



FIRST COMMITTEE
40th meeting
held on
Thursday, 17 November 1988
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 40th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ROCHE (Canada)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS
[51 to 69, 139, 141 and 145] (continued)

*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 fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/43/PV.40
23 November 1988
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.50 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 51 TO 69, 139, 141 AND 145 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning, we shall take action on the following draft resolutions: in cluster 4 - A/C.1/43/L.26/Rev.1; in cluster 6 A/C.1/43/L.31 A and B; in cluster 10 - A/C.1/43/L.70/Rev.1; and in cluster 11 - A/C.1/43/L.19/Rev.2.

Before hearing speakers on these draft resolutions, I call upon the Secretary of the Committee for an announcement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I wish to inform the members of the Committee that the following countries have become co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.22/Rev.1: Luxembourg and Paraguay.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): It is a particular pleasure for me to present to the First Committee today draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.26/Rev.1 on a nuclear-arms freeze. It is sponsored by India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sweden and my own delegation.

This draft resolution is the result of consultations between my delegation and that of India, a major co-sponsor of another draft resolution on the same subject, which was before the Committee in document A/C.1/43/L.56.

The purpose of the draft resolution is very simple. It is one of those texts that are usually self-explanatory. It requests the five States that possess nuclear weapons to declare a total freeze on their nuclear arms and, as a first step towards that end, urges the Soviet Union and the United States to proclaim an immediate nuclear-arms freeze.

I should like to express my gratitude to the delegation of India, and in particular to Mr. Rakesh Sood, whose flexible and constructive attitude made

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

possible the merging of our two texts. It is a matter of great satisfaction to me to be able to introduce the results of our efforts to the Committee and also to point out that our draft resolution enjoys the co-sponsorship of all States that sponsored the two original texts, which constitutes a validation of our undertaking.

Mr. SHARMA (India): Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico has just introduced draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.26/Rev.1 and explained its background. My delegation would like to express its appreciation to Ambassador Robles and his delegation for the open-minded and accommodating spirit in which discussions were conducted.

As the members of the Committee will observe, and as has also been pointed out by Ambassador Robles, the co-sponsors include all Member States that had, earlier, co-sponsored the two draft resolutions. That is a positive and encouraging sign.

We hope that that sign will translate itself into universal support for the merged draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.26/Rev.1. Consensus building is a complex and slow exercise and by merging the two drafts we believe that we have taken a significant step towards it.

In conclusion, I should say that our effort was in sincere pursuance of your exhortation, Sir, that, to the extent possible, attempts should be made to merge draft resolutions on the same general subject. We are happy that that effort proved to be successful.

The CHAIRMAN: Does any delegation wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting? If not, the Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.26/Rev.1.

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 29th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November, and has the following sponsors: India, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Romania and Sweden.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, 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, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: China, Iceland, Spain

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 26/Rev.1 was adopted by 116 votes to 13, with 3 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I call now on delegations wishing to explain their votes after the voting.

Mr. VALERO (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 26/Rev.1, on a nuclear-arms freeze. Our objections are based on the very notion of a freeze and have been set out repeatedly.

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

(Mr. Valero, France)

First of all, a freeze would, by definition, freeze the existing situation along with any imbalance that situation reflects and the attendant risks to the security of States concerned. Moreover, a freeze would confer a lasting advantage on States that have increased their armaments sizably compared with those that have limited their efforts.

In addition, a freeze would be very difficult to verify, and negotiations to define the conditions of an effective freeze would be no less lengthy or complex than negotiations on verification of an arms-reduction agreement. Furthermore, a freeze benefitting a given Power could well diminish substantially that Power's interest in pursuing negotiations and its determination seriously to negotiate an arms reduction.

Thus, progress towards a reduction of nuclear arsenals would in no way be promoted by declarations in favour of a freeze. The path towards such reductions must pass initially through negotiations between the two major nuclear Powers, and the point of departure for those negotiations must be the definition and subsequent implementation of a satisfactory balance.

Mr. ANDERSEN (Iceland): Iceland abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.26/Rev.1, concerning a freeze on nuclear weapons. We are of the opinion that today, when we are witness to the negotiations taking place between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America and to the results obtained, this draft resolution does not seem to be a positive contribution to the ongoing negotiations.

Mr. NUMATA (Japan): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.26/Rev.1, on a nuclear-arms freeze. I wish first to emphasize the consistent efforts of Japan in pursuit of nuclear disarmament, with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth. Japan has been engaged in such efforts in the United Nations, the Conference on

(Mr. Numata, Japan)

Disarmament and various other international forums. We take an active interest in such issues as a nuclear-test ban.

We welcome the fact that the United States and the Soviet Union have ratified and brought into force the Treaty on the elimination of their intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. We earnestly hope that this real and concrete step of arms reduction will provide the impetus for the two countries to make further progress in other areas, including the substantial reduction of their strategic nuclear weapons.

In the process of moving towards the realization of nuclear disarmament we should not lose sight of the present situation, where a balance of military capability plays a role in maintaining an equilibrium. We have serious doubts about the practicability or meaningfulness of the nuclear-arms race proposal on which the Committee has just voted because, unless immediately followed by firmly and delicately constructed arrangements for a balanced reduction in nuclear arms, it could lead to the preservation of a real or perceived nuclear superiority of one side over the other. Such an outcome would bring about destabilization of the basic fabric of international security.

It must be pointed out that verification, the importance of which is now widely recognized, is extremely difficult to apply to a nuclear freeze.

Those are the basic reasons we voted against draft resolution

A/C.1/43/L.26/Rev.1.

Mr. GEVERS (Netherlands): My delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.26/Rev.1 because it is our conviction that initiatives calling for a freeze on nuclear weapons are hardly appropriate at a time when real nuclear disarmament is under way. Now that substantial reductions in the nuclear arsenals of the largest Powers are taking place, and prospects for halving strategic nuclear arsenals are promising, we think it would no longer be appropriate to have a freeze.

(Mr. Govers, Netherlands)

I should like also to refer to statements my delegation made on this subject in earlier years.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to inform members of the Committee that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.56 do not wish to put that draft resolution to the vote; the Committee will therefore take no action on it.

We turn now to cluster 6: draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.31 A and B.

Mr. KIBIDI (Zaire) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the African Group, Zaire wishes to draw the Committee's attention to the reasons why it introduced draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.31 A and B. The two parts of the draft resolution deal respectively with implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa and with the nuclear capability of South Africa.

With regard to part A, we wish to highlight a number of facts well established by studies of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research and the relevant reports of the International Atomic Energy Agency, as well as by recent statements by the leaders of the apartheid régime themselves.

(Mr. Kibidi, Zaire)

Those facts relate to the SAFARI research reactor, the nuclear-power station at Koeberg and the hot cell laboratory at Valindala. It should be added that a semi-commercial uranium-enrichment plant in South Africa remains outside the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards system. Those facts alone enable us to state unequivocally that South Africa is developing a military nuclear programme and, hence, nuclear capability.

In light of those factors, the Group of African States is calling for the adoption by consensus of draft resolution L.31 A, which, inter alia, renews its call upon all States to consider and respect the continent of Africa and its surrounding areas as a nuclear-weapon-free zone, reaffirms that the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity would be an important measure to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to promote international peace and security and condemns South Africa's continued pursuit of a nuclear capability and all forms of nuclear collaboration by any State, corporation, institution or individual with the racist régime that may enable it to frustrate the objective of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, which seeks to keep Africa free from nuclear weapons.

With regard to draft resolution L.31 B, which deals specifically with the nuclear capability of South Africa, that draft resolution condemns the massive buildup of South Africa's military machine, in particular its frenzied acquisition of nuclear-weapon capability for repressive and aggressive purposes and as an instrument of blackmail, requests the Disarmament Commission to consider once again as a matter of priority during its substantive session in 1989 South Africa's nuclear capability and requests the Secretary-General to follow very closely South Africa's evolution in the nuclear field and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its forty-fourth session.

(Mr. Kibidi, Zaire)

I should like to draw the Committee's attention to a change in the twelfth preambular paragraph of part B of the draft resolution. The new preambular paragraph should read as follows:

"Deeply disturbed at the continuing hostile policy of the South African racist régime, as evidenced by its constant invasions of Angolan territory, which are an act of aggression against that country's sovereignty and territorial integrity".

Bearing those elements in mind, I would request, on behalf of the Group of African States, that the Committee adopt draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.31 A and B without a vote, in order to demonstrate the endorsement by the international community as a whole of the denuclearization of Africa and the goal of making it a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to make a statement on behalf of the Secretary-General with regard to draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.31 A and B.

In operative paragraphs 9 of draft resolution L.31 A and 10 of L.31 B the General Assembly requests the Secretary-General to provide all necessary assistance that the Organization of African Unity might seek regarding the modalities and elements for the preparation and implementation of the relevant convention or treaty on the denuclearization of Africa.

Should the draft resolutions be adopted, the Department for Disarmament Affairs and the Office of Legal Affairs would be ready to provide the required assistance within existing resources.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.31 A and L.31 B. The Committee will turn first to draft resolution

(The Chairman)

A/C.1/43/L.31 A, the programme-budget implications of which have been read out by the Secretary. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Zaire on behalf of the Group of African States at the twenty-eighth meeting of the First Committee on 7 November. 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, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, 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.1/43/L.31 A was adopted by 132 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.31 B, as orally amended. The programme-budget implications of the draft resolution have been read by the Secretary. The draft resolution was

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

(The Chairman)

introduced by the representative of Zaire on behalf of the Group of African States at the twenty-eighth meeting of the First Committee on 7 November. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, 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, Chile, Colombia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.31 B, as orally amended, was adopted by 116 votes to 4, with 13 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon those delegations that wish to make statements in explanation of vote after the voting.

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

Mr. JAEGER (Denmark): I am speaking to explain the vote of the five Nordic countries on the two draft resolutions contained in document A/C.1/43/L.31, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearisation of Africa".

The strong condemnation by our countries of apartheid in all its forms and manifestations is well known. The apartheid system remains a flagrant violation of the fundamental human rights laid down in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(Mr. Jaeger, Denmark)

The Nordic Governments have for many years actively supported the struggle against apartheid and have, through the Nordic Programme of Action against Apartheid, implemented an economic boycott against South Africa and Namibia as well as other measures which limit relations with South Africa.

The Nordic countries have also adopted measures and legislation in compliance with Security Council resolution 418 (1977) on the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa and 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 A/C.1/43/L.31 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.

For those reasons our delegations have voted in favour of both resolutions. However, we want to voice reservations on some formulations used in the two resolutions.

We must generally 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.

The Nordic countries deplore the inappropriate and selective mentioning of individual countries or groups of countries. That makes it more difficult to reach international consensus in dealing with the question of South Africa.

It is also important that the Assembly should address itself to Governments rather than to private citizens and enterprises.

(Mr. Jaeger, Denmark)

As regards specific paragraphs, we have reservations on operative paragraph 7 in resolution A, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa", and also on the twelfth preambular paragraph in resolution B, "Nuclear capability of South Africa" as that paragraph does not reflect the actual situation in relation to Angola.

Mr. FYFE (New Zealand): New Zealand shares the concern expressed in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.31 B regarding 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 the draft resolution.

Notwithstanding New Zealand's abhorrence of apartheid and the anxieties we have about the possible further development of nuclear capacities in that environment, we must register the reservations we have over the practice of putting forward draft resolutions singling out one country or group of countries, nor do we believe it appropriate to clutter a draft resolution on nuclear issues with political issues which, although important in their own right, are incidental to the draft resolution and should be dealt with elsewhere.

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 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. ZIPFORI (Israel): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.31 B, my delegation was unfortunately unable to vote for the draft resolution because of the unfair naming of Israel in the preamble.

We have on many occasions, both in this Organization and in other forums, made known our abhorrence and total condemnation of apartheid and South Africa's régime of racial discrimination and have curtailed our relations with South Africa.

As far as alleged nuclear collaboration is concerned, my Government has often categorically rejected that allegation. That is borne out by the statement of the Secretary-General, which I mentioned earlier in the debate, in his 1981 report:

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

(A/36/431, para.13)

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

Ms. COURTNEY (Australia): Australia abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.31 B which deals with the nuclear capability of South Africa. That decision was determined by several aspects of the draft with which we had certain difficulties. They include the singling out of certain States as well as questionable assertions with respect to South Africa's nuclear-weapons capability.

Nevertheless, in explaining Australia's vote, let me stress that Australia considers the racist apartheid régime of South Africa as abhorrent and we strenuously oppose it. A nuclear-armed apartheid régime would be more abhorrent still and would be unequivocally rejected by my Government.

Mr. NUMATA (Japan): I wish to explain Japan's votes on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 6, including those voted on on Tuesday, 15 November.

Japan voted in favour of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/43/L.5 and A/C.1/43/L.31 A. It has always been the view of the Government of Japan that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, in Africa, or in any other region would be conducive to the objective of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as well as to the peace and security of the region in question.

However, my delegation wishes to reiterate its view that the establishment of such a zone would require the fulfilment of a number of conditions. Important among those conditions are that such zones should be agreed upon on the initiative of the countries in the region and by all the countries concerned, including the nuclear-weapon States, as the case may be; and that they should also strengthen the peace and security, not only of the region, but also of the world as a whole.

My delegation also considers it highly desirable that all the countries in the region concerned adhere to the Treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Japan abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.6 entitled "Israeli nuclear armament" because it contains several paragraphs on which we have reservations and on which we cannot make judgments due to lack of objective information. We have listened carefully to the accusations and defence on the question of Israeli nuclear armaments.

Japan, as an ardent supporter of the non-proliferation Treaty régime, is disturbed over the persistent news of Israeli nuclear armament, and earnestly hopes that the nuclear non-proliferation régime will be further strengthened on the basis of the Treaty and that Israel and other countries which are not parties will accede to the Treaty as soon as possible and thus remove the apprehension of the international community.

Mr. VALERO (France) (interpretation from French): It is with regret that the French delegation has had to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.31 A and to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.31 B. The French Government is in full agreement with the fundamental objectives of these draft resolutions - the denuclearization of Africa and the prevention of the acquisition by South Africa of a nuclear capability. On the other hand the French Government shares the concern of the African States regarding the acts of force and attempts at destabilization carried out by South Africa against the countries of the region. Finally, France supports the principle that all States must refrain from acts which would promote the proliferation of nuclear weapons. We also believe that South Africa must submit all its nuclear installations to the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency. On all these items, therefore, the French Government is in full agreement with the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.31 A and B. At the same time we attach great importance to the distinction which must be made between the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and its use for military purposes, and we do not believe that this distinction is sufficiently clear in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.31 A. On the other hand we believe that the expression of views dealing with the possession and development of a nuclear-weapons capability by South Africa goes beyond what we would have deemed useful.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.31 B, we note that the necessary distinction between military applications and civilian use no longer appears at all and in the light of the importance which we attach to that distinction we have had to vote against that draft resolution as we have voted against similar draft resolutions in past years.

Mr. FISCHER (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): The Uruguayan delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.31 B as we share the grave concern reflected in the text. We bore particularly in mind the fact that over the past few months the Government of South Africa finally has not adhered to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, an action which might have given the international community adequate securities and guarantees with regard to its nuclear capability. Thus the depository Governments of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons themselves felt it necessary to continue further action aimed at securing the legal guarantees and safeguards from South Africa which would be provided by such adherence.

That was stated in a letter dated 20 September 1988 sent to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which the Secretary-General included in his report on the item in document 43/701.

Also, in accordance with the criterion usually observed in the Assembly, the Uruguayan delegation wishes to express its reservations with regard to the thirteenth preambular paragraph, which describes and singles out the conduct of certain States on this matter. It departs from the balance which, in the view of our delegation, should be maintained in the text and fragments the efforts which are necessary to bring about a viable and effective solution to this situation which is of growing concern to the whole international community.

Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom): I wish to explain why the United Kingdom was unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.31 A, which has 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 interests of all, especially those of the population of South Africa itself and its neighbours, that there should be no nuclear weapons in the region.

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

We note South African statements that it has the technical capability to manufacture nuclear weapons. That underlines the urgent need for South Africa to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty and to place all nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. We hope that South Africa will now take very early steps to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

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-weapons capability. We therefore are in sympathy with important aspects of the draft resolution. 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 the draft resolution contains judgements that are either insufficiently substantiated or more properly matters for the Security Council. For these reasons we abstained in the voting.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now concluded its action on cluster 6. We shall now turn to cluster 10 and draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.70/Rev.1. I call first on Mr. Kheradi, Secretary of the Committee, to make a statement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to make a statement on behalf of the Secretary-General with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.70/Rev.1 entitled "Conventional disarmament on a regional scale". By the terms of operative paragraph 5 the General Assembly would request the United Nations to provide assistance to States and regional institutions that might

(Mr. Kheradi)

request it with a view to establishing disarmament measures on a regional scale. Should the draft resolution be adopted the Secretary-General would respond to any request for assistance made on the basis of operative paragraph 5 to the extent possible within existing resources and taking into account other commitments. Under these arrangements there would be no additional cost to be borne by the regular budget of the Organization.

Mr. SCHIALER (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): It is an honour for my delegation, on behalf of the co-sponsors, to outline the changes proposed for the draft resolution entitled "Conventional disarmament on a regional scale". These changes are embodied in document A/C.1/43/L.70/Rev.1, which delegations have before them.

(Mr. Schialer, Peru)

First, I should like to express my gratitude for the comments many delegations have made to the sponsors. They have led to the issuance of a new version. We have tried to accommodate, with balance and equilibrium, the views of all States represented here.

The third paragraph of the preamble clearly emphasizes the highest priority in negotiations on nuclear disarmament and the primary responsibility of the militarily significant States, especially the nuclear-weapon States, for halting and reversing the arms race, as was pointed out by the General Assembly at its tenth special session in 1978.

The fourth preambular paragraph, which should be analysed in the light of the third preambular paragraph, reaffirms that there is nothing to prevent negotiations on nuclear disarmament and conventional disarmament from being pursued concomitantly and resolutely. It simply reaffirms what we believe to be an obvious fact: the urgency and renewed importance of regional procedures for conventional disarmament.

The fifth preambular paragraph has been made more flexible in its wording and has been shortened in order to strengthen the principle of the non-diminution of the security of States involved in the process of regional disarmament. That is explicitly stated, therefore, in a new preambular paragraph that we have added.

In the operative part of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.70/Rev.1, we have made certain changes to clarify the content of each of its paragraphs.

Thus, in paragraph 1, we have eliminated the last sentence in order to show, in the best possible way, the substantive elements of the paragraph.

In operative paragraph 2, I should like particularly to draw the attention of members and of the Secretariat to the fact that, in the English version, the word "help" appears in the context which I am going to read:

(Mr. Schialer, Peru)

(spoke in English)

"which would help to set in motion ..."

(continued in Spanish)

Our delegation would like to see the word "facilitate" instead of "help", so that it would read as follows:

(spoke in English)

"which would facilitate setting in motion specific ..."

(continued in Spanish)

Also, in operative paragraph 2, we have succeeded in formulating wording that properly reflects the close link between the peaceful solution of conflict situations and the specific measures for conventional regional disarmament that may derive from it.

I should also like once again to express our firm support for the principles and norms enshrined in the United Nations Charter, which is the fundamental guideline for the conduct of States. We have therefore added the relevant sentence to operative paragraph 3.

Finally, on the request of certain delegations and with a view to consensus, which we consider essential in a matter such as conventional disarmament, we have eliminated the second phrase of the original wording of the penultimate paragraph of the operative part. Nevertheless, I should like to point out that the spirit of that paragraph remains intact, and we believe it to be of fundamental importance that the countries outside a given region should respect and facilitate the process of regional disarmament initiated, in accordance with their sovereign rights, by the countries of the region to which they belong.

Our delegation has confined itself to pointing out briefly the changes to the draft resolution before us. We do however, consider it necessary to point out

(Mr. Schiale, Peru)

that a careful reading of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.70/Rev.1 reveals the efforts which the sponsors have made to find an objective that will reassure people in all their concerns.

We should like to extend to you, Sir, our warmest possible gratitude. My delegation would like to express to members its hope that this draft resolution will receive the widest possible support.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call for statements in explanation of vote or position before the voting.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): At the outset, my delegation would like to reaffirm what was said by the representative of Jordan on behalf of the Arab Group concerning the draft resolutions in cluster 10 in our programme of work.

At the same time, we would like to point out that the number of draft resolutions pertaining to conventional armaments and conventional disarmament have increased dramatically this year. We support any sincere efforts to achieve serious progress in the field of conventional disarmament without prejudice to the priorities set forth in the strategy unanimously adopted by the international community, as reflected in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in 1978.

That Document gives absolute priority to nuclear disarmament and does not allow for dealing with the conventional and nuclear fields on an equal footing. We are fully aware of the political objectives that some quarters would like to achieve by laying emphasis on conventional disarmament and diverting attention from nuclear armaments at a time when the nuclear arms race is continuing to spiral.

It is also a matter of concern to us that some of the draft resolutions before us do not address our concerns and do not take into account the characteristics of the region in which we live, where we are confronted by two racist régimes, in

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

Israel and South Africa, which have complete access to the conventional and nuclear arsenals of some of the States which today are calling on us to achieve conventional disarmament.

It is paradoxical that some of the States that talk about the keen interest they take in the achievement of progress in conventional disarmament are found to be voting against or abstaining on certain issues pertinent to nuclear armaments, most recently in the vote on Israeli nuclear armaments. We wonder where their priorities lie: Is it a spontaneous reaction or a politically motivated one when those States abstain on, or vote against, the need to put an end to the collaboration between the racist régimes in South Africa and Israel?

For all those reasons, my delegation intends to abstain on any draft resolutions pertaining to conventional disarmament that do not squarely address our concerns; resolutions that in certain paragraphs do not take clearly enough into account the right of peoples to self-determination and their right to use all means available to them to achieve their national liberation and to maintain their independence and sovereignty; resolutions that do not take into account our legitimate right to liberate our Arab Palestinian territories under Israeli occupation or the right of the people of Namibia to liberate their country from the illegal occupation by the South African racist régime; resolutions that do not refer to the embargo imposed on the export of arms to racist régimes, and that do not take into account Security Council resolution 418 (1977), which called for a comprehensive embargo on the export of arms to the racist régime in South Africa.

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

On that basis, my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.70/Rev.1. We shall also abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.22/Rev.1 when it is put to the vote unless radical changes are made in the text taking account of our concerns and the special characteristics of our region.

We wish to make clear that we have made efforts to achieve a text taking those characteristics into account, but those efforts have not borne fruit. We hope they will be more successful next year.

Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to set out the reasons why my delegation is obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.70/Rev.1, on conventional disarmament on a regional scale.

I thank the sponsors of the draft resolution for their effort to reflect in the text the views of all delegations, but despite that effort there remain important elements related to regional disarmament that are not mentioned in the draft resolution.

Paragraph 26 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly sets out the principles that should guide disarmament negotiations. Because of its importance I shall read out that paragraph:

"All States Members of the United Nations reaffirm their full commitment to the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and their obligation strictly to observe its principles as well as other relevant and generally accepted principles of international law relating to the maintenance of international peace and security. They stress the special importance of refraining from the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or against peoples under colonial or foreign domination seeking to exercise their right

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

to self-determination and to achieve independence; non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States; the inviolability of international frontiers; and the peaceful settlement of disputes, having regard to the inherent right of States to individual and collective self-defence in accordance with the Charter". (resolution S-10/2, para. 26)

In my view, it would have been desirable and necessary to mention those principles in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.70/Rev.1, especially since even though that would have made the text a little longer, there are many examples in all regions of the world of how the security of some countries is threatened by factors not always originating within the region. There are numerous examples, including recent ones, of threats and acts of aggression and hostility and other violations of the security of small countries. Large numbers of aircraft carriers and aircraft are employed in threatening the security of such countries.

It is necessary to take this into account in speaking of regional disarmament, and in my view it is not duly reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.70/Rev.1.

The Final Document is also clear and unambiguous in stating that disarmament measures, including regional measures, should take into account

"the need of States to protect their security ... [and] the inherent right of self-defence embodied in the Charter of the United Nations". (para. 83)

Other aspects of the draft resolution too are unsatisfactory to us. A resolution adopted last year clearly expressed support for disarmament measures taking into account the characteristics and situation of each region. This year's text, however, is without any mention of this, even though it is reflected in paragraph 84 of the 1978 Final Document, which states, inter alia, that

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

"Bilateral, regional and multilateral consultations and conferences should be held where appropriate conditions exist with the participation of all the countries concerned for the consideration of different aspects of conventional disarmament". (para. 84)

A great many other important elements are, in our view, missing from the draft text. I lay stress on the right of States to defend their national sovereignty and to non-interference in their internal affairs. Those are fundamental principles that should be part of any discussion of regional disarmament. In the light of the history of foreign intervention, aggression, interference and hostility over the past 160 years against many countries of our region, my own included, those principles are of fundamental importance and cannot easily be forgotten.

I wish to refer briefly to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.10/Rev.1. My delegation did not oppose its adoption without a vote, but wishes to note that we understand the reference in the second preambular paragraph to the need for greater attention to be given to conventional disarmament as meaning that this should be done in the framework of progress towards general and complete disarmament and in the light of the priorities established for the disarmament process, under which nuclear disarmament has absolute priority. We must all work for disarmament negotiations in the relevant forums.

Mr. SHARMA (India): My delegation has asked to speak to place on record its views on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.70/Rev.1, entitled "Conventional disarmament on a regional scale".

The priorities of disarmament were established by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, held in 1978, and are reflected in paragraph 45 of the Final Document of that session. They are: nuclear weapons;

(Mr. Sharma, India)

other weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons; conventional weapons, including any which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects; and reduction of armed forces.

Those priorities are as valid today as they were a decade ago, in view of the escalating nuclear-arms race on Earth and the threat of its extension into outer space. Nuclear war is qualitatively different from other forms of war, as it threatens the survival of mankind. Therefore, conventional disarmament has to be pursued within the framework of progress towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

Approximately three fourths of world military expenditure, currently estimated at about \$1 trillion per annum, is accounted for by nuclear-weapon States and member States of the two military alliances. The same nuclear-weapon States and member States of the two military alliances account for more than 93 per cent of international arms transfers. A linkage exists between nuclear weapons and conventional weapons, as the nuclear-weapon Powers and the two military alliances account for the largest arsenals of both nuclear and conventional weapons. It is clear that it is those countries that have to take the lead in ending the arms race, both nuclear and conventional, by halting qualitative escalation and by significantly reducing stockpiles to increasingly lower levels.

(Mr. Sharma, India)

Isolated measures in the field of conventional disarmament offer little hope for meaningful progress. A global approach is required if our efforts are to lead to significant results. Due attention needs to be given to regions that possess the highest concentration of both nuclear and conventional forces. A limited approach would not only dilute the priorities required but also divert attention to secondary or peripheral areas.

Accordingly, my delegation is constrained to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. TAEB (Afghanistan): In explanation of its position with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.70/Rev.1, my delegation would like to state the following. The Republic of Afghanistan supports all efforts directed towards general and complete disarmament. In that context, we are in favour of conventional disarmament on a regional scale as an integral part of the global problem of disarmament, which could satisfy all countries directly concerned in the specific situation.

We firmly believe that all regional conflict situations should be solved through peaceful means with full respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity, security and national interests of the States concerned. The Government of the Republic of Afghanistan, by signing the Geneva Agreements earlier this year, has proved its sincere desire in this respect.

In order to bring peace and tranquillity to the region and to the country, the Republic of Afghanistan has recently come up with new proposals. In accordance with those proposals an international conference on Afghanistan should be convened to consider the situation in and around Afghanistan. One of the important elements of the proposals is consideration of the question of the demilitarization of Afghanistan. In discussing that question in such an international gathering the

(Mr. Taeb, Afghanistan)

international community should guarantee the principle of non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan.

My delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.70/Rev.1 because it does not contain a direct reference to the important principle of non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States. Furthermore, we do not agree with the language used in the third paragraph of the preamble.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.70/Rev.1, as orally amended. The programme budget implications of the draft resolution have been read out by the Secretary of the Committee. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Peru at the 30th meeting of the First Committee on 8 November and is sponsored by the following delegations: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Sri Lanka and Uruguay. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Angola, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ethiopia, India, Israel, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.70/Rev.1, as orally amended, was adopted by 110 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the representative of the United States of America, who has asked to make a statement in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mr. GRANGER (United States of America): Our delegation supports the underlying principles embodied in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.70/Rev.1. We have in the past voted in favour of similar draft resolutions. We regret that the particular formulation of the present version did not make it possible for us to vote in favour of this text. If there are similar draft resolutions introduced at future session of the Committee, we shall continue to work co-operatively towards consensus language.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now concluded its action on the draft resolutions in cluster 10.

We shall now turn to cluster 11 and draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.19/Rev.2. I call upon representatives who wish to make statements on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.19/Rev.2 in cluster 11.

Mr. SZABO (Hungary): The Hungarian delegation was one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.19/Rev.2. Hungary has always supported any measure that might serve to increase confidence among States. In our view, confidence can be developed only when it is based on a profound acquaintance with one another, on the predictability of the intentions of the parties concerned, and on the

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

(Mr. Szabo, Hungary)

transparency of their actions. All this holds true especially in the case of military matters. Objective information on, and an objective assessment of, military capabilities would, in our delegation's view, contribute to dispelling distrust and promoting confidence and would be an indispensable ingredient of successful negotiations on disarmament agreements. It is in that spirit that Hungary is a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.19/Rev.2.

Recent years have witnessed favourable developments as regards greater understanding and confidence among States, but the suspicions and distrust of decades cannot be done away with overnight. A firm resolve and consistent action are needed. Therefore our delegation deems it highly important for States, particularly the militarily significant ones, to provide regular information of a widening scope on their military potentials. Information should naturally be correct, objective, regular and continuous. By furnishing objective information on military matters, States can give proof of their genuine commitment to and readiness for arms limitation and reduction, as well as disarmament. Strengthening confidence in that way is bound to extend to other political, social and economic areas.

(Mr. Szabo, Hungary)

Regular and objective information is therefore, in our view, an effective confidence-building measure. It increases openness and mutual understanding and serves to prevent misperceptions of military capabilities and intentions. Appropriate openness, a better flow of military information and a sharing of objective military data on a regular basis may greatly promote and facilitate verification, which would in turn have a favourable influence on further confidence-building efforts and might lead to new, more effective agreements on verification and compliance with existing treaties.

Hungary shares the view that in the age of nuclear weapons all peoples are interdependent as regards security. We are therefore convinced that strengthening confidence and working for disarmament are not the responsibility and the duty of the great military Powers alone, but are problems which all countries can and should contribute to solving.

My delegation believes that by sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.19/Rev.2, bearing in mind the considerations just mentioned, we can express our readiness to contribute to facilitating the availability of objective information on, as well as an objective assessment of, military capabilities.

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

If there are none, we shall now proceed to the vote. Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.19/Rev.2 was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 9 November 1988, and has the following sponsors: Australia, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Spain,

(The Chairman)

Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom and United States.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Algeria, Brazil, Cuba, Egypt, India, Iraq, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Saudi Arabia, Somalia

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.19/Rev.2 was adopted by 109 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to inform members of the Committee that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.29 do not wish to have the draft resolution put to the vote. Therefore we shall not take any action on it.

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

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

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.19/Rev.2, entitled "Objective information on military matters", because there are certain ideas in this text which should be reformulated.

The draft limits the concept of confidence-building measures and is not limited only to military aspects. This gives the impression that what is found in the text is sufficient to promote security. Certain extremely important confidence-building measures, such as those relating to foreign military bases and military manoeuvres that threaten certain States, are not to be found in the text. What strengthens the security of our countries - and this does not appear in the draft - is not objective information but on the contrary, the cessation of hostile or aggressive acts against our countries. In speaking of the need to make use of instruments and the question of military expenditure, the draft resolution does not take those factors into account.

Mr. KALUDJEROVIC (Yugoslavia): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.19/Rev.2, which relates to an action that Yugoslavia has supported since it was first introduced in the General Assembly. In our view, objective information on military matters is an important element that could contribute to effective negotiations on disarmament issues. However, its importance should be viewed in a broader context so that, together with some other, more important, prerequisites, such as sincere political determination for instance, it would serve its purpose. On the other hand, one should not over-estimate the effects of a lack of objective information - implied in the draft resolution - on the armaments programmes of States. Even though it is not in full agreement with some of the elements, my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution bearing in mind the intention of the sponsors to point to one of the ways in which it would be possible to make a contribution to the building of confidence among States in the process of disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: At this afternoon's meeting we shall take up the following draft resolutions in cluster 9: A/C.1/43/L.38/Rev.1 and, if they are ready to be voted on, A/C.1/43/L.62/Rev.2 and A/C.1/43/L.72/Rev.1. We shall then proceed to take action on the following draft resolutions in cluster 13: A/C.1/43/L.24, A/C.1/43/L.46, A/C.1/43/L.50, A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1, A/C.1/43/L.65 and A/C.1/43/L.66.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.