

UNITED NATIONS
General Assembly
FORTY-FOURTH SESSION
Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
39th meeting
held on
Thursday, 16 November 1989
at 3.30 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 39th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) (Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of and action on draft resolutions on disarmament items [49] to [69] and [151] (continued)
- Programme of work

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/44/PV.39
13 December 1989
ENGLISH

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Fahmy (Egypt), Vice-Chairman, took the chair.

The meeting was called to order at 4.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 TO 69 AND 151 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Canada, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.38/Rev.1.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Canada): I wish at this point to introduce, on behalf of the sponsors of the original version, the revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.38, which has been issued as document A/C.1/44/L.38/Rev.1.

Following the original submission of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.38, the delegations of a number of non-aligned countries approached some of the sponsors to seek changes to certain elements in the text. In addition, one delegation of a non-aligned country proposed that a new preambular paragraph be added to the text.

Both in the spirit of co-operation and compromise which all of us favour and in order to ensure that the delegations concerned were more comfortable with the text, the following changes were agreed upon.

First, in the fifth preambular paragraph, the word "world's" has been deleted.

Secondly, the sixth preambular paragraph has been changed to read:

"Commending in this regard the initiative of the Australian Government by convening...".

The rest is unchanged.

Thirdly, there is a new eleventh preambular paragraph, which reads as follows:

"Emphasizing the importance of the widest possible participation of States in the negotiations on the draft convention in order to ensure universal adherence on its conclusion".

(Mr. Robertson, Canada)

Fourthly, in paragraph 7, the word "world's" has been deleted, and the word "assist" has been replaced by the words "co-operate with".

Finally, in paragraph 8, the wording has been changed to read:

"recognizes that constructive proposals were discussed at the Government Industry Conference against Chemical Weapons which could contribute momentum to the Geneva negotiations and assist in the conclusion and early implementation of such a convention".

It is the hope of the sponsors that the revised text will attract consensus and that it can be adopted without voting.

The CHAIRMAN: As was announced this morning, the Committee will proceed this afternoon to take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/44/L.8/Rev.1, L.53/Rev.3, L.41/Rev.2 and L.46/Rev.1, which are included in clusters 1, 7 and 13.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, I shall call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): Before presenting a draft resolution, my delegation would like to pay a tribute to our colleague, Ambassador Garcia Robles, who has, as it were, decided to leave us. This certainly warrants a tribute and an expression of gratitude and thanks to him from us because he has devoted so much of his career to the cause of disarmament.

In my capacity as current Chairman of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and on behalf of the sponsors, I should like to introduce a revised draft resolution on the report of the Disarmament Commission, contained in document A/C.1/44/L.8/Rev.1.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,
Zaire)

As representatives may recall, at the last plenary meeting of the Commission's 1989 session, held on 31 May, views were expressed and proposals were made by a number of delegations regarding the question of ways and means of enhancing the functioning of the Commission, including the effectiveness and rationalization of its work. In that connection the Commission agreed to set up an open-ended informal working group including, in particular, members of its Bureau and all the Chairmen of subsidiary bodies, for consultation. During the past five weeks this open-ended consultation group has held six meetings and put forward a large number of concrete proposals on the subject. Many delegations participated in the consultations, which were open to all delegations, with great interest and with a view to reaching some common ground or understanding on the question.

(Mr. Beqbeni Adeito Nzangaya,
Zaire)

Therefore, when I introduced the draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.8 on 7 November, paragraph 5 reflected the state of affairs as regards the issue at that time and noted that

"consultations on the question of ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission in the field of disarmament are under way and the result could be considered at the Commission's organizational session in December 1989".

Nevertheless, I pointed out that if, at the later consultation meetings, some common ground could be reached on certain proposals those agreements might be incorporated in a revised draft resolution for action by the First Committee.

Today, it is my pleasure to report that as a result of intensive consultations a series of measures with respect to ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission have been agreed upon. At the sixth and last meeting of the consultations, held on 14 November 1989, it was agreed to annex the agreed text to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.8, which has been reissued as document A/C.1/44/L.8/Rev.1, with appropriate changes in paragraphs 5 and 6. Now that the consultation group has finished its task, paragraph 5 notes that "consultations have been held on the question of ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission in the field of disarmament". In paragraph 6, the General Assembly would commend

"the fact that as a result of the above-mentioned consultations, the measures with respect to the ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission have been agreed, as annexed".

The annex to the revised draft resolution contains the agreed text on ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,
Zaire)

I must emphasize that this agreed text is the result of compromise among delegations after a series of open-ended consultations during the past five weeks with devoted efforts and difficult negotiations on the subject. I trust it will be agreeable to all.

In submitting this revised draft resolution, I should like to express my great appreciation to all delegations, particularly members of the Bureau and the sponsors, for the support and co-operation they have shown so that common ground could be reached on a series of measures to improve the functioning of the Disarmament Commission. I also thank the Department for Disarmament Affairs, particularly the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Yasushi Akashi, and the Secretary of the Disarmament Commission, Mr. Lin Kuo-chung, for their support and assistance.

Out of concern for compromise, certain delegations have made some slight modifications to paragraph 6 of the revised text. Thus, we propose that it read as follows:

"Notes with satisfaction the results of those consultations on ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission, as annexed".

Having explained the new elements introduced into the revised draft resolution, I submit it to the First Committee for consideration.

Since it is the result of collective efforts through open-ended consultations, I request that draft resolution A/44/L.8/Rev.1 be adopted without a vote, as has been the case with similar draft resolutions over the past decade.

Mr. KENYON (United Kingdom): We listened with great interest to what has just been said by the representative of Zaire. We find the paper annexed to this draft resolution completely satisfactory. I should be grateful, though, if the Secretary could read out for us in English the new text of paragraph 6 that we are now addressing.

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

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): As interpreted into English, the text of operative paragraph 6, as revised, is as follows:

"Notes with satisfaction the results of those consultations on ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission as annexed".

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.8/Rev.1, in cluster 1, as orally revised. It is entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission". This draft resolution has 17 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Zaire at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1989. The sponsors are Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, German Democratic Republic, Haiti, Indonesia, Nigeria, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo and Zaire.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution might be adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.8/Rev.1 was adopted.

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

Mr. SOOD (India): My delegation wishes to explain its participation in decision taken on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.8/Rev.1. We have participated in this decision on the understanding that the mandate of the Disarmament Commission derives from paragraph 118 (a) of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The fact that the annex to this draft resolution has been adopted without a vote does not in any way constrain or restrain the original mandate that was given to the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Furthermore, it deals with ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission, which in the view of my delegation is an ongoing exercise.

(Mr. Sood, India)

While this year we have decided on certain ways and means to improve the functioning of the Disarmament Commission, my delegation feels that once we try to put them into practice, we may discover that they may need to be modified and this could well be an ongoing exercise.

My delegation would have preferred it if this annex had been presented to the Disarmament Commission at its organizational session. There it could have been adopted as tentative guidelines to be implemented in the course of the next session of the Disarmament Commission. However, we would like to see it in that context and not give it any more status than that of guidelines for use in the future as the Disarmament Commission might deem fit.

Mr. DOLEJS (Czechoslovakia): The Czechoslovak delegation supported the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.8/Rev.1 without a vote. The process of consultations concerning ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission has resulted in the working out of a text, which is annexed to the above-mentioned draft resolution.

From the very beginning this process was supported by the Czechoslovak delegation, which contributed to it through a number of proposals and suggestions put forward in writing jointly with some other delegations. We are pleased to see that a number of those proposals were reflected in the text. The Czechoslovak delegation is ready to co-operate with all other delegations in the process implementing those proposals.

We should like to take this opportunity to thank the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission, Mr. Bagbeni Adieto Nzenzaya, for his efficient and effective efforts, which have resulted in the set of proposals on ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission.

(Mr. Dolejs, Czechoslovakia)

It should, however, be noted that it is the will of the Member States to co-operate with a view to attaining concrete results that would be the decisive factor in improving the efficiency of the Disarmament Commission. The Czechoslovak delegation is ready to work in this direction.

Mr. RIVERO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Briefly, our delegation too would like to say that we have supported draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.8/Rev.1 on the report of the Disarmament Commission, because we agree with the views expressed therein. My delegation has also been concerned - as we have said at meetings of the Disarmament Commission or at some of the informal meetings of the Commission, under the chairmanship of the distinguished representative of Zaire - about the need to improve the functioning of the Commission, the history of which we need not repeat because, as we know, the Commission has reached agreements on some issues but unfortunately there are others which for years and years have been on its agenda without leading to any solution.

With that in mind, my delegation shares the concern, which other delegations have expressed, that there is a need to make the Disarmament Commission a body which may make a more valuable contribution. This was considered at the special session in 1978.

My delegation was unable to take part at the last of the informal consultations of the Commission. We should have liked to participate more fully and share more in the outcome of those consultations as contained in the annex to the draft resolution. We would have preferred it if the result of those informal consultations had been put before the body to which they are addressed, that is, before the Disarmament Commission for consideration. We are certain that we will take these ideas into account when we meet in the Disarmament Commission as general guidelines with a view to enhancing its effectiveness.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Lesotho, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3.

Mr. KOLANE (Lesotho): On behalf of the members of the Group of African States, my delegation wishes to introduce two draft resolutions, both in document A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3, respectively, entitled, "Implementation of the Declaration" and "Nuclear capability of South Africa". These two draft resolutions fall under item 59, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa". The Committee will recall that last year these two resolutions were introduced by Zaire on behalf of the Group of African States. Therefore the two resolutions are not new to the Committee as it has been seized of this matter since then.

Members will also recall that the Disarmament Commission has also been seized of the matter without succeeding in reaching consensus, and that this year we are still to consider the matter again, much to the regret of Africa, in view of the threat that South Africa's nuclear capability constitutes to international peace and security.

The text of the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Declaration" is the same as that submitted to the Committee last year, and therefore needs no explanation. The facts submitted to the Committee's attention by Zaire in 1988, relating to the studies of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research and the relevant records of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the disclosures by South Africa, still stand today and indicate that the country is going ahead with its military nuclear programme, which has enabled it to acquire nuclear capability. This, of course, is of paramount concern to Africa inasmuch as it frustrates the purpose of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

Africa once again calls upon all States to respect the continent of Africa as a nuclear-weapon-free zone and appeals to all States to monitor South Africa's

(Mr. Kolane, Lesotho)

research on, and development and production of, nuclear weapons. Africa demands from South Africa that it submit all its nuclear installations and facilities to inspection by IAEA.

With regard to revised draft resolution B, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa", the text is essentially the same as it was when submitted to the Committee earlier, except that operative paragraph 5 is amended to read as follows:

"Calls upon the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of three or more qualified experts, to investigate these reports, bearing in mind the implications for the implementation of the policy of denuclearization of Africa and for the security of African States and in particular the front-line and other neighbouring States."

In operative paragraph 5 the Group of African States is aware of the financial constraints faced by the United Nations and merely requests the Secretary-General to field a small investigative group of experts to hold discussions with the front-line and neighbouring States, the secretariat of the Organization of African Unity, IAEA and the nuclear-weapon States and to submit a preliminary report thereon. The financial implications of operative paragraph 5 as set forth in the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/C.1/44/L.65 are far outweighed by the security and peace of our region vis-à-vis the threat posed by the nuclear capability of South Africa.

(Mr. Kolane, Lesotho)

The above-mentioned amendments are necessitated by the recent disclosure that South Africa, in collaboration with Israel, has developed a nuclear-tipped missile. In the view of Africa, this development needs to be investigated urgently and reported on by the United Nations so that Africa can have an idea of the seriousness and volatility of the situation. The acquisition of a nuclear-weapon capability by South Africa constitutes a grave danger to international peace and security and, in particular, jeopardizes the security of Africa and increases the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

We might ask what would happen if other States in Africa were to embark on programmes to enable them to acquire a nuclear capability. Is it the privilege of South Africa alone to acquire this capability? Indeed, would the international community, especially the nuclear-weapon States of today, accept such an escalation? Why not, if they can be indifferent to, and can acquiesce in, the acquisition by South Africa of a weapon with such adverse implications for international peace and stability, coupled with its inherent threat to international peace and security?

I therefore commend draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3, parts A and B, to the Committee for approval by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on representatives who wish to make statements other than statements in explanation of their votes.

Mr. OSHODI (Nigeria): My delegation supports parts A and B of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3, which deal, respectively, with the denuclearization of Africa and with South Africa's nuclear capability. The draft resolution was introduced by the Group of African States.

It is rather unfortunate that, a quarter of a century after the adoption of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa by the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the achievement of its objectives has been made rather elusive by the

(Mr. Oshodi, Nigeria)

nuclear capability of South Africa, which has increased by leaps and bounds. Since that time, my country has made concerted efforts, at forums such as the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the United Nations General Assembly, the special sessions on disarmament and the Special Committee against Apartheid - to mention but a few - to help mobilize world opinion against assistance for, as well as co-operation and collaboration with, South Africa towards realizing its nuclear-arms ambition. Today South Africa has acquired an alarming nuclear-weapon capability.

The cocoon of secrecy surrounding the nuclear-weapon programme of South Africa was punctured when, in August 1988, none other than the South African Foreign Minister, R.F. Botha, announced, with threatening disdain, that his minority régime had, in fact, acquired a nuclear-weapon capability. Now that South Africa, by deed and by its own proclamation, has joined the nuclear club, what is left of the hope for a nuclear-free Africa? This development is evidence of the deliberate favouritism of the nuclear-weapon States or of their willingness to turn a blind eye to proliferation in chosen geographical areas.

It is hypocritical of some countries to raise the dust over the proliferation of lethal weapons in the Third World, while enhancing South Africa's nuclear-weapons programme. It is an example of a double standard when South Africa's nuclear foster-parents overtly herald non-proliferation but, at the same time, covertly support the proliferation tendency of South Africa. Should nuclear weapons be in the possession of crisis-prone South Africa? Furthermore, do those States that collaborate with the apartheid régime believe in preferential proliferation of nuclear weapons?

The recent revelation of South Africa's capability in delivery systems for nuclear warheads is most disturbing, not only to Africa but to the whole world. Despite the usual denials, there were clear indications that South Africa

(Mr. Oshodi, Nigeria)

had carried out tests of these delivery systems, together with another State that is in an armament romance with the apartheid régime. According to expert opinion, South Africa's booster-rocket could be used to launch missiles capable of carrying a conventional or nuclear payload up to 1,700 miles.

The recent development of the delivery system by South Africa must have made it clear to the world that the racist régime wants to become a regional super-Power of Africa and to use this power to intimidate the Africans through nuclear blackmail. The effect of this development on the future political situation in southern Africa will be serious.

My delegation believes that South Africa's nuclear-armament programme is a matter of grave concern not only to the continent but to the whole universe. If a racist régime like the one in South Africa can be encouraged to constitute a nuclear threat, not only to regional peace and stability but also to international security, there is a need to take urgent action to stop immediately all illegal acts that will further enhance South Africa's nuclear capability, either now or in the future. In addition, there is a need for the super-Powers to help publish details of the nuclear capability of South Africa and of the assistance given to the régime by various countries. The least that can be done now is for the international community to prevail upon South Africa to submit all its nuclear facilities to safeguard inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

On a final note, I must say that the world efforts on disarmament cannot be complete if Africa is not completely denuclearized. South Africa and its collaborators seem to be moving in the opposite direction - against the efforts to achieve a nuclear-free world. South Africa's participation in the nuclear-arms

(Mr. Oshodi, Nigeria)

race will make nonsense of the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR), the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Partial Test Ban Treaty, especially if nuclear-arms-related contacts and contracts with South Africa are not terminated immediately. There is no doubt that these new revelations about South Africa's armament will affect Africa's position with respect to negotiations, in the 1990s, on key issues of disarmament because it will mean that only those who have the nuclear means to deter can get respect and influence. Consequently, Africa is now afraid to trust.

This Committee therefore has a duty to demonstrate its disapproval of the nuclear-arms ambition of South Africa by approving draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3 by consensus.

Mr. DZVAIRO (Zimbabwe): My delegation too supports draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3.

Repeated calls to the international community, particularly to the nuclear-weapon States, to ensure that South Africa's nuclear programme for hostile purposes is halted have been to no avail. It seems that the very Western States that call for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons have not only replied with apathy and with a deafening silence but have irrefutably rendered assistance to the racist régime in its acquisition of a nuclear capability.

The South African régime itself not only admits having nuclear weapons but steadfastly refuses to promise not to use them in any circumstances. In fact, apartheid spokesmen have stated explicitly that if the iniquitous system of apartheid is attacked no rules will apply in its defence.

(Mr. Dzvairo, Zimbabwe)

Recent reports of the continuing collaboration between South Africa and Israel in enhancing South Africa's nuclear capability and resulting in the development of a medium-range nuclear-tipped missile delivery system are a cause of great concern to us in Africa in general, and amongst the front-line States in particular. South Africa's continuing destabilization of neighbouring States and the régime's oft-expressed belligerence make this development all the more ominous.

We appreciate the financial constraints facing our Organization, but the invocation of financial constraints in the face of this very real threat to peace verges on the hypocritical when we consider that vast sums have been spent on lesser projects in the interests of peace. Apart from the relatively small amount involved, it would be a positive gesture of good intent if delegations, rather than shooting down the draft resolution for financial reasons, sought ways of ensuring the achievement of its aims. I refer here to an urgent call for investigation by the Secretary-General, with the assistance of experts, to ascertain the veracity of reports of collaboration between South Africa and Israel in developing a medium-range delivery system for nuclear weapons.

For these reasons, my delegation considers it very important that support be given to this draft resolution.

Mr. KUNDA (Zambia): My delegation wishes to underline the great importance that it attaches to the draft resolutions A and B in document A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3.

The implementation of the denuclearization of Africa is of paramount importance to the work of this Committee, a Committee which is committed to the cause of disarmament. My delegation, coming as it does from one of the front-line States, is gravely concerned at South Africa's nuclear weapon capability. It is all the more concerned at the recent reports of apartheid South Africa's active

(Mr. Kunda, Zambia)

military collaboration with Israel in the production of nuclear-tipped medium-range missiles with completed testing facilities.

My delegation feels that South Africa's nuclear capability and those reports referred to in operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution B in document A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3, undermine the concept of the denuclearization of Africa. For this reason, my delegation attaches the greatest importance to the draft in question according to which, inter alia, the General Assembly would call upon the Secretary-General, with the assistance of qualified experts, to investigate those reports. Furthermore, we feel that the preliminary report requested in operative paragraph 6 would be very useful for the Disarmament Commission at its 1990 session.

My delegation has also had occasion to study the programme budget implications of the draft resolution set forth in document A/C.1/44/L.65, and we feel that the expenditure of an extra \$57,000 for the biennium 1990-1991 would be worth while, considering the potential danger that South Africa's nuclear capability poses not only to the peace and security of the region, but also to international peace and security. This Committee, which deals with political and security matters, should undoubtedly be interested in the investigation called for in operative paragraph 5 and should look forward to the final report to be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session.

Mr. AMBEYI (Kenya): It is not the intention of the Kenya delegation to explain how Kenya is going to vote on this particular draft resolution. However, it is the intention of my delegation to address the friends of the racist South African régime and those who collaborate with the South African régime in the preparation of various weapons which the United Nations and various United Nations agencies have proved would pose a great danger, not only to Africa, but to international security. Those friends have forced us in our present draft

(Mr. Ambeyi, Kenya)

resolution to ask the United Nations to assist us in investigating the nuclear build-up in South Africa.

It is the view of my delegation that this report will help convince those "doubting Thomases" who still do not realize that South Africa is a threat, not only to Africa but also to the international community.

I address those who normally abstain on this draft resolution. I know they may now use another excuse, citing financial implications, but I am telling them that the danger to security should be recognized, despite what they will say are budgetary constraints. I believe that, in the changed international situation, the time has come even for those friends of South Africa and those who co-operate with it to recognize reality and understand that South Africa is a danger. It is now time, I believe, even for those who normally abstain, to support us on this draft resolution so that it may be adopted without a vote.

Mr. DJIENA (Cameroon) (interpretation from French): I want to make some brief comments with regard to draft resolution B in document A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3. The first relates to the question of the financial implications. The report of the Secretary-General in document A/C.1/44/L.65, on the implications of the implementation of operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution B, gives some figures which, if we do not read them attentively, may be misleading and may give the impression that the financial implications are particularly heavy. Indeed, my delegation simply wishes to stress that this document setting forth the financial implications should be read in relation to the eleventh paragraph of the preamble: "by its own public admission at Vienna on 13 August 1988 the apartheid South African régime has now acquired nuclear-weapon capability".

(Mr. Djiena, Cameroon)

This may give a juridical foundation, on the basis of the evidence. It begins with a recognition by the State concerned but, in all equity, the African Group wants there to be an investigation, and I believe that in this Committee we know of some precedents. I do not think there is any use in going back to those precedents, but there are some which do allow us to justify the request of the African Group, and I think I can assert that this request should not give rise to any major problems in this Committee.

(Mr. Djiena, Cameroon)

The second point I should like to make relates to the aims of non-proliferation. Whether the proliferation is horizontal or vertical, as indicated in the relevant paragraphs of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, once a State situated on the African continent has acquired and recognizes this way - I am speaking of the nuclear capability, the above-mentioned aims are still valid on another continent and if that is not the case, what is the real significance of the Treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and what meaning is there in the adherence of Africans to this Treaty? So I think the terms of this draft resolution have been very carefully chosen to bring about a consensus in the Committee. Therefore, in so far as possible, we want to adopt it by consensus, but all States that are really committed to the aim of non-proliferation should draw the consequences from the state of affairs in Africa in the future work, not only in the First Committee, but also in the Preparatory Committee for the work of the Fourth Review Conference on the non-proliferation Treaty.

Mrs. MULAMULA (United Republic of Tanzania): My delegation does not wish to delay further the taking of action on this draft resolution, but the position of my Government was well explained in our statement during the general debate. Nevertheless, I want to draw the attention of this Committee, and your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the financial implications set forth in document A/C.1/44/L.65. I am well aware that it is not this Committee that is to discuss the financial implications. But, in the last paragraph of the Secretary-General's report, it is stated that:

"Should it not prove possible to meet the costs required from the Contingency Fund, the activities might have to be postponed". (A/C.1/44/L.65, para. 15)

I close with the hope that the Secretary-General will not be constrained to postpone the report requested in this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: As no delegation has asked to speak to explain its vote before the voting, the Committee shall now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa". This draft resolution was sponsored and introduced by the representative of Lesotho on behalf of the African Group of States at the 38th meeting of the First Committee, held this morning. The draft resolution has programme budget implications, which are contained in A/C.1/44/L.65. It is in two parts, A and B. We shall proceed first to take a vote on part A of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3 A was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to vote on part B of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3 B was adopted by 118 votes to 4, with 10 abstentions.**

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

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

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

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): The Netherlands delegation supported draft resolution A, concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, but it abstained on draft resolution B, concerning the nuclear capability of South Africa.

We do not believe that the line of action set forth in draft resolution B would be to the advantage of our ultimate goal which is to induce South Africa to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty. Draft resolution B does not take into account some positive developments such as the reaffirmation by the South African Government of its earlier statements about its intention to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty. We understand that a meeting between South Africa and the depositary Powers of the non-proliferation Treaty will be held early in December 1989. The Netherlands looks forward to concrete results from that meeting.

Accession by South Africa and by the neighbouring States in the region of southern Africa would be a significant contribution to the denuclearization of Africa, a concept which my Government supports. In our opinion, these considerations are not fully covered in draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3 B, and this, in addition to other objections of a political nature, prompted us to abstain on draft resolution B.

Mr. ZIFFORI (Israel): The Government of Israel has on many occasions expressed its support for the principle of nuclear non-proliferation. This is especially true for the continent of Africa. However, with regard to the draft resolution in part B of document A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3, my delegation was forced to vote against that draft resolution because of the unfair singling out of Israel.

We have on many occasions both in this Organization and in other forums made known our abhorrence and total condemnation of apartheid and South Africa's régime of racial discrimination, and have curtailed our relations with South Africa. As far as alleged nuclear collaboration is concerned, my Government has often categorically rejected that allegation. There is an unfortunate practice in the United Nations to base condemnatory and accusatory resolutions against Israel, and Israel alone, on unsubstantiated press reports. This draft resolution is one more example with regard to these stories. Recently the Minister of Defence of Israel, Mr. Yitzhak Rabin, in an interview on Israel radio stated:

"When it comes to the nuclear field, we have no relations whatsoever with South Africa, and therefore all the stories about any relationship between our two countries on this issue are totally unbased and without any justification".

Mr. SADER (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in part B of document A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3 because we agree with its basic objectives. There is no doubt that we share the concern of the international community about South Africa's nuclear capability. I should, however, like to enter reservations with regard to some of the provisions of the text. First, the twelfth and fifteenth preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 4 and 17 single out the behaviour of a country or group of countries. Uruguay does not agree with this practice. It is discriminatory, it affects the balance of

(Mr. Sader, Uruguay)

draft resolutions, and it is in no way constructive. Furthermore, in the view of my delegation there does not seem to be sufficient proof to warrant including in the draft resolution provisions such as those in paragraphs 5 and 6.

Mr. KENYON (United Kingdom): I wish to explain the United Kingdom's vote on the draft resolutions in parts A and B of document A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.1, which have just been adopted by the Committee.

The United Kingdom fully supports South Africa's neighbours in their efforts to guarantee and safeguard their territorial integrity and national sovereignty. It is in the interest of all, especially that of the population of South Africa and its neighbours, that there should be no nuclear weapons in the region.

We note that South Africa has expressed renewed interest in the non-proliferation Treaty and that there is to be a further meeting between South Africa and the Depository Powers, including the United Kingdom, next month in Vienna. In the interests of regional and world security there is an urgent need for South Africa to accede to the Treaty and to place all nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. We hope that South Africa will take these steps at a very early date.

As we have stated on many occasions, the United Kingdom does not collaborate in any way with South Africa in the development of its civil nuclear power programme. We, together with the other member States of the European Community, have prohibited all new collaboration with South Africa in the nuclear sector. There is absolutely no question of our providing the South African Government with assistance in the development of a nuclear-weapon capability. That would of course be a gross violation of our obligations under the non-proliferation Treaty.

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

As a founder member of the missile technology control régime the United Kingdom is also concerned about recent reports that South Africa and Israel may be collaborating on missile development. We are therefore in sympathy with important aspects of the draft resolutions. However, there are passages we find less acceptable. All States have the right to apply and develop programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, a right that is internationally recognized and set out in a number of international instruments.

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

In addition to these points, which we have made repeatedly over the years, we note that paragraphs 5 and 6 of the draft resolution in part B of A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3 have adverse financial implications.

For these reasons we abstained on the draft resolution in part A and voted against the draft resolution in part B of A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3.

Mr. RIDER (New Zealand): New Zealand shares the concern expressed in the draft resolution in part B of document A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3 about South Africa's unsafeguarded nuclear facilities. While my country is also concerned about a number of other nuclear or potential nuclear States not covered by International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards agreements, the case of South Africa, with its volatile security situation, is of special concern. For that reason New Zealand has supported this draft resolution.

New Zealand's deep abhorrence of apartheid should be well known to the international community. We have put on record as well our concerns about the possible further development of nuclear capacities in the tense South African environment, but we must also register the reservations we have over the practice

(Mr. Rider, New Zealand)

of putting forward draft resolutions singling out one country or group of countries. Nor do we believe it is appropriate to focus in a text such as this on issues that are incidental to the main concern of the draft resolution and should be dealt with elsewhere.

In addition, I must express the concern of my delegation at the fact that the proposal for the establishment of a group of experts to assist the Secretary-General in the preparation of the report called for in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution in part B has been made with little time for consideration. That is particularly regrettable in view of the budgetary consequences of the adoption of this proposal.

The New Zealand delegation fully appreciates the concerns which have led to the request for a report by the Secretary-General, especially in view of recent news reports, but we are not convinced that the establishment of a group of experts is a necessary or suitable means to address this issue.

Nuclear proliferation constitutes a dire threat to international security and stability. In South Africa's circumstances the danger inherent in further unregulated nuclear development is compounded. Accordingly, New Zealand once again urges South Africa to place its nuclear facilities under the IAEA safeguards régime and to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty, thereby renouncing any interest in acquiring nuclear weapons.

Mr. NOREEN (Sweden): I am speaking to explain the vote of the five Nordic countries on the two draft resolutions in parts A and B of document A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3 entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa". Our countries' strong condemnation of apartheid in all its forms and manifestations is well known.

(Mr. Noreen, Sweden)

The apartheid system remains a flagrant violation of fundamental human rights and fundamental freedoms as laid down in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The Nordic Governments have for many years actively supported the struggle against apartheid. Through their programme of action against apartheid the Nordic countries have adopted a wide range of unilateral measures against South Africa, including a trade embargo. In compliance with Security Council resolution 418 (1977), they have also adopted measures and legislation on the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa. Furthermore, the Nordic countries have implemented Security Council resolution 558 (1984) by prohibiting imports of arms, ammunition of all types and military vehicles produced in South Africa. Co-operation in the nuclear field with South Africa is excluded through legislation in all five Nordic countries.

The Nordic countries share the concern expressed in draft resolution L.53/Rev.3 that South Africa might acquire nuclear weapons. Such a development would be a major setback to international non-proliferation efforts and would add to the already grave threat to international peace and security caused by the policy of apartheid and by South Africa's acts of destabilization in the region.

The Nordic Governments have therefore persistently and in various contexts called upon the South African Government immediately to adhere to the Treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

For these reasons our delegations have voted in favour of the two draft resolutions.

However, we want to voice serious concern regarding some formulations used in both texts. The Nordic countries strongly deplore the continued inappropriate singling out of individual countries or groups of countries, which clearly detracts from the main objective of strengthening international support for the Declaration

(Mr. Noreen, Sweden)

on the Denuclearization of Africa. It also makes it more difficult to reach international consensus in dealing with the question of South Africa.

In general, we must reserve our position with regard to formulations which fail to take into account the proper division of competence between the Security Council and the General Assembly. Furthermore, the Assembly should address itself to Governments rather than to private citizens and enterprises.

As regards specific paragraphs, we have reservations on, inter alia, the new elements introduced in paragraphs 4, 5, 6 and 17 of draft resolution L.53/Rev.3 B.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): It is with regret that the French delegation has been compelled to abstain on L.53/Rev.3 A and to vote against draft resolution L.53/Rev.3 B.

The fundamental objectives of these draft resolutions fully meet with the support of the French Government, that is to say the denuclearization of Africa and the prevention of the acquisition by South Africa of a military nuclear capacity.

Furthermore, the French Government shares the concerns of the African States regarding attempts at destabilization undertaken by South Africa against the countries of the region. Also, France supports the principle that all States should refrain from actions which would promote the proliferation of nuclear weapons. We also think that South Africa should submit all its nuclear facilities to the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

On all these points, therefore, the French Government is in full agreement with the sponsors of draft resolutions L.53/Rev.1 A and B, but at the same time we attach great importance to the necessary distinction between the peaceful use of nuclear energy and its use for military purposes, and we do not think that this distinction has been properly observed in the draft resolutions.

We also feel that the formulations relating to the possession and development of a capacity by South Africa go beyond what we believe to be appropriate. As

(Mr. Morel, France)

to L.53/Rev.1 B, in our view the indispensable distinctions between military and civilian uses do not appear at all. Given the importance we attach to that distinction, we were compelled, as in previous years, to vote against the draft resolution.

Mr. JANDL (Austria): The Austrian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution L.53/Rev.2 B, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa". We did so because we agree with the thrust of the draft resolution and because we are aware of the great dangers to international peace and security which could emerge from the possible development or proliferation of nuclear weapons, in particular in the region in question.

Austria is opposed to all attempts at nuclear proliferation on both the regional and the global levels.

However, we would like to underline our reservations regarding the twelfth and fifteenth preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 and, in particular, Paragraph 17.

We are not convinced that it is necessary or helpful to cite reports on certain allegations which have not been verified. Furthermore, we cannot agree with the concept of singling out a given country or group of countries in a resolution of the General Assembly.

In the case of a separate vote, those reservations would have compelled Austria to abstain on the paragraphs I have just mentioned and would have obliged us to vote against the request of the Secretary-General contained in paragraph 17.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen): What we have heard so far is interesting philosophy. I wonder why it is that, when a question relates to countries other than South Africa and Israel many tend to be advocates of a campaign against those countries, yet now they try to convince us that this chamber is without light, even as we see bright light.

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

If the question of collaboration had concerned collaboration between countries other than South Africa and Israel, we would see a campaign against those countries. But since that is not the case, we find the question tends to be treated philosophically. Even the legitimate request of the African States - which we support whole-heartedly - that the matter be investigated has been turned down for technical or financial reasons. I had hoped one of those States would have said it would cover the \$50,000.

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

But just in order to create an obstacle it became a big issue to have \$50,000 to cover it. I hope that we will not have here a double standard, because when it came to the same responsibility on the part of the Secretary-General to investigate chemical weapons, they tended to become advocates. But when it was about nuclear weapons and the nuclear capability of the racist régime of South Africa which threatens Arab countries and the African continent, and about collaboration between two racist régimes, we hear many excuses.

Now that the Committee has taken a decision on revised draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3, I should like to make a statement with particular reference to operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of part B. I am doing so in the light of the budgetary implications set forth in document A/C.1/44/L.65 and of statements made by several delegations.

The objective of paragraphs 4 to 6 of this revised draft resolution is to establish the truth. The approach proposed in operative paragraph 5 is consistent with time-honoured practice in the United Nations, which has in the past dispatched impartial missions to investigate allegations and reports with serious security implications. The records of the United Nations are replete with examples of such missions, notably the missions sent in the last few years to investigate reports of the use of poisonous gas in the Iran-Iraq situation. In fact, the African Group at the United Nations is not asking for anything new in operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 6.

The reports alluded to in operative paragraph 4 are quite serious. They raise serious implications for peace and security not only for the African continent but also for the world as a whole. The reports which have also been circulated by the media have come at a time when the international community is placing a high premium on peace and harmonious relations, as evidenced by the number of draft resolutions that this Committee has adopted, in particular those regarding various

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

nuclear-free zones in the world. It is therefore necessary that allegations of collaboration between two Member States of this Organization - which, as the reports stated, has enabled one of them to acquire nuclear-tipped missiles - be investigated and the truth established.

It would be tragic, indeed a dereliction of duty, if an otherwise well-intentioned proposal aimed at clearing the air concerning reports with serious implications were to be stifled in the name of lack of funds.

I would therefore hope that a second thought would be given to the report contained in A/C.1/44/L.65 so that it would be possible for this request by the African Group to be carried out without hindrance.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to consider cluster 13. At the beginning of the meeting we had announced that two draft resolutions were to be submitted for decision at this afternoon's session. However, during our proceedings we have received a request to postpone draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.41/Rev.2 for further consultations. It will therefore be taken up tomorrow.

The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.46/Rev.1, entitled "Science and technology for disarmament". This draft resolution has four sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic at the 31st meeting, on 8 November 1989.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.46/Rev.1 are: the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None

Abstaining: United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.46/Rev.1 was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning I should like to remind members of the Committee that, in accordance with the Committee's programme of work and time table, on Monday, 20 November the Committee will begin its general debate on consideration of and action upon agenda item 70, "Question of Antarctica". I therefore urge delegations kindly to inscribe their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible in order to enable the Committee to utilize fully the conference facilities available to it.

I shall not read out the list of draft resolutions the Committee will deal with tomorrow. We are going to cover all the remaining draft resolutions and I am sure delegations will come prepared. They should also come prepared to stay here as long as it takes to finish, even if that means extending the afternoon meeting into the early evening.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.