systematically put in the path of the implementation of decisions which reflected a consensus on the creation of a free and independent Namibia and which aimed at putting an end to the violation of the principles on which the Organization is based, in particular those of respect for the rights of peoples to self-determination, to their sovereignty and territorial integrity and to non-interference in their internal affairs.

124. Portugal therefore believes that the immediate accession of Namibia to independence is imperative, with respect for its national frontiers, and considers with apprehension the crisis which has occurred in the United Nations regarding a problem of vital importance which endangers the prestige and credibility of this Organization. In this context, my delegation has also always stressed that the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa must cease and that the problem falls within the purview of international responsibility. Like all the members of the international community, including those parties most directly involved, Portugal believes that only the United Nations settlement plan, endorsed by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978), can serve as the framework for a peaceful and balanced transition of Namibia to independence, and assure its people the right to decide on their own future through free elections under United Nations control, as a guarantee of recognition internationally.

125. This position of principle must, however, take into account those difficulties experienced in the application of resolution 435 (1978), as well as the importance and significance of the initiatives and contacts which have taken place in the meantime, on both the bilateral and the regional levels, to eliminate those obstacles and ensure a peaceful solution to the problem.

126. The Portuguese Government has followed and is supporting the efforts made by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, the OAU, the front-line States, the Western contact group and SWAPO. It does so in the hope that this will lead to the establishment of a climate of mutual confidence between the parties involved which could bring South Africa to accept in practice resolution 435 (1978). My Government also views positively the agreements reached this year by the States of the region, in particular the agreement of Lusaka, between Angola and South Africa, dealing with the control machinery for military withdrawal from Angolan territory. My delegation therefore condemns all delaying tactics which contribute to increasing the danger to the security and stability of the region, in particular the insistence of the Pretoria Government on maintaining its illegal occupation of Namibia, defying internationally accepted compromises, in particular with other countries of the region, such as Angola, as well as all other acts which, under the guise of strengthening the role of the United Nations, are in fact aimed at undermining the negotiations which are under way and discrediting the countries directly involved or disputing the legitimacy of their initiatives.

127. Because of the language in which some of the provisions of the draft resolutions before us are formulated, and in view of the discriminatory references made therein to certain countries, my delegation is not in a position to support all of the draft resolutions. What it believes is extremely important is the intensification of all sincere efforts designed to come to an urgent, negotiated, peaceful and internationally acceptable solution of the question of Namibia. It therefore reaffirms its full support for Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which reflects the will of the international community to achieve the liberation of the Territory and to contribute to the development and progress of an independent and sovereign Namibia, a full-fledged Member of the United Nations.

128. Mr. SARRÉ (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): Like the question of *apartheid*, the question of Namibia is at the core of African concerns. Regarding these two questions, Africa, standing in unity and solidarity, does and will do its utmost to eradicate those two evils that impair its dignity and jeopardize its economic and social development. For those considerations, the African Heads of State, while ready for a dialogue which would lead to a negotiated and thus a peaceful solution of these problems, remain more than ever determined to ensure that law and justice will prevail over force.

129. Senegal, through its President, Mr. Abdou Diouf, has made the item currently under consideration one of the constants of its foreign policy since the very accession of Senegal to independence. It is upon the initiative of Senegal that there is a yearly International Day of Solidarity with the Namibian People, and it was my delegation which had the honour of presiding over the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence held in Paris in April 1983. My country also actively participates in activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

130. The interest my country attaches to the question of Namibia stems from its dedication to General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and also from our support for the restoration of stability in Africa and the consolidation of international peace and security. No one can doubt that those two objectives cannot be fully achieved as long as Namibia remains under the yoke of South Africa; therefore, my country must explore all ways and means which could lead to the independence of Namibia. The Head of State of Senegal has always advocated, both internationally and nationally, the full and speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which includes a plan for the settlement of the Namibian question. Accordingly, we cannot endorse any prerequisites to its implementation; and, in the same spirit, we have always appealed to the countries of the Western contact group to step up their pressure on South Africa.

131. On that basis, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolutions contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

132. However, my delegation considers that the formulation of some paragraphs in the draft resolutions contained in that report should be reworded. I should like to mention, for example, selective condemnations. My delegation considers that, in so far as condemnation is concerned, objectivity and credibility require that it be total rather than selective. That has become a rule because in similar circumstances and cases our Assembly has indeed abided by that provision. The texts we are considering today would remain valid in substance in the absence of these selective condemnations or recriminations. That is why my delegation will vote in favour of the amendments in document A/39/L.23 to L.25, except for the amendment to draft resolution B, contained in paragraph 2 of document A/39/L.24, and the amendment to draft resolution D contained in paragraph 1 of document A/39/L.25. Hence my delegation abstained in the voting on those two amendments.

133. My delegation supports and will in the future continue to support the Namibian people to ensure the triumph of their inalienable right to independence. We give similar support to the Palestinian cause and to the eradication of *apartheid*.

134. Mr. de La BARRE de NANTEUIL (France) (*interpretation from French*): France is now more than ever aware of the situation in southern Africa and in particular the situation in Namibia. We have continually called for independence for Namibia in keeping with the modalities stipulated in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). My Government voted in favour of Security Council resolutions 532 (1983) and 539 (1983) calling for the speedy implementation of the United Nations settlement plan so as to ensure the end of the illegal occupation of that Territory by South Africa.

135. Everyone knows very well the circumstances that caused France to suspend its active participation in the work of the Western contact group in December 1983. That was a solemn way of indicating its strict adherence to resolution 435 (1978).

136. Today we can only note with interest the official letter addressed by the President of the People's Republic of Angola to the Secretary-General [A/39/688], to whom my country wishes to pay a particular tribute in view of the personal attention he constantly gives to the questions of southern Africa. My delegation hopes that recent developments will contribute to establishing the conditions indispensable to the settlement of the Namibian question.

137. While awaiting such a settlement, which we hope will be achieved without delay, France intends to maintain a position which will make it possible to make a contribution to the conclusion of the process leading to the independence of the Territory.

138. For that reason, my delegation intends to take a position of abstention in principle regarding these five draft resolutions.

139. Mr. MIZERE (Malawi): First, please allow me to reiterate and solemnly declare here and now that my delegation fully and unequivocally supports self-determination and genuine independence for Namibia. This commitment is total and irimutable.

140. Secondly, my delegation supports the consensus that has emerged that South Africa should relinquish its hold on Namibia in order to allow Namibians to exercise self-determination and to enjoy the fruits of independence in terms of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

141. Thirdly, my delegation welcomes the release from prison of Andimba Toivo ya Toivo and expresses the cherished hope that other political prisoners will also be released.

142. Having stated this, my delegation, however, has reservations in respect of, first, the principle of singling out some Member States for selective condemnation or criticism. Such a procedure may be construed as sheltering some States for their double standards, thereby creating a credibility gap. Secondly, because of geographical predicament, practical difficulties and Malawi's belief in the policy of contact and dialogue, my delegation is unable to support the policy of isolation, sanctions and some of the language formulations contained in some of the preambular and operative paragraphs of the draft resolutions.

143. For these reasons, my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolutions A and B contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and it will be recalled that it abstained in the vote on the amendments contained in documents A/39/L.23 to L.25. We shall, however, vote in favour of draft resolutions C, D and E.

144. Mr. CHETTY (Sri Lanka): Sri Lanka fully supports the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole, legitimate representative, for the establishment of a free, unified and independent Namibia.

145. We believe, in this context, that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) constitutes the means through which Namibian independence could be brought about. It should be implemented in its entirety without pre-conditions. Issues such as the linkage of the Cuban presence in Angola with the independence of Namibia are extraneous and should not be advanced as reasons for the delay or denial of Namibian independence.

146. Sri Lanka's consistent policy at the United Nations on all issues has been that we have not favoured the condemning or denouncing by name of countries with which we have diplomatic relations. Our carrying out of this policy in United Nations voting does not, however, imply any diminution of our position on the question of Namibia which we have summarized just now and indicated in our statement in the general debate [5th meeting] under this item.

147. Sri Lanka has supported some of the amendments and opposed some others contained in documents A/39/L.23 to L.25. Had we been given an opportunity of voting separately on the amendments to paragraph 49 of draft resolution A contained in paragraphs 5 (b) and (c) of document A/39/L.23, we would have voted in favour of them. Similarly, on the amendments to draft resolution D, contained in document A/39/L.25, our vote would have been cast differently had we been given the opportunity to vote separately. We regret that we were denied that opportunity.

148. We intend to vote in favour of all the draft resolutions under this item when each of them is put to the vote as a whole, as contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

149. Miss DEVER (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): Belgium, which is a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, regrets that, despite the diplomatic efforts carried out during the past 12 months, no substantive progress has been achieved in the attainment of independence for Namibia.

150. With respect to this situation, the international community can only maintain and endeavour to make more effective the pressure it is exerting on the Government of South Africa to ensure that it ceases to block the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In that regard, my country last month joined in the consensus by which all countries members of the United Nations Council for Namibia adopted the report of the Council.

151. However, on that occasion, my delegation pointed out that it still had reservations on some of the draft resolutions included in the report and that it would explain those reservations at the time of the voting in the General Assembly.

152. In reference to the comments that have just been made by the representative of Ireland in this

regard on behalf of the European Community, my delegation believes it is useful to recall some of the principles motivating Belgium in its international relations, which it feels should not be discarded even in the present situation.

153. My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution C, on the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia, while recalling here the very strong reservations which explained its abstention in the voting on the financial implications yesterday in the Fifth Committee. My country will also vote in favour of draft resolution E on the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

154. On draft resolutions A, B and D, concerning respectively the situation in Namibia, the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and the dissemination of information, my delegation will abstain. The reasons for this triple abstention are the same as those we explained last year. The wording that caused difficulties for us in the past has been maintained and in some cases even strengthened.

155. For example, in draft resolution A, my country cannot agree with those paragraphs which call for support for armed struggle and for the breaking off of all relations with South Africa, or those which systematically denigrate the actions of some countries.

156. Nor can my country recognize SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. No party has ever obtained or claimed such recognition in Belgium. Indeed, that would be contrary to the ideals of freedom and pluralism that are the basis of our national democratic system. We therefore cannot attribute to SWAPO—and my delegation hopes that it understands this—a title which only the Namibian people can grant it, through free elections.

157. My delegation believes also that the diplomatic efforts exerted in southern Africa during the past 12 months deserve—despite the fact that so far the results have been very limited—a more subtle interpretation than that given in this draft resolution.

158. In draft resolution B, my delegation cannot accept the unjustified attacks upon the United States and the criticism directed at other Western members of the Security Council.

159. With regard to draft resolution D, on the dissemination of information, my delegation believes that the volume of this programme of information and mobilization is excessive. This programme, moreover, contains various points of view that are not shared by my Government.

160. Having said that, I would state that my country understands the impatience—indeed, the exasperation—of the Namibian people and the countries most directly involved with the consequences of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. We are not losing sight of the fact that this question, with its tragic consequences, results from the challenge flung by Pretoria at the international community. We shall continue to work for Namibia's rapid accession to independence.

161. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): When my delegation spoke in the debate on this question [81st meeting], we expressed a number of reservations about the draft resolutions appearing before us today.

162. In this connection, I should like to emphasize that it has long been a matter of concern that,

because of language which is unacceptable to us, Australia has been obliged to distance itself in the United Nations Council for Namibia and in the General Assembly over a number of years from resolutions and programmes with which the Australian Government is in basic agreement.

163. During the general debate, in which approximately 100 delegations participated, there was a clear and unanimous message: Namibia must be brought to the earliest possible independence, in accordance with the United Nations plan, and South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory must be terminated.

164. Yet, turning to the draft resolutions before us, we find language which deliberately sets out to divide rather than to mobilize the common purpose of the international community.

165. The Australian Government is deeply concerned about the situation in Namibia resulting from South Africa's occupation of the Territory. We fully support the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and we support programmes to disseminate information and mobilize international public opinion in support of Namibia. Yet, in the past, we have been unable to accept resolutions which were similar to draft resolutions A, B and D and which dealt precisely with these subjects, because of the language in which they were couched.

166. As I said earlier, my delegation has sought to have the United Nations Council for Namibia and the General Assembly adopt resolutions which will be more widely acceptable. We supported the amendments contained in documents A/39/L.23 to L.25, proposed by the representative of the United States, because we have consistently argued against the selective and arbitrary naming of Member States in General Assembly resolutions. We regret that these amendments were not carried. If they had been carried in their entirety, my delegation would have voted in favour of draft resolutions B, C, D and E and abstained on draft resolution A. This would have represented a distinct change in Australia's voting pattern, as compared to recent years. We would have done so notwithstanding the fact that draft resolutions A and B—and A in particular—contain elements which we do not fully support. As the amendments were not carried, we shall now abstain on draft resolutions A, B and D and support draft resolutions C and E.

167. The draft resolutions before us contain a number of difficulties that we have previously elaborated on in the Assembly. For example, my delegation is unable to accept references to SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, although we acknowledge that SWAPO has an essential role to play in the settlement negotiations.

168. Nor can we accept endorsement of armed struggle as a means of bringing about Namibian independence, as this runs counter to the very Charter of the United Nations. Having said this, however, we do understand the frustrations which have led many countries and peoples to argue that if peaceful methods do not produce the necessary results, force may inevitably occur as a last resort to end institutionalized discrimination in southern Africa.

169. We are concerned also with exaggerated allegations concerning co-operation by "Western countries" with South Africa. I do not propose here to

outline in detail the concerns we have where such allegations are made on each and every occasion; I would simply register that such criticism is arbitrary and selective. A further difficulty we have is that we do not accept that South Africa ought to be excluded from international organizations. It is through its membership in such bodies that South Africa comes face to face with the force of international opposition to its unacceptable policies in relation to *apartheid* and Namibia.

170. Mr. ULRICH (Denmark): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries—Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Denmark—in explanation of vote on the draft resolutions concerning the question of Namibia.

171. The Nordic countries remain firmly convinced that the people of Namibia must be permitted as soon as possible to determine their own future through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). They are deeply concerned that South Africa continues to lay down extraneous conditions for co-operating in the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. The Nordic countries reiterate the view that the settlement plan alone provides a universally accepted framework for Namibian independence.

172. The Nordic countries deeply regret that again this year they will not be able to support all the draft resolutions. This is all the more regrettable since we strongly support the overall objective—namely, freedom and independence for Namibia.

173. The draft resolutions before us contain an increasing number of elements which cause us difficulties of principle. I shall now outline these difficulties in general terms.

174. First, as we have stated on a number of occasions, the Nordic countries cannot accept endorsement by the United Nations of the use of armed struggle. One of the basic principles of the Organization is to promote peaceful solutions to international problems. For the same reason, we cannot support calls for military assistance.

175. Secondly, owing to the strict adherence of the Nordic countries to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, we must generally reserve our position with regard to formulations which fail to take into account that only the Security Council can adopt decisions binding on Member States.

176. Thirdly, the Nordic countries deplore the inappropriate and arbitrary singling out of individual countries and groups of countries. We believe that this procedure, which is getting increasingly common, makes it more difficult than before to maintain the international consensus on the question of Namibia.

177. Fourthly, all political parties enjoying popular support in Namibia must be allowed to participate in a political process through free and fair elections. SWAPO is such a party and must be part of any solution in Namibia. However, we have reservations concerning formulations which prejudice the outcome of free elections.

178. Fifthly, we are also this year concerned about the substantial additional expenditures which the proposed large meetings away from Headquarters involve. The Nordic countries support the general principle embodied in General Assembly resolution

31/140 that United Nations bodies shall meet at their established Headquarters.

179. The Nordic countries hope that the future recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia will be changed accordingly, thereby making it possible for our long-standing support for the Namibian people to find expression in only affirmative votes.

180. Mr. WERNDL (Federal Republic of Germany): I believe the position of the Federal Republic of Germany on the question of Namibia is well known. There has been no change in that position. As Federal Foreign Minister Genscher repeatedly stated, most recently on 6 June before the German Bundestag, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is and remains the one and only basis for the internationally recognized independence of Namibia.

181. Being a member of the Western contact group, the Federal Republic of Germany, as in recent years, will abstain on all draft resolutions concerning the question of Namibia. As has been pointed out by the contact group collectively on similar occasions in recent years, such abstention is motivated by procedural reasons. As a member of the contact group, the Federal Republic of Germany might be involved in negotiations on the implementation of the Western settlement plan endorsed by the Security Council in 1978. In order not to prejudice the outcome of those negotiations in any way, the Federal Republic of Germany must refrain from associating itself with the draft resolutions before the General Assembly in either a positive or negative manner. Mainly for this reason, but also out of certain reservations with regard to some financial implications contained in the draft resolutions, my delegation will abstain.

182. Mr. van der STOEL (Netherlands): The Netherlands has repeatedly condemned South Africa for continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia in defiance of the unanimous opinion of the international community. My Government has consistently joined other Members of this Organization in appealing to South Africa to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). For the Namibian problem to be solved, South Africa must be prevailed upon to co-operate without further delay or pre-conditions in carrying out the settlement plan endorsed by resolution 435 (1978) which, *inter alia*, provides for free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and the establishment of an independent and sovereign State of Namibia.

183. The Netherlands will continue to encourage all efforts aimed at bringing about this goal and overcoming the obstacles to which the inalienable right of the Namibian people to independence has been held hostage too long. As Namibia has always been a particular responsibility and concern of the United Nations, it is our duty, as Members of this world body, to attract the widest possible support for these efforts. To our deep regret, however, we are faced once again with draft resolutions that include many elements which are more likely to create controversy and division than to lay the foundations for concerted action by the Organization in pursuit of our common goal.

184. My delegation has no choice, therefore, but to abstain on some of the draft resolutions presented to us.

185. As an Organization whose Charter commits its Members to search for solutions by peaceful means, the United Nations cannot in good conscience encourage the use of violence. For this reason, the Netherlands dissociates itself from any wording which, explicitly or implicitly, condones the use of force, such as the endorsement of armed struggle. Furthermore, the Netherlands cannot agree to calls for the total isolation of South Africa because the imposition of such measures would run counter to the objective of seeking international agreement on Namibia's independence.

186. In our view, SWAPO is a major political force in Namibia and as such it has participated from the outset in the negotiations concerning the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). But my Government feels that to designate SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people would prejudice the outcome of the free and democratic elections provided for in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). Nor can the Netherlands Government subscribe to attempts to politicize the specialized agencies and to interfere with their autonomy. We also attach great importance to the principle of universality and respect for the division of competences of United Nations bodies embodied in the Charter.

187. In our view, one of the most reprehensible aspects of the draft resolutions before us is the arbitrary and unjustified accusations hurled at individual Member States or groups of countries. My Government strongly rejects this practice of selective name-calling as unworthy of the Organization. The aspersions cast on one particular group of Member States can only serve the interests of those who are less concerned with strengthening the resolve of the United Nations to deal effectively with this difficult issue than with exploiting it for their own narrow objectives.

188. Against this background, my delegation has voted in favour of all amendments introduced by the United States. In this context we would urge the United Nations Council for Namibia henceforward to resist the introduction of those elements into draft resolutions and thereby enhance this body's ability to contribute to international efforts to bring about Namibia's independence.

189. In view of the considerations just mentioned, the Netherlands will abstain on draft resolution A and on draft resolution D concerning the dissemination of information. We will also abstain on draft resolution B concerning the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The early exercise by the Namibian people of its internationally recognized right to self-determination and independence should not be impeded because of the situation in a neighbouring country. At the same time, the Netherlands Government supports the efforts of all parties concerned to reach a common understanding on issues relevant to the stability of the region as a whole once the implementation of the Namibian independence plan is set in motion. The immediate cessation of South African aggression against the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Angola and the withdrawal of foreign troops from that country would certainly contribute to a climate of confidence conducive towards this end. But I wish to emphasize that, in the opinion of the Netherlands, the independence of Namibia remains the essential and primary responsibility of the

United Nations, which must necessarily take precedence over other considerations.

190. The Netherlands will vote in favour of draft resolution C concerning the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia. It cannot be inferred from our positive vote, however, that the Netherlands agrees to all aspects of the programme of work. In particular, we feel strongly that the request to the Council, in paragraph 19, to hold a series of plenary meetings during 1985 away from Headquarters, will require considerable additional cost in return for a very questionable additional benefit. At a time when most Member States and the United Nations itself have increasingly been forced to observe financial self-restraint, it cannot be beyond the Council to find less extravagant projects with a greater potential benefit to the people of Namibia on which to spend the funds that could be saved by holding the meetings at Headquarters.

191. Finally, the Netherlands does not share the view that the United Nations Council for Namibia must enjoy the same rights and privileges in international organizations as are reserved for States.

192. Mr. SVOBODA (Canada): My delegation would like to make clear that its abstentions in the votes on the draft resolutions concerning Namibia now before the Assembly are purely procedural and indicate neither approval or disapproval of their contents. We do regret, however, that the amendments proposed a few moments ago were not adopted by this body. Canada is again abstaining on the substantive resolutions this year because we are a member of the contact group, which has been involved in the past and, indeed, may be involved in the future in negotiations concerning the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We would not wish, therefore, to prejudge the outcome of any negotiations by our votes on these draft resolutions. Canada's basic position was stated by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in his statement to the Assembly on 25 September:

"We are also grieved that the people of Namibia are still denied their independence after a century of colonial rule. South Africa must set a date to implement Namibia's independence under Security Council resolution 435 (1978)." [7th meeting, para. 97.]

193. We join other delegations in looking forward to the day when Namibia will be free and will join the ranks of our membership.

194. Mr. BARMA (Chad) (*interpretation from French*): The debate on the question of Namibia, and even the debate which has been devoted to the question of *apartheid*, have clearly shown to what extent South Africa continues to defy the international community by its illegal occupation of Namibia and its base policies of *apartheid*. It is unquestionable that all delegations here present, even those which did not take part in the debate, quite strongly denounce and condemn South Africa for its illegal occupation of Namibia and reject its abject policy of *apartheid*.

195. It is in this spirit that the foreign policy of my country, Chad, has always been pursued, since we have always worked and will always work in so far as possible, for the fraternal Namibian people, under the wise and responsible leadership of its sole authentic representative, SWAPO, to accede to freedom and independence in accordance with the

United Nations plan, which was endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978)—a resolution which has been accepted by all the parties concerned.

196. Whereas the United Nations, through the United Nations Council for Namibia, was about to implement this Plan, South Africa, in order unjustly to hold up the independence of the Territory, has set in motion problems which are quite contrary to the spirit and letter of resolution 435 (1978).

197. As we did last year, we would like to reiterate that there should be no link established between the independence of Namibia and the presence of foreign troops in Angola because that is a matter which concerns two sovereign independent States—Angola and Cuba. It is by no means accurate to say that Cuban troops in any way pose a threat to a heavily armed South Africa. It is rather South Africa which represents a threat to its neighbours, particularly Angola, a considerable part of whose territory it occupies.

198. We would therefore urge South Africa's friends to exert appropriate pressure on that country to bring it to abide by the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations by unconditionally liberating Namibia and by completely giving up its policy of *apartheid*. Undoubtedly, it will be retorted, with some reason, that this attitude, far from leading the Government of South Africa to heed these appeals, will encourage it to persist in its policy of *apartheid* and its occupation of Namibia. My delegation is not entirely convinced by this view and considers that as far as self-determination for the Namibian people is concerned, the process of negotiation under way, although slow and difficult, will undoubtedly lead eventually to the much desired independence of Namibia.

199. My delegation sincerely believes, therefore, that it would be judicious not to discourage those States which, like the United States, are trying to do the best they can by approaching South Africa in order to try and induce it to grant independence to Namibia. Of course, each and every one of us recognizes that pressures exerted on South Africa have not proved as decisive as the international community had hoped they might be. We can only regret this state of affairs. Nevertheless, we do not believe that a condemnation by name of particular States Members of the Organization is likely to facilitate a solution to the Namibian problem. However, I hope we will be properly understood; our position should not be construed to mean that we are encouraging any sort of collaboration with South Africa. This is far from our thoughts. The idea of our delegation is that selective condemnations, at whatever States they be aimed, frequently produce results which are contrary to those that we are seeking.

200. That is why my delegation, in accordance with its traditional policies, voted in favour of the amendments introduced in documents A/39/L.23 to L.25. In so doing, we believe that avoiding selective condemnation by no means detracts from the substance of the draft resolutions on Namibia, with which we are in agreement. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of the draft resolutions contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia while at the same time entering express reservations on those paragraphs which selectively condemn certain States Members of the Organization.

201. Mrs. LEGWAILA (Botswana): Although my delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions contained in document A/39/24, we wish to place on record our reservation on any paragraph in any of them which seeks to commit us to the imposition of sanctions against South Africa. For reasons which are well known to the Assembly and which have often been stated in the past, Botswana is in no position to participate in such sanctions.

202. Mr. GBEZERA-BRIA (Central African Republic) (*interpretation from French*): My country, the Central African Republic, has continuously and firmly reiterated that Namibia should be independent without any pre-conditions. There could be no compromise with regard to the right of the Namibian people to self-determination under the leadership of its sole legitimate representative, SWAPO. Therefore there must be an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa so that Namibia may accede to independence and freedom without linking it to extraneous considerations, which in fact have to do with the full and complete sovereignty of Angola and South Africa, and without its being subject to any pretext for destabilization in the region. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) must therefore be implemented in its entirety.

203. My country's position on this matter cannot be called in question; nor can the will of the international community be challenged. Indeed, with regard to Namibia, there exists a collective responsibility in the application of decisions which have been taken. There also exists a complacency which comforts South Africa in its arrogant persistence in perpetuating its illegal occupation, with no chance in sight for a negotiated settlement which would not only lead to the international sovereignty of Namibia, but also guarantee peace in southern Africa. The important role which is played by the United States does not exclude such collective responsibility, and it is that collective responsibility which is tested in the difficult and delicate negotiations under way which must be encouraged and the merits of which must be recognized.

204. Thus, while voting in favour of the draft resolutions as a whole, my delegation could not support certain provisions, in particular those which selectively condemn one State or another, that is, the United States, which is endeavouring to reach a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia.

205. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): South Africa is the only régime which has an institutionalized system of racism, *apartheid*. All the Members of the Assembly know very well and very much about the racist policies and the crimes that the South African régime has been perpetrating against humanity. We have all read about and heard the cries of the 3.5 million black workers who have been removed from their homelands; about the strikes of over 800,000 students and millions of workers; and about many other examples of public and popular outcry against racism and the *apartheid* policies of the South African régime.

206. On the other hand, the involvement of the United States—not forgetting the involvement of the Zionist régime in the Middle East—in South Africa is well known, not only to the General Assembly, but also to the American people and their senators. This is why demonstrators occupied the South African embassy and its many consulates in Washington,

D.C. and in other American states, in opposition to the policies of the United States regarding South Africa and, indeed, in opposition to the policies of the South African régime.

207. In spite of all that, United States-owned transnational companies are still very active and apparently very productive and prolific in South Africa. There is nothing secret about it. Even the American mass media—channel 13—have disseminated information about the exceptionally high level of profit and the accumulation of wealth enjoyed by the American-owned companies in South Africa. Those companies, thanks to the cheap and abundant manpower and raw materials, which essentially belong to those poor people, made a profit of 1,500 per cent last year. This easily explains the reason behind the poverty of the indigenous people of South Africa and also the profound interest of the United States Government in its dealings with South Africa. It is that same illegitimate wealth which constitutes the backbone of the constructive engagement of the United States, which is intended to serve its exploitative, inhumane and destructive role in South Africa, and I shall therefore call it American “destructive engagement”.

208. This unholy, sinister engagement has a wide range of activities and objectives which are embodied in the phrase which the President of the United States is quoted as using: “the strategic value of South Africa”. One of the many dangerous and anti-human elements of this destructive engagement is United States co-operation with the régime of South Africa in the field of military and nuclear technology. *The Wall Street Journal* of 28 November 1984 stated the following:

“One of the six countries that have not signed the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, South Africa, has the necessary technology and equipment, raw uranium and scientists to fashion at least a crude nuclear bomb.”

The same paper continued:

“Indeed, Western countries have little leverage over South Africa. What few pieces of the nuclear puzzle South Africa lacks have mostly been given or sold to them by the United States and others.”

And then the article continues:

“In 1957, under the ‘Atoms for Peace’ programme, the United States signed a 50-year co-operation agreement with South Africa. In 1961 South Africa built its first nuclear reactor with United States technology. The United States has agreed to supply enriched uranium, uranium fuel, to that reactor.”

209. These and many other examples bear witness to the role of the United States Government in South Africa. It is this sinister destructive engagement that is immediately responsible for the perpetration of the crimes of *apartheid* in South Africa and also for the perpetuation and prolongation of the *apartheid* régime in that part of the world. Had it not been for the sinister role of this collaboration between the United States and South Africa, the South African régime would have died long ago, and our oppressed fellow man in South Africa and, as a matter of fact, the entire population of Africa, would have been rid of that régime.

210. The South African Catholic Bishops’ Conference, as you know, has condemned the policies of the South African régime in that part of the world. A

report by the Conference states that "the South African police behaved like an occupying army controlling enemy territory while combating recent black unrest in the townships."

211. The United States Administration and the Zionist régime in the Middle East are historically known as the most adamant supporters of South Africa, and their joint collaboration with that régime deserves the explicit condemnation of the entire international community. That is why my delegation, regarding it as a personal religious duty as well as being the position of my Government and my people, voted against the amendments contained in documents A/39/L.23 to L.25.

212. I have to congratulate you, Mr. President, for this defeat that was so swiftly and effectively inflicted upon the enemies of the African people under your leadership. I must also sincerely congratulate and thank my dear friend Mr. Sinclair for his very intelligent and timely move requesting approval by a two-thirds majority. Today's record has made it evident that, in spite of all the United States intimidations, the oppressed can be victorious and they will be indeed.

213. Mr. LUNA MENDOZA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions submitted on the question of Namibia. The position of Peru on this question is well known. We firmly support the exercise by the people of Namibia of their inalienable rights to self-determination and independence. In that connection we call for the immediate implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

214. We cannot, however, agree with the mentioning by name of specific countries in the draft resolutions before us. Such singling out is discriminatory not only as a practice but also in the light of the reality of the international situation and of the Power that is illegally occupying the Territory of Namibia.

215. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu): The Government of Vanuatu has instructed our delegation to support the recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia contained in its report [A/39/24, part four, chap. I]. In supporting the draft resolutions in that document the Government of Vanuatu regrets that language capable of gaining a consensus was not used.

216. It is our belief that Namibia's independence will be achieved by a concert of co-operation and good will and through the efforts of the people of Namibia themselves, with the support of a broad international constituency. Concrete action in support of Namibia's people is, of course, essential. Unfulfilled promises, empty sloganeering and strident rhetoric will gain nothing. Had we been responsible for the wording of these draft resolutions, we would have used different language. However, such was not the case, and we will, because of their primary thrust, support the draft resolutions as recommended by the Council.

217. We will do so for two basic reasons. One, we respect the recognized expertise and authority of the Council. Two, we firmly believe that it is essential to send a strong message of support to the people of Namibia and their representative, SWAPO, particularly at this moment in history, while at the same time sending an equally strong message of disapproval to Pretoria. Our vote is directed against no country

but South Africa and for no people but the people of Namibia.

218. We believe that we, the nations of the world, must finally fulfil our promise to Namibia's people and stand firmly once and for all against South Africa's injustice. We must lead by example and not just word in rejecting the continued illegal occupation of Namibia in defiance of international public opinion. To us, these factors outweigh deficiencies in the language and thrust of parts of the draft resolutions.

219. While we do not approve of all of that language, we were compelled to vote against the proposed changes because of our aforementioned support for the Council and for Namibia's people. Nothing should be read into our position, nor should any interpretation be given other than a heartfelt empathy with the colonized people of Namibia. We have and will continue to state to our friends our objections to the imperfect language. We will also continue to make what we feel are constructive suggestions. We hope that some of these suggestions, and those made by others, will find their way into future draft resolutions.

220. It is our firm hope that, should the situation in that country persist and we consider similar draft resolutions next year, such draft resolutions may be more precise, far less selective and more capable of eliciting broad support. We believe that selectivity is neither constructive nor accurate. However, by the same token, we do not believe it is appropriate to change the language of the Council's recommendations at this time. We do not doubt that in the future greater thought will be given to the words expressed today by all of us, both those who will support the draft resolutions and those who will not be able to.

221. Reflection, reappraisal, re-evaluation and interaction can only serve us all. In the process we may strengthen the opposition to South Africa here at the United Nations and swell the ranks of those who vote to support the Council's recommendations.

222. Mr. GARCÍA-MORENO (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In a recent statement on this question [83rd meeting], the delegation of Colombia reiterated its unequivocal support for the independence and territorial integrity of Namibia and renewed its unswerving solidarity with that country's people. The cause of Namibia, as we have said before, is a priority objective of our foreign policy.

223. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of all the draft resolutions that have been submitted to the Assembly today. However, we have reservations with regard to the wording of paragraphs in which specific countries are singled out for condemnation. We believe that draft resolutions that come before the Assembly should seek the desired balance and avoid any language that might lead to confrontation rather than co-operation.

224. The authors of these important initiatives, which are aimed at ending the illegal occupation of Namibia, should find formulas that could enjoy the support of the overwhelming majority of the international community.

225. Mr. MILES (United Kingdom): My delegation's general reservations on certain of the draft resolutions in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia have been expressed by the representative of Ireland speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Community.

226. The five members of the contact group were involved in the formulation of the United Nations settlement plan and are likely to play a role in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It has therefore been our custom not to adopt a substantive position on the draft resolutions on Namibia placed before the General Assembly. For that reason my delegation will once again abstain in the voting on those draft resolutions.

227. **Mr. MALINGA (Swaziland):** The Swaziland delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions on Namibia before the General Assembly because their main thrust seeks to obtain the long-overdue independence of Namibia. It is our wish that our fellow southern Africans be given an opportunity to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination.

228. Owing to well-known reasons dictated to us by circumstances of geographic sensitivity, my delegation will register, for the record, its reservation on all paragraphs which contain elements that advocate economic sanctions against South Africa. We also do not endorse the use of arms by both sides as a means of solving the problem of Namibia.

229. **Mr. TOMBIA (Angola):** My delegation rejects the allegation made by the representative of the United States of America concerning the establishment of a Liaison Office in Windhoek. In the Lusaka talks referred to by the representative of the United States, no agreement was reached with anybody about the establishment of a so-called Liaison Office. The People's Republic of Angola did agree in those talks that the United States would be invited to participate in the joint commission only at the invitation of the parties concerned, just in case of any disagreement in the process of disengagement. Therefore, the allegation made by the representative of the United States of America that there was an agreement, or any kind of understanding with the United States to establish the so-called Liaison Office, is false.

230. That is why my delegation voted against all the amendments presented by the delegation of the United States, in particular the amendment contained in paragraph 4 of document A/39/L.23 concerning paragraph 38 of draft resolution A.

231. There is not a shadow of a doubt that my delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions before us.

232. **Mr. HAPPI TCHANKOU (Cameroon) (interpretation from French):** I should like to explain my vote on the amendment by the United States which is contained in paragraph 3 of document A/39/L.23 and which concerns paragraph 21 of draft resolution A. We voted against this amendment, but the voting display showed that we abstained. I should like the record to indicate that my delegation voted against that amendment. I should like to make it clear that the position of Cameroon on Namibia has been constant.

233. **The PRESIDENT:** We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the voting. However, before proceeding to the vote, in answer to a number of queries we have received, I wish to inform the Assembly that as soon as we have completed the present item on Namibia, we shall then proceed to take up the remaining items on our agenda covering various reports from the First Committee.

234. The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolutions A to E recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia in its report [*ibid.*]. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of the draft resolutions is to be found in document A/39/813. The General Assembly will now begin the voting process and take a decision on draft resolution A, entitled "The situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

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

Draft resolution A was adopted by 128 votes to none, with 25 abstentions (resolution 39/50 A).

235. **The PRESIDENT:** The General Assembly will vote next on draft resolution B, entitled "Implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ec-

uador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

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

Draft resolution B was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 25 abstentions (resolution 39/50 B).

236. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution C, entitled "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, 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, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Repub-

lic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Paraguay, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 148 votes to none, with 7 abstentions (resolution 39/50 C).

237. The PRESIDENT: Next we turn to draft resolution D, entitled, "Dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution D was adopted by 130 votes to none, with 24 abstentions (resolution 39/50 D).

238. The PRESIDENT: We come now to draft resolution E, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma,

Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, 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, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution E was adopted by 149 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 39/50 E).⁷

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

240. Mrs. BETHEL-DALY (Bahamas): The Bahamas has always supported every initiative which we felt would somehow facilitate the long overdue attainment of independence for Namibia. Similarly, we have wasted no time, nor have we minced our words, in condemning those actions which have been barriers or obstacles to the achievement of Namibia's independence. As noted in our statement in the general debate [28th meeting] at the beginning of this session, we find it discouraging and even deplorable that the international community continues to be plagued by this issue year after year.

241. Because we believe that the policies of the racist régime of South Africa with regard to Namibia pose a direct threat to international security and peace and because it is our conviction that Namibians must exercise their inalienable rights as free human beings, through sovereignty and the establishment of democratic rule in that country, my delegation voted whole-heartedly in favour of the resolutions just adopted. Further, we support these resolutions because we believe that their general thrust underscores the important fact that Namibia's independence and the inherent dignity of its people should no longer be jeopardized through the intransigence and selfishness of another State, namely South Africa.

242. Having said this, my delegation is convinced that issues which are extraneous to these two basic

and crucial elements of independence and democratic rule serve not to enhance the resolutions but rather to make them just another scapegoat for prolonged and unnecessarily complicated debates. In an effort to promote the call for equity and sound judgement my delegation voted in favour of the amendments to the seventeenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A and paragraph 5 of draft resolution D. As we see it, fundamentally, what is being called into question in the aforementioned seventeenth preambular paragraph is not the actions of an individual country but rather the rules and procedures of the Security Council, which should not be an issue in this context. With regard to paragraph 5 of draft resolution D, my delegation contends that the language of this paragraph fails to show any correlation between the objective thought and the methods to be employed. Our vote against the amendment to paragraph 38 of draft resolution A was determined by our belief that until Namibia achieves independence, no foreign Government should establish any type of representative office in that country, particularly since Namibia is currently being administered by the United Nations Council for Namibia, which represents the world Organization and consequently the individual States.

243. Finally, we believe that arbitrary name-calling is sometimes necessary. For example, the omission of reference to South Africa from the texts would make them meaningless. It would seem that, generally speaking, the repetitious and inconsistent references tend to compromise the balance of the texts and their possible future efficacy. We reiterate our point that independence and democratic rule for Namibia should be the focal point of this issue and neither will be gained through resolutions which would seem to give undue weight to other contentious aspects. My delegation trusts that these ideas will be considered in any future texts that may be deemed necessary.

244. Mr. LEHNE (Austria): Austria has consistently supported the right of the Namibian people to self-determination. We regard the United Nations plan for Namibia as offering the most promising way to end South Africa's illegal occupation and to facilitate peaceful transition to independence. We regret that issues outside the scope of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have so far prevented the implementation of the Namibian plan and consider it imperative that South Africa change its intransigent attitude.

245. For all these reasons, we would have liked to support all the draft resolutions submitted under this item. Unfortunately, some of these texts contain provisions which are unacceptable to Austria. Also, we understand the impatience and disappointment of the Namibian people in view of the protracted negotiating process. We remain convinced that, in the light of the principles and goals of the Charter of the United Nations, it is not up to the General Assembly to endorse the resort to armed struggle, nor should it encourage military support for such struggle.

246. Furthermore, Austria has strong reservations about the attempts to prejudice and influence the independent work of the Security Council, an attempt which is in contradiction with the relevant provisions of the Charter. Austria is fully aware of the significant and important role which SWAPO plays in the fight for Namibian independence, as well as in the negotiating process, a role which undoubt-

edly will continue. The final endorsement of this role, however, will be given by the Namibian people themselves in free and fair elections. The General Assembly must not prejudge this free and democratic expression of political will by the population of Namibia.

247. Austria also does not believe that the arbitrary singling out of certain States for condemnation either is justified or in any way advances the legitimate interests of the Namibian people. We therefore supported the amendments regarding these paragraphs.

248. We regret that, for the reasons mentioned above, Austria had to abstain on draft resolutions A, B and C. We wish to reiterate, however, that this in no way affects Austria's firm commitment to a peaceful and negotiated transition of Namibia to independence on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

249. Mr. PFIRTER (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): During the recent debate on the question of Namibia, my delegation explained in detail Argentina's position on the item [81st meeting].

250. Argentina strongly condemns the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and supports the adoption by the Security Council of mandatory sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. Pursuant to that clear and firm position, we voted in favour of all the draft resolutions that were put to the vote. Nevertheless, we wish to reiterate the reservations which we expressed in the Fourth Committee [see A/C.4/39/SR.19, para. 40] as to the references to certain countries in the draft resolutions. Those reservations guided our position on each of the amendments voted on this afternoon.

251. Mr. BERMUDEZ (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Honduras voted in favour—and has done so every year—of all the resolutions on the question of Namibia, whose Territory and people are under the direct legal and political responsibility of the Organization. Our commitment is strong in favour of the cause of self-determination, independence and freedom for the Namibian people, as well as for the territorial integrity of Namibia. On 29 November of this year [79th meeting] we expressed our position in this respect in this forum.

252. On this basis, Honduras has continued to vote in favour of these resolutions without thereby implying that we share views as to the specific mention of countries other than South Africa, since the selective mention of certain States does not seem to us to be a justifiable practice in the Organization. In addition, Honduras adopts the same position in everything which relates to any State Member of the Organization.

253. Neither do we share views with regard to other aspects which are not in keeping with the fundamental requirements frequently reiterated in resolutions of this Organization to ensure that South Africa withdraws from Namibian territory, the duty of every State Member of the United Nations not to recognize that presence and illegal military occupation and, to that end, to support all efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Secretary-General aimed at reaching a peaceful solution of the Namibian question based on Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

254. Mr. DOS SANTOS (Mozambique): The Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique strongly rejects the South African attempts to wreck Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and to delay the independence of Namibia. We are also opposed to the so-called linkage. We hold the position that one people's sovereignty should not be used as a bargaining chip for another people's independence.

255. My Government has taken an active part in all efforts aimed at finding an immediate and just solution to the question of Namibia at the OAU, in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and here at the United Nations. We have therefore spared no effort in the joint undertaking by the front-line States with a view to immediately freeing Namibia from the colonial yoke. The People's Republic of Mozambique, together with other front-line States, played an important role in the efforts that led to the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which endorses the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. We have engaged in this process on the understanding that only the genuine independence of Namibia and the eradication of *apartheid* can bring about peace and stability in the region.

256. I want to take this opportunity once again to reiterate our firm support for and solidarity with SWAPO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people. Those were the reasons for our affirmative votes on the draft resolutions just adopted.

257. Nevertheless, while supporting the view that the United Nations should consider taking every possible measure, including those envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter, to ensure South Africa's compliance with the decisions of the Organization, my delegation reiterates the fact that the People's Republic of Mozambique is not in a position to apply economic sanctions against South Africa.

258. Mr. INFANTE (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Since the year 1946, that is, practically from the birth of the United Nations, Chile has rejected South Africa's alleged claims over the Territory of Namibia and has supported the various stages of the Namibian people's struggle. Its conduct as a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia has always been consistent. Today we reiterate that decision and pledge Chilean support for the present and future of the Namibian cause.

259. However, my delegation must reiterate here what it has stated on several occasions, namely, that it does not consider it advisable to adopt the practice of bringing to this forum and in respect of this question accusations that would be better placed in the context of the East-West conflict and debated in other forums. A specific case in point is the unfelicitous drafting of paragraph 14 of draft resolution A, which is selective with regard to the general responsibility that members of the Security Council bear for the maintenance of international peace and security.

260. Furthermore, in this context we find specific mention of countries. Selectivity, in our view, is not a good practice and, ultimately, it affects the credibility of the resolutions concerned.

261. Likewise, my delegation does not consider it appropriate to refer to measures that fall within the Security Council's competence and believes that the way in which mention is made of technical financial bodies is counter to the autonomy of their constitu-

tional documents, which are based on purely technical considerations.

262. Mr. AOKI (Japan): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolutions A, B and D. As we have explained on many occasions, we have serious reservations about a number of their provisions. For example, these resolutions contain many paragraphs which refer to and criticize by name particular Member States. My delegation does not believe that this name-calling will contribute to a solution of the problem. That is why we voted in favour of the amendments proposed by the United States.

263. In addition, with reference to draft resolution D, while my delegation attaches importance to the dissemination of information on Namibia, we believe that the information must be accurate, fair and balanced. It is also important that close co-operation and co-ordination be maintained between the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat so that the facilities of that Department will be utilized effectively and information disseminated in a co-ordinated manner. It is essential that limited financial and human resources be utilized as effectively as possible.

264. My delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions C and E; however, our affirmative vote should not be construed as support for all the paragraphs of those resolutions. My delegation's position, which it has made clear on various occasions, has not changed.

265. As in previous years, my delegation has reservations about some parts of the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which we expressed in the debate on this agenda item [81st meeting].

266. My delegation has reservations also with regard to the dramatic increase in the budget appropriations. Again, although we recognize and appreciate the important role that the United Nations Fund for Namibia is playing, we have reservations regarding paragraph 5 of draft resolution E, which allocates \$1 million from the regular budget. The Fund, it should be recalled, was established as a voluntary fund.

267. Mr. KOFA (Liberia): The policy of the Government of Liberia regarding the question of Namibia is well known. Liberia has repeatedly expressed its firm support and commitment to the concerted efforts of the international community to bring an end to the colonial and illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. Its membership in the United Nations Council for Namibia has further served as a constructive contribution to the achievement of this goal.

268. My delegation has voted in favour of the adoption of all the draft resolutions recommended by the Council in its report, because they reflect the general thrust of the Namibian liberation struggle for the attainment of self-determination, freedom and independence.

269. Having voted affirmatively, we take this opportunity to emphasize that we differ with the approach taken in the formulation of the provisions of the draft resolutions, which we feel could give rise to difficulties for some Member States, such as Liberia, and even resistance by others, in their implementation.

270. In this respect, Liberia reserves its position with regard to the following matters. We consider certain sections of resolutions A, B, and D that arbitrarily single out a few countries for exposure,

criticism and condemnation while deliberately shielding other known and recognized culprits which are co-operating and collaborating with South Africa to be not only divisive but self-defeating.

271. Our vote, therefore, in favour of the amendments proposed by the United States delegation is to make clear our strong opposition to selective criticism and condemnation and does not in any way imply a radical departure from our position calling for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) in its entirety. Liberia would have preferred similar language to that used in the resolution adopted at the twentieth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Addis Ababa from 12 to 15 November 1984.⁸ The Liberian delegation had hoped that the Assembly would have adopted all the resolutions by consensus. We are deeply disappointed that it has not been possible to achieve such unanimity, but we expect that in the future this will be the case, since we all profess to have the same goal: self-determination, freedom and independence for Namibia at the earliest possible date.

272. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey) (*interpretation from French*): The Turkish Government supports all efforts which are aimed at ensuring the swift accession of Namibia to complete independence in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978). My Government's view on this matter was expressed in a statement made during the general debate by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Turkey [20th meeting] as well as in the debate on the question of Namibia [81st meeting].

273. In accordance with the firm support which we have committed ourselves to providing for the independence of Namibia, my delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia. Nevertheless, my delegation has a number of reservations in connection with certain paragraphs in draft resolutions A, B and D. Generally speaking, we do not approve of the idea of making express mention of certain countries or groups of countries when it is difficult to spell out the respective responsibilities. More specifically, my delegation has reservations about the references made to the Western countries, either as a group or individually, which appear in the seventeenth, twentieth and twenty-third preambular paragraphs and in paragraphs 14, 21, 37, 44 and 49 of draft resolution A.

274. We also disapprove of a Western country and all the countries belonging to that region being mentioned by name in the third preambular paragraph and in paragraphs 3, 8, 9 and 11 of draft resolution B. We have a similar reservation in connection with the sixth preambular paragraph and paragraph 5 of draft resolution D.

275. Mr. MAGALHÃES (Brazil): The Brazilian Government supports all measures aimed at the prompt independence of Namibia. That is why we voted in favour of the five draft resolutions submitted for our attention by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

276. The Brazilian delegation, however, deems it necessary to place on record its reservations concerning the language of certain paragraphs of those draft resolutions, language which cannot be considered as

a positive contribution to our common objective: the granting of freedom and independence to the Namibian people.

277. Mr. MAKEKA (Lesotho): My delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia because they represent the position of the Government of Lesotho on the question of Namibia.

278. In the vote on the amendments proposed by the United States, my delegation abstained on those amendments which unfairly singled out some countries by name while in fact there are many other countries which are engaged in similar activities. We have, however, voted against amendments that would distort the facts. I conclude by stating that my delegation has, as usual, difficulties with paragraphs which invoke Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

279. Mr. AYE (Burma): The delegation of Burma would like to clarify that it has just voted in favour of all five draft resolutions on the question of Namibia in conformity with our firm and consistent support for the Namibian people in their brave struggle for national liberation, under the leadership of SWAPO. Burma is in complete agreement with the objectives expressed in the draft resolutions, which are directed towards compelling South Africa to abide by the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which constitutes the basis for the peaceful settlement of the Namibian question.

280. However, we regret to note that a number of the formulations in draft resolutions A, B and D have tended to be unfairly selective and partial, and their inclusion is not a positive contribution to the furtherance of the primary objective of our deliberations, which is the attainment of national independence by the people of Namibia. In such unfortunate circumstances, my delegation sees no alternative but to register its reservations to the form and content of certain paragraphs in draft resolutions A, B and D, but my delegation would like to reaffirm that by our positive vote on all five draft resolutions on the question of Namibia Burma has amply demonstrated its long-standing and continued support for the just cause of the Namibian people.

281. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): As in the past, we have supported all the draft resolutions before the Assembly concerning Namibia because we are anxious to secure early independence for Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and because we sympathize with the sense of frustration of all against South Africa's delaying tactics. That does not necessarily imply, however, that we are in full accord with every single provision contained in the draft resolutions, particularly draft resolution A. On such an important issue we feel that more effort should be expended in searching for a resolution which would command universal support.

282. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on the representative of Turkey, who will speak in his capacity as Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

283. Mr. HAKTANIR (Turkey): On behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, I would like to thank all those Member States which participated in the debate on the question of Namibia. The draft resolutions which the United Nations Council for Namibia recommended to the present session of the

General Assembly have been adopted by the overwhelming majority of Member States. We thank those who voted in favour of the resolutions, thus making it clear to South Africa that the international community stands solidly behind the Namibian people in their struggle for justice, liberty and independence.

284. A large majority of Member States have, in the debate on this question, condemned the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa in defiance of the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. They have demanded the withdrawal of South African troops from Namibia and have stated that Namibia is a unique responsibility of the United Nations and one of the most serious problems facing the Organization. Many delegations have opposed the linking of Namibian independence with extraneous and irrelevant issues.

285. From the statements by Member States and the resolutions just adopted it is quite clear that the collective view of the international community is that South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia constitutes a threat to international peace and security. The General Assembly, by these resolutions, gives a mandate to the United Nations Council for Namibia to continue its extensive programme of work for the next year. It calls for appropriate action by Member States; it provides for increased action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations.

286. A number of Member States have abstained in the voting on the draft resolutions. The United Nations Council for Namibia would like to believe that these Member States still support the spirit of the resolutions adopted. The Council is confident that they too share with it the deep conviction that the people of Namibia must attain their right to self-determination and genuine independence in a united Namibia.

287. The firmness of our resolutions in recent years is a natural reaction to South Africa's continuing rejection of all efforts on the part of the United Nations to solve the Namibian question. It is, furthermore, a reflection of the deep disappointment of the oppressed people of Namibia, who have struggled for a century against the colonial occupation of their country.

288. The United Nations Council for Namibia, in conformity with its mandate as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence, will continue its efforts to mobilize world opinion in support of the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, for self-determination, freedom and national independence.

289. Before concluding, I should like to recall what the Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization, Mr. Andimba Toivo ja Toivo, said in his statement on 29 November:

"As I speak now, my people have their ears glued to their transistor radios in the hope that my words before the General Assembly will rekindle outrage and invigorate the world community to take concrete measures to assure the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)." [78th meeting, para. 108.]

290. The people of Namibia have put their trust in the United Nations; they have waited for almost 40 years for that trust to be fulfilled. The United

Nations Council for Namibia strongly believes that effective means to compel South Africa to comply with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) are provided for in the Charter of the United Nations.

AGENDA ITEM 45

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/61 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)

AGENDA ITEM 46

Cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 47

Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 48

Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 49

Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 50

Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 51

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: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 52

Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 54

Prevention of an arms race in outer space: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 56

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/72 on the immediate cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 57

Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa:

- (a) Implementation of the Declaration: report of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research;
- (b) Nuclear capability of South Africa:
 - (i) Report of the Disarmament Commission;
 - (ii) Report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 58

Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament

AGENDA ITEM 60

Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly:

- (a) Consideration of guidelines for confidence-building measures: report of the Disarmament Commission;
- (b) Freeze on nuclear weapons;
- (c) United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament: report of the Secretary-General;
- (d) World Disarmament Campaign: report of the Secretary-General;
- (e) Implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/73 E on a nuclear-arms freeze;

- (f) Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament;
- (g) Disarmament and international security: report of the Security Council;
- (h) Regional disarmament: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 61

Reduction of military budgets:

- (a) Report of the Disarmament Commission;
- (b) Reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 64

Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons:

- (a) Report of the Conference on Disarmament;
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 142

Use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind

291. The PRESIDENT: Before the Assembly proceeds to consider the reports of the First Committee, I shall call on the Secretary-General, who wishes to make a statement.

292. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: The Assembly has before it at this session 64 draft resolutions dealing with disarmament. During the past weeks, the able and dedicated representatives in the First Committee have worked diligently to devise resolutions on almost every aspect of nuclear and conventional disarmament and arms limitation. Their efforts have been painstaking and thorough. I believe I would be failing in my responsibility as Secretary-General, however, if I did not take this occasion to voice my alarm at the current state of disarmament endeavours in the world. We must ask ourselves if we are truly committed to the first precept of the Charter of the United Nations, which is "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war".

293. The Charter gives both the General Assembly and the Security Council responsibility for considering disarmament and the regulation of armaments. Today there is no more important task before us. The threat of nuclear catastrophe is not one issue among many. Preventing such a horror is the pre-condition of all our endeavours. The great tasks before the world Organization, the challenges of economic and social development, progress in human rights, the construction of a world of justice and human digni-

ty—all will be in vain if we fail to prevent nuclear disaster.

294. Imperfect as it may be, the United Nations is the only existing expression of the entire international community. The common aspirations of the world's people must be articulated here, and none is more fundamental than the survival of humanity. I will not rehearse once more the terrifying statistics that seem to have numbed us with their repetition. Suffice it to say that a nuclear war could never remain limited and could never be won. Its effects would not be confined to the nuclear adversaries but would threaten the existence of all the peoples on this earth. It could lead to the extinction of humanity. Doomsday scenarios need not be proven; the existence of the risk is enough, for the worst need only happen once.

295. As I look across this Hall, I see the delegations of 159 member nations. Almost all the world's peoples are represented here. All of them—all of us—live under the nuclear threat. As Secretary-General of the Organization, with no allegiance except to the common interest, I feel the question may justifiably be put to the leading nuclear Powers: by what right do they decide the fate of all humanity? From Scandinavia to Latin America, from Europe and Africa to the Far East, the destiny of every man and woman is affected by their actions. No one can expect to escape the catastrophic consequences of a nuclear war on the fragile structure of our planet. The responsibility assumed by the great Powers is now no longer to their populations alone: it is to every country and every people, to all of us.

296. No ideological confrontation can be allowed to jeopardize the future of humanity. Nothing less is at stake: today's decisions affect not only the present; they also put at risk succeeding generations. Like supreme arbiters, with our disputes of the moment we threaten to cut off the future and extinguish the lives of the innocent millions as yet unborn. There can be no greater arrogance. At the same time, the lives of all who lived before us may be rendered meaningless, for we have the power to dissolve in a conflict of hours or minutes the entire work of civilization, with all the brilliant cultural heritage of mankind.

297. For almost 40 years we have lived under the nuclear shadow. Many have claimed that it alone has kept peace in the world. If nuclear weapons are indeed peace-keepers, does it follow that they ought to be acquired by every nation on earth? On the contrary, it is clear that to rely on nuclear deterrence is to accept a perpetual community of fear. That is very far from the community of human worth and understanding foreseen by the Charter.

298. It is neither desirable nor feasible in the long term to find true stability through nuclear deterrence. It is not desirable because in the long term human values are inconsistent with the threat of the indiscriminate death of millions of our fellow men and women. No humane society that recognizes individual worth and dignity can contemplate such an action. Conversely, the very fear and hatred of an adversary believed to be capable of carrying out such an attack would destroy the basis of a civilized society.

299. Even if we ignore its inhuman aspects, in the long run can we really expect stability from a balance of fear and the suspicion that it breeds? With the accelerating pace of military technology, the need to

counter each new threat will become ever more frantic and desperate. Every innovation in arms will tend to destabilize the fragile balance. Every perceived advantage will lead to fears of first-strike capability and the resulting temptation, at a time of great crisis, to launch a pre-emptive attack. And will our scientific vanity allow us to forget the double fallibility we face from human and from technological error? Offensive capacity must certainly be reduced. Ultimately, however, there is no deterrence, since any initiation of nuclear hostilities would be to no one's advantage. This is made cruelly clear by suggestions that a "nuclear winter" could follow a nuclear strike, even without any retaliation. To launch any nuclear attack could then indeed be suicide. The fruits of such violence would fall equally and with grim justice on the initiator and the victim alike.

300. Six years ago in this Hall we decided on the fundamental objective facing all of us:

"Removing the threat of a world war—a nuclear war—is the most acute and urgent task of the present day. Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation". [*Resolution S-10/2, para. 18.*]

It remains our most acute and urgent task. Every representative in this room, I am sure, shares the hope that the meeting between the Foreign Ministers of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will be a step in the direction that we all seek. Indeed, every one of us has a right to urge the start of a new and determined process of disarmament negotiations by the nuclear Powers. Next September we shall hold the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The corollary for horizontal non-proliferation under that Treaty was the undertaking given, particularly by the great Powers, to "pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament" [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex, art. VI*]. Is it reasonable to expect restraint in one direction and uncontrolled expansion in the other? With progress in both directions the Non-Proliferation Treaty could become the embryo of a treaty, however distant, for the abolition of nuclear weapons.

301. It is not for me to make detailed observations on the course of the negotiations to be undertaken. However, it seems clear that fundamental security needs have to be acknowledged and taken into account. Paradoxically, both sides have an interest in each other's security, since insecurity can only lead to mutual peril and to pre-emptive considerations. Given the enormous complexity of today's weaponry and the varying composition of arsenals, advantages in different spheres will have to be balanced against each other. Finally, serious talks can take place only at the negotiating table and not through the media. The international community will no longer be reassured by the mere appearance of progress.

302. United Nations Member States have at their disposal the world's only multilateral negotiating body for disarmament, the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva. I have said on more than one occasion that its endeavours should not be made to depend upon progress on the bilateral side. More-

over, we can make a contribution to the bilateral process in various ways. I appeal for a renewed effort towards a comprehensive test-ban treaty. No single multilateral agreement could have a greater effect on limiting the further refinement of nuclear weapons. A comprehensive test-ban treaty is the litmus test of the real willingness to pursue nuclear disarmament. Is it wise to develop new classes of ever more lethal, ever more technically complex weapons, whose control is ever more difficult to verify? We are at the point of leaving the decision on humanity's future to the automatic—and fallible—reactions of computers. Talks on a comprehensive test ban have been in abeyance for too long, and their value has even been questioned. As with all arms-limitation negotiations, there will never be a perfect time to begin them in the opinion of all sides. The time to recommence these talks is now; they should not be delayed any further.

303. The time is equally pressing for talks on space weapons. It seems that, where weapons are concerned, the only way to halt a race is to prevent its starting. Once the race is under way, agreement is far more difficult. And the winner enjoys only a few insecure moments of victory before the other side catches up, leaving both to look back over yet more wasted human effort and ingenuity. There is no final advantage in the arms race. It is therefore crucial that a ban on weapons in the new theatre, outer space, be concluded at the earliest possible time, before it is once again too late.

304. Next year is the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. It is also the fortieth anniversary of the first and only use of nuclear weapons, at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. While we have so far avoided global conflagration, we have made only halting and inadequate progress in disarmament or arms limitation over these past 40 years. Discussions have taken on a life of their own. All too often it seems as if the players are only moving their lethal pawns in a global chess game. We cannot calculate the quantity of our precious and limited resources that has already been poured into the endless arms race.

305. At a time of uncertainty for the young and despair for the poor and the hungry, we have truly mortgaged our future to the arms race, both nuclear and conventional. Several brilliant studies have shown us how expenditure on arms distorts our economies. We know that development will be a casualty of the arms race. In this sense, the arms trade impoverishes the receiver and debases the supplier. Here there is a striking resemblance to the drugs trade. Yet we continue on the same course even when faced with the silent genocide of famine that today stalks millions of our fellow men and women. The international community has to focus and act on the link between disarmament and development. We should take concrete and far-sighted steps toward the conversion of arms industries from military to civilian production. And we should begin to redress some of the enormous imbalance between research on arms and research on arms limitation and reduction.

306. The role of the Secretary-General under the Charter requires him to confront any matter which may threaten international peace and security. It is my belief that nothing poses a greater threat to the international community than the continuing arms race, above all the nuclear-arms race. The leaders of the great Powers have recently expressed their commitment to the prevention of war between them. The announcement that their two Foreign Ministers will

soon meet is most welcome. I appeal to the two leaders to ensure that these talks lead to persistent, determined negotiations. I would also hope that they will eventually meet together in recognition of their responsibility for humanity's survival. I would urge them to enhance the prospects for disarmament by taking steps to strengthen the collective security framework afforded by the United Nations. The Organization and I are at their disposal.

307. Many words have been spoken in the cause of disarmament. We are all aware of the goals, as outlined in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session [*resolution S-10/2*]. Only the political decisions of Governments can take us towards the realization of these goals, and only the peoples of the world can urge their Governments to move in that direction. The Charter of the United Nations speaks of "We the peoples", since it was to fulfil their hopes that the Organization was created. Every person on this earth has a stake in disarmament. In the nuclear age, decisions affecting war and peace cannot be left to military strategists or even to Governments. They are indeed the responsibility of every man and woman. And it is therefore the responsibility of all of us in this chamber to break the cycle of mistrust and insecurity and respond to humanity's yearning for peace.

308. The PRESIDENT: I now request the Rapporteur of the First Committee, the representative of Chad, to present all the reports of the First Committee relating to disarmament.

309. Mr. KESSELY (Chad), Rapporteur of the First Committee (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour and the pleasure to present to the General Assembly the reports of the First Committee on its work on disarmament matters under agenda items 45 to 52, 54, 56 to 58, 60, 61, 64 and 142. These reports are contained in documents A/39/735 to 742, A/39/744, A/39/746 to 748, A/39/750, A/39/751, A/39/754 and A/39/760. In this connection, may I point out that the reports on the question of Antarctica and international security, under agenda items 66 to 69 and 143, will be presented at a subsequent meeting of the General Assembly. The group of 22 disarmament items was included on the agenda of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly pursuant to previous resolutions adopted by the Assembly, with the exception of agenda item 142.

310. The great number of agenda items dealing with disarmament clearly indicates the growing concern which delegations are experiencing *vis-à-vis* world peace and international security and the efforts they are making to bring about disarmament.

311. In order to improve and streamline the Committee's work, we organized the general debate in two stages. The first stage consisted of a general debate on all disarmament items. The second stage was intended to gear the discussion to specific disarmament items, while at the same time allowing for a debate like that of the first stage. The two stages of the general debate lasted approximately four weeks. Thereafter, we had two weeks to consider draft resolutions submitted on these items. The Committee devoted 33 meetings between 17 October and 12 November to the general debate and statements on specific disarmament items. A large number of delegations took part in the debate, which made it possible to have a fruitful exchange of views.

312. Among the various subjects relating to disarmament, the Committee particularly focused on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament, as well as bilateral negotiations on nuclear weapons, the prevention of nuclear war, a nuclear-test ban, the prevention of an arms race in outer space and chemical weapons. Furthermore, the vast majority of speakers emphasized the importance of the relationship between disarmament and development. Although the thirty-ninth session opened in a climate of uncertainty, which increased the fear of nuclear confrontation, the debate which we had on disarmament during this session proceeded in a less tense atmosphere than that which prevailed last year, undoubtedly because there was some hope for an improvement in international relations, particularly with respect to the two super-Powers, as indicated by the bilateral negotiations which are to be held on 7 and 8 January at Geneva. However, the concerns and anxieties expressed by most of those speakers over the continuing arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race between the two major Powers, brought out the fact that no effort should be spared to keep the situation from deteriorating and to ensure that the situation will be reversed.

313. During the work of the Committee the delegations introduced 71 draft resolutions and a draft decision on various disarmament items. In this connection, the Committee organized its work to facilitate the adoption of these draft resolutions. The Committee considered 71 draft resolutions and the draft decision before it. Seven of them were not put to a vote. The consideration of one draft resolution was adjourned under rule 116 of the rules of procedure. The Committee therefore adopted at this session 18 draft resolutions on disarmament matters without voting on them and 45 draft resolutions as well as a draft decision by a recorded vote, which amounts to a total of 63 draft resolutions and one draft decision. We can thus see that this figure is somewhat higher than the number of draft resolutions adopted last year. Of the 63 draft resolutions adopted, 26 dealt with the question of nuclear disarmament, including the prevention of nuclear war, a nuclear-weapons-test ban, bilateral negotiations on nuclear weapons, a nuclear-weapons freeze and security safeguards for non-nuclear-weapons States, as well as nuclear-weapon-free zones. The draft decision dealt with the question of deterrence. The number of draft resolutions dealing with the subject indicates the importance which attaches to matters related to nuclear armament.

314. Regarding other disarmament matters which are also of very great importance, the Committee adopted four draft resolutions on chemical weapons, three on conventional weapons, including the naval arms race, one draft resolution dealing with the prevention of an arms race in outer space and 29 draft resolutions on all other matters, including the Conference on Disarmament, the Disarmament Commission, the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, the World Disarmament Conference, a certain number of studies covering various disarmament issues, the relation between disarmament and development and the reduction of military budgets, as well as the World Disarmament Campaign and Disarmament Week.

315. The reports of the First Committee which you have before you give details about the action taken on each of the agenda items, as well as the results of

the votes on the various draft resolutions which were adopted. It is not my intention to take up too much of the little time available to the General Assembly by presenting detailed comments on all of these reports. Nevertheless, I would simply like to emphasize that among these reports there are three which cover a number of subsidiary items which were the subject of several draft resolutions, particularly agenda item 59 on review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session, comprising 12 sub-items that were the subject of 19 draft resolutions; agenda item 60 on review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly, comprising eight sub-items, which gave rise to 11 draft resolutions; and agenda item 65 on general and complete disarmament, comprising eight sub-items, which were the subject of 10 draft resolutions.

316. In conclusion, I should like to emphasize that the Committee carried out constructive consideration of all disarmament matters, which covered a wide range of international issues. Deliberations in recent weeks in the First Committee have clearly indicated that there is a general consensus that the United Nations should play a central role and bears prime responsibility in the field of disarmament. In this context it is encouraging to note that delegations have undertaken to work unswervingly towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The decisions they took on various disarmament items before the Committee indicated that it was their genuine desire to seek practical, effective ways and measures to preserve and promote international peace and security.

317. With these brief comments, I have the honour to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft resolutions contained in the reports of the First Committee.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the First Committee.

318. The PRESIDENT: Statements will be limited to explanations of vote.

319. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the First Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

320. May I remind members that under paragraph 7 of decision 34/401 the General Assembly agreed that

“When the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, i.e., either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation’s vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee.”

May I also remind members that, in accordance with the same decision, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

321. We turn now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 45 [A/39/735]. I invite members to turn their attention to the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, 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,⁹ Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Argentina, Belize, Cuba, France, Guyana, Ivory Coast, Malawi, Mali.

The draft resolution was adopted by 139 votes to none, with 8 abstentions (resolution 39/51).

322. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 46 [A/39/736]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua

New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: France,¹⁰ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, China, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Spain, Turkey.

The draft resolution was adopted by 122 votes to 3, with 23 abstentions (resolution 39/52).

323. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Cuba, who wishes to explain his vote.

324. Mr. GARCÍA ITURBE (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution just adopted but wishes to state for the record that that does not affect Cuba's position regarding the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which is mentioned therein.

325. The PRESIDENT: The next report of the First Committee is on agenda item 47 [A/39/737]. I invite the Assembly to turn its attention to the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report.

326. I call on the representative of Nigeria, who wishes to explain his vote before the voting.

327. Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): The statement made this afternoon by the Secretary-General is a further indication of his personal concern at the escalating arms race, a concern which my delegation deeply shares. Permit me therefore to preface my intervention with this observation.

328. Two events, as the Secretary-General mentioned in his statement, that have taken place in the last six years are emphasized in two different ways. As regards the universal consensus on disarmament, at the first special session devoted to disarmament, in 1978, representatives of all Member States adopted by consensus the Final Document [*resolution S-16/2*], which remains on record as the closest thing to a blueprint for disarmament ever adopted. A second special session devoted to disarmament, in 1982, which was to have consolidated the achievements of the first special session, failed, but that special session can best be remembered as providing the opportunity for the unprecedented march for peace on 12 June 1982, in which about three quarters of a million people from all over the world participated. This was a clear demonstration of the fervent desire of the ordinary man and woman that Governments should act before it is too late. Instead of improving, however, the situation has grown worse.

329. The General Assembly, of course, has not been remiss in its duty of adopting resolutions that emphasize areas for urgent action. However, the nuclear-weapon States have simply ignored these resolutions and persisted in their resolve not only to refine nuclear weapons to unimaginable limits but to

extend the arms race to an environment hitherto considered fictional.

330. In the conventional weapons age which saw the birth of this Organization, disarmament was desirable to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. In the nuclear age in which we now live, disarmament is an absolute necessity to save mankind from total extinction.

331. The present level of sophistication of nuclear weaponry has brought mankind to a period in which the next war will be one of machine against man, and it is one which man is bound to lose. Man's own creation of nuclear weaponry accumulated by the two super-Powers will, if launched in a war between them, kill perhaps half of humanity in its direct and immediate impact, but, more than that, it will create what has been called a nuclear winter, which will certainly finish the other half. This is not the imagination of alarmists or idealists; it is the finding of eminent scientists.

332. Thanks to the study whose result has been popularized by Mr. Carl Sagan, we now know that obscuring dust, and especially the dark soot which is one of the four known environmental consequences of the nuclear war, will absorb ordinary visible light from the sun, heating the atmosphere and cooling the earth's surface. Severe and prolonged low temperatures—the nuclear winter—would follow a nuclear war. For the first time it has been shown that the effects of such a war would not be restricted to the northern hemisphere where the nuclear exchange would mainly take place. Fine particles would be transported across the equator, bringing cold and darkness to the southern hemisphere. Therefore, the more we know about the consequences of nuclear war, the greater is our fear, if not panic.

333. We are about to adopt a series of draft resolutions which again signify that fear. However, we are painfully aware also that the key to progress is with the two super-Powers, and their perception of each other is a major obstacle to that progress. We therefore hope that the forthcoming negotiations, which are due to commence in January, will be undertaken in a changed atmosphere.

334. The attitude to multilateral negotiations, we believe, must also change. It is most unfortunate that the single multilateral negotiating forum which emerged out of the first special session on disarmament has not been enabled to carry out serious negotiations. There seems to be a certain distrust of the Conference on Disarmament by certain nuclear-weapon States. That distrust is leading to the paralysis of that body.

335. Turning now to the draft resolutions in document A/39/737, my delegation attaches very great importance to the urgent conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. It is regrettable that, although this subject is one of the most thoroughly studied, it has not been possible for the multilateral negotiating body to undertake concrete negotiations on it. This is a result of the distrust that I have just mentioned, a distrust of the multilateral negotiating body. At the same time during which there has been no negotiation in the Conference on Disarmament, the trilateral negotiations between the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union have not been resumed since 1980. The crucial role of a comprehensive test ban in an effective non-proliferation régime cannot be over-emphasized. The impending

ing Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons obliges the nuclear-weapon States parties to show their determination to fulfil their undertakings under that Treaty. My delegation hopes that a step in this direction will be demonstrated by a consensus in the Conference on Disarmament on the initiation at its next session of multilateral negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Such a consensus will of course imply the agreement of those nuclear-weapon States not parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

336. With this hope in mind, my delegation will support all the draft resolutions on a nuclear test ban recommended by the First Committee, and this includes the draft resolution in document A/39/737. However, our affirmative vote on that draft resolution—which is a change from our abstention in the First Committee—is not to be construed as endorsement of paragraph 4 of that draft resolution.

337. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report [A/39/737]. A separate vote has been requested on paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. If there is no objection, I shall first put to the vote paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Algeria, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Burma, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, France, Ghana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Morocco, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Paragraph 4 of the draft resolution was adopted by 80 votes to 19, with 41 abstentions.

338. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam.

The draft resolution, as a whole, was adopted by 124 votes to none, with 24 abstentions (resolution 39/53).

339. The PRESIDENT: The next report of the First Committee is on agenda item 48 [A/39/738]. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. The Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/54).

340. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 49 [A/39/739]. The Assembly will vote on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab

Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malawi, 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, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Bhutan, India, Mauritius.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 100 votes to 3, with 42 abstentions (resolution 39/55).

341. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 50 [A/39/740]. The draft resolution recommended by the First Committee appears in paragraph 7 of its report. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 39/56).

342. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 51 [A/39/741]. May I invite members to turn their attention to the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, 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, China, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Honduras, India, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Malaysia, Paraguay, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sweden, Uruguay, Zaire.

The draft resolution was adopted by 104 votes to 19, with 20 abstentions (resolution 39/57).¹¹

343. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 52 [A/39/742]. I invite members to turn their attention to the recommendation of the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 146 votes to none, with 4 abstentions (resolution 39/58).

344. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 54 [A/39/744]. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 13 of its report. A separate vote has been requested on paragraph 8. If there is no

objection, I shall put that paragraph to the vote first. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Paragraph 8 of the draft resolution was adopted by 138 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

345. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius,

Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 150 votes to none, with one abstention (resolution 39/59).

346. The PRESIDENT: We shall now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 56 [A/39/746]. The Assembly will vote on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Spain, Turkey, Zaire.

The draft resolution was adopted by 123 votes to 2, with 24 abstentions (resolution 39/60).

347. The PRESIDENT: Next we turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 57

[A/39/747]. The Assembly will take a decision on the two draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 11 of its report. Draft resolution A is entitled "Implementation of the Declaration". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, 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, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

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

Draft resolution A was adopted by 147 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 39/61 A).

348. The PRESIDENT: Next I put to the vote draft resolution B, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's

Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, 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, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

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

Draft resolution B was adopted by 137 votes to 4, with 11 abstentions (resolution 39/61 B).

349. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Albania for an explanation of vote.

350. Mr. JANKU (Albania): The Albanian delegation did not participate in the voting on numerous resolutions recommended by the First Committee regarding various disarmament problems. At the same time, I should like to put on record that although my delegation dissociated itself from the consensus when these resolutions were so adopted, it did not mean that my country is against disarmament and the strengthening of international peace and security. On the contrary, our position in this respect is just and crystal clear; it has been expressed in our statements in the General Assembly or the appropriate committee.

351. We share the concern and join our voice to the appeal of peace-loving peoples and countries for peace, international security and genuine disarmament. However, by taking this opportunity, the Albanian delegation wishes once again to reiterate its reservations with regard to these resolutions.

352. As on previous occasions, we maintain that it is the two super-Powers—American imperialism and Soviet social imperialism—which, in pursuit of their aggressive and hegemonistic policies, and ignoring the concern of world public opinion, as well as resolutions adopted by the United Nations and other international forums, are continuously intensifying the arms race, which has now extended to outer space. Nevertheless, we wish to point out that our delegation voted in favour of the draft resolutions in document A/39/747, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration" and "Nuclear capability of South Africa" and will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/39/743, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament".

353. As we have explained before, we reiterate now that our affirmative vote for those draft resolutions is in keeping with our determined position in support of the struggle of the African peoples against the racist régime of South Africa and the Arab peoples' struggle against the Israeli Zionists. However, we should like to stress that our support for these draft resolutions does not affect our well-known and

principled attitude as regards the establishment of so-called zones of peace, or nuclear-weapon-free zones.

354. The PRESIDENT: We come now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 58 [A/39/748]. The Assembly will vote on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 125 votes to 1, with 23 abstentions (resolution 39/62).

355. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 60 [A/39/750]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the eleven draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 30 of its report. Draft resolution A is entitled "World Disarmament Campaign: actions and activities". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Repub-

lic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 117 votes to none, with 31 abstentions (resolution 39/63 A).¹²

356. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution B is entitled "United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament". The First Committee adopted draft resolution B without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution B was adopted (resolution 39/63 B).

357. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution C is entitled "Nuclear arms freeze". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist

Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Bahamas, China, Iceland, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Saint Lucia, Spain.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 129 votes to 12, with 8 abstentions (resolution 39/63 C).

358. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution D is entitled "World Disarmament Campaign". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Rwanda, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution D was adopted by 139 votes to none, with 12 abstentions (resolution 39/63 D).

359. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution E is entitled "Consideration of Guidelines for Confidence-Building Measures". The First Committee adopted draft resolution E without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution E was adopted (resolution 39/63 E).

360. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution F is entitled "Regional Disarmament". The First Committee adopted draft resolution F without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution F was adopted (resolution 39/63 F).

361. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution G is entitled "Freeze on Nuclear Weapons". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, China, Guyana, Iceland, Israel,¹³ Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Saint Lucia, Spain.

Draft resolution G was adopted by 127 votes to 11, with 11 abstentions (resolution 39/63 G).

362. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution H is entitled "Convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius,

Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Austria, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Japan.

Draft resolution H was adopted by 128 votes to 17, with 5 abstentions (resolution 39/63 H).

363. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution I is entitled "Convening of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament". The First Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 39/63 I).

364. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution J concerns the World Disarmament Campaign. The First Committee adopted draft resolution J without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution J was adopted (resolution 39/63 J).

365. The PRESIDENT: Finally, we turn to draft resolution K, which is entitled "Disarmament and international security". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of),¹⁴ Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Rwanda, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution K was adopted by 128 votes to none, with 19 abstentions (resolution 39/63 K).¹²

366. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 61 [A/39/751]. The Assembly will take a decision on the two draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 9 of its report. The Committee adopted draft resolution A without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution A was adopted (resolution 39/64 A).

367. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of),¹⁴ Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Israel,¹⁵ Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Brazil, Burma, China, India, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 114 votes to 16, with 7 abstentions (resolution 39/64 B).

368. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Botswana, who wishes to explain her vote.

369. Ms. MOSELE (Botswana): My delegation voted positively on resolution B in document A/39/751, but it would like to reserve its position on paragraph 3.

370. The PRESIDENT: We shall now take up the report of the First Committee on agenda item 64 [A/39/754]. The Assembly will take a decision on the five draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 21 of its report. I shall first put to the vote draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas,¹⁶ Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Algeria, Angola, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Congo, Cyprus, Ethiopia, India, Madagascar, Mexico, Nicaragua, Romania, Yugoslavia.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 118 votes to 16, with 14 abstentions (resolution 39/65 A).¹⁵

371. The PRESIDENT: Next, we turn to draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria,

Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 84 votes to 1, with 62 abstentions (resolution 39/65 B).¹²

372. The PRESIDENT: The First Committee adopted draft resolution C without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution C was adopted (resolution 39/65 C).

373. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to draft resolution D. The First Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution D was adopted (resolution 39/65 D).

374. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution E. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia.

Against: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet

Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burma, Cape Verde, Chile, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Finland, Iran (Islamic Republic of),¹⁷ Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Madagascar, Mexico, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Draft resolution E was adopted by 87 votes to 18, with 30 abstentions (resolution 39/65 E).^{15,18}

375. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Democratic Kampuchea, who wishes to explain his vote after the vote.

376. Mr. THACH SIRAY (Democratic Kampuchea): I should like to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolution B. My delegation abstained in the voting on that draft resolution, for the following reasons. Most people believe that the use of chemical warfare began and ended in the fields of Europe in the First World War, with monstrously gassed boys dying in the trenches. The deaths of the troops eased up, but the development of chemical warfare has never stopped. The capability of chemical weapons to bring sickness, death and destruction has in fact grown to levels never before thought possible. As a result we are now on the threshold of the age of chemical weapons.

377. During the past few years chemical weapons have still been widely used on hot battlefields in various areas of the world, for instance, in Afghanistan, Laos and my country, Kampuchea. Since December 1978, as a result of the Vietnamese aggression against Kampuchea, many hundreds of thousands of Kampucheans have died in massacres committed by the enemy or as a result of famine deliberately spread or chemical and biological weapons used by the invading forces.

378. These crimes of genocide, perpetrated by means of the systematic, widespread and indiscriminate use of chemical weapons against the Kampuchean people, show still more clearly, first, the barbaric nature of the present war of aggression against Kampuchea; secondly, the policy of genocide being pursued by the aggressor against the Kampuchean people; and, thirdly, the total impasse into which the aggressor has been driven by the increasingly powerful struggle of the people and the national resistance forces of Kampuchea. The aggressors in Kampuchea have intensified their use of chemical weapons to make up for their shortage of troops in Kampuchea or to reinforce their troops, who are overcome by defeatism and demoralization and who are about to suffer their final defeat on the battlefield of Kampuchea.

379. As the people of Kampuchea have been victims of the use of chemical and biological weapons, my delegation wishes more than anyone else to see the earliest possible adoption of the convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction. In this regard, we should like to reiterate our profound gratitude to all friendly countries which have shown their sympathy for the plight of the Kampuchean people and which have been making serious and sincere efforts towards the adoption of the convention. However, among the list of sponsors of the draft we find the name of the country which has more than 200,000 troops occupying Kampuchea

and resorting to barbaric chemical warfare against the people of Kampuchea.

380. The Assembly is aware of the number of times the authorities of that country have used the Organization as a platform to slander the international community, to justify their acts of aggression and to attack other peace-loving countries throughout the world. They continue to this day to defy the insistent appeals of the international community, which has asked them to withdraw their troops from Kampuchea and to allow the Kampuchean people to decide their own destiny without any foreign interference.

381. We cannot but view this sponsorship as part and parcel of the diplomatic manoeuvres which are constantly used by those authorities to show that they are the champions of peace and thus to justify their invasion and occupation of Kampuchea, to induce the international community to tolerate the crimes they have committed and are still committing against the people of Kampuchea and to assist in a *fait accompli* in Kampuchea.

382. The presence of that country among the sponsors of the draft resolution we have just adopted is not only an insult to the peace-loving and justice-loving countries which have given sincerely of their time and their energy to ensure the triumph of right and justice but also an insult to the memory of those who have perished and those who are still struggling for their national liberation. It is not by becoming a sponsor of this draft but rather by putting an end to its war of aggression in Kampuchea and an end to the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons against the Kampuchean people that Viet Nam can contribute positively to the early adoption of the convention.

383. My delegation would like to enter very serious reservations on this score and to request that they appear in the records of the General Assembly.

384. The PRESIDENT: Finally, we turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 142 [A/39/760]. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to take note of this report?

It was so decided (decision 39/415).

The meeting rose at 9.10 p.m.

NOTES

¹Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports, 1971, p. 16.

²Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24, vol. I, annex II.

³See paragraph 232 of the present meeting.

⁴The delegation of the Sudan subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had not intended to participate in the vote on the amendment.

⁵The delegation of Senegal subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the amendment.

⁶The delegation of Malaysia subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the amendment.

⁷The delegation of Nigeria subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

⁸See A/40/87, annex, resolution AHG/Res.125 (XX).

⁹The delegation of Rwanda subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

¹⁰The delegation of France subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

¹¹The delegation of Haiti subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

¹²The delegation of Israel subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

¹³The delegation of Israel subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against the draft resolution.

¹⁴The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had not intended to participate in the vote.

¹⁵The delegation of Israel subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

¹⁶The delegation of the Bahamas subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

¹⁷The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

¹⁸The delegation of Angola subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.