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The meeting was called to order at 4.40 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 AND 145 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee to make an announcement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I have to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/40/L.57, Morocco; A/C.1/40/L.61, Jamaica; A/C.1/40/L.65, Morocco; A/C.1/40/L.73, Jamaica and Thailand; A/C.1/40/L.57, Peru; A/C.1/40/L.30, Samoa; and A/C.1/40/L.31, Samoa.

The CHAIRMAN: This afternoon the Committee is scheduled to proceed to take decisions on those draft resolutions which are listed under cluster 2 of the informal paper distributed to the Committee. However, I propose that first we should address ourselves to some unfinished business, namely the draft resolutions that we postponed taking action on this morning. The first of these is draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.14, on which I propose that the Committee now take action.

I shall first call on those delegations that wish to make statements on that draft resolution.

Mr. GROOT (Denmark): I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having postponed action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.14 to afford me time for consultations. After consultations with a number of delegations I now wish to propose orally an amendment to the draft resolution. I am grateful for the co-operation I have had from those whom I have consulted.

The amendment requested is as follows: the deletion of the present operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.14 and the insertion of the following amended text as the new operative paragraph 1:
(Mr. Groot, Denmark)

"Appeals to all Member States to make the widest use of the study and its conclusions and recommendations;".

I hope the Committee will be able to adopt the draft resolution, as amended, without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.14, as orally amended. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Denmark at the 35th meeting of the First Committee, on 12 November 1985. The representative of Denmark has requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.14, as orally amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60. This draft resolution has 20 co-sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 34th meeting of the First Committee, on 12 November 1985. The co-sponsors are: Algeria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe.
I call upon the representative of the United States of America, who has asked to make a statement in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): In his address to the General Assembly last month, President Reagan stated that at his forthcoming meeting with General Secretary Gorbachev he looked to a fresh start in the relationship of our two nations. The talks will cover, therefore, a range of important issues, among them those relating to nuclear and space arms.

As was recalled in this Committee just yesterday, President Reagan called on both sides to go to Geneva committed to a world with fewer nuclear weapons and some day with none. We trust that the objective of such a world is endorsed by all. Yet we know that progress towards it will not be easy. The issues are complex, and the obstacles to their solution are many.

A unanimous expression of support and encouragement by the community of nations would no doubt be welcome and heartening to both leaders when they meet in Geneva. The United States regrets that draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60 will not have such an effect. We are deeply disappointed that, instead of carrying to Geneva our common wishes for success, it only further demonstrates the preoccupation of some delegations with scoring points in this body.

Even on this important occasion, when only a consensus resolution can have meaning and value, agreement could not be reached on language neither promoting nor prejudicing the viewpoints of anyone, including both participants in the Geneva meeting. Consequently, the United States is not able to support this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60. A recorded vote has been requested.
A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60 was adopted by 117 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60.

The first operative paragraph of the draft resolution refers to an event to which the peoples of the world attach hopes for a positive change in international relations. The Soviet Union is actively in favour of the achievement at the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva of concrete, tangible agreements that will promote the strengthening of security and trust in the world and open up opportunities for ending the accelerated process of the accumulation
and upgrading of weapons. The Soviet leadership attributes great significance to the forthcoming meeting in Geneva and is doing everything possibly to ensure that it will have tangible results.

In any event, in Geneva the Soviet Union will seek a just and constructive solution to the most urgent problems of our time. Aware of its responsibility for the fate of peace, the Soviet Union has proposed a complex of new initiatives on nearly every issue relating to the ending of the arms race and to disarmament, including, of course, issues that are the agreed object of consideration and resolution in their interrelationship at the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space weapons. I should like to refer here to the relevant passage in the joint Soviet-American communiqué of 8 January 1985, which reads as follows:

"The sides agree that the subject of the negotiations will be a complex of questions concerning space and nuclear arms, both strategic and intermediate range, with all of the questions considered and resolved in their interrelationship."

The draft resolution just adopted expresses the hope that the forthcoming meeting between the two leaders of the USSR and the United States will produce early and effective agreements on the halting of the nuclear-arms race, with its negative effects on international security, as well as on social and economic development, the reduction of the nuclear arsenals, the prevention of the arms race in outer space and the use of outer space for peaceful purposes. The Soviet Union is in favour of such agreements. New evidence of this is its proposal for a 50 per cent reduction in the nuclear weapons of the USSR and the United States capable of striking each other's territory if a prohibition on the creation of space-based weapons is adopted. That is a real and practical formula for preventing an arms race in outer space and achieving a truly radical reduction of nuclear weapons on Earth.
Accordingly the Soviet Union, particularly in recent times, has unilaterally undertaken a series of major practical steps.

We share the view expressed in the draft resolution concerning the importance and significance of the Geneva negotiations and agree that bilateral and multilateral negotiations should complement one another. In this connection, I would mention the statement made by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, that peace must be based on realities. To be sure, each of the participants in the forthcoming meeting in Geneva has his own interests, but who has ever suggested that States do not have interests of their own? As Mr. Gorbachev stressed, to assume that only one country or group of countries can act in the international arena shows an incorrect understanding of today's world. Such faulty understanding can have major consequences. It is most important that the realities should be taken into account.

The Soviet Union attaches very great significance to the Soviet-United States negotiations in Geneva, and it has consistently and with a sense of urgency encouraged the prompt commencement of negotiations on issues concerning nuclear disarmament and the prevention of an arms race in outer space, in a multilateral forum: the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. As to providing information about the progress of the Soviet-United States negotiations, we shall base ourselves on existing practice.

Mr. de la BAUME (France): My delegation regrets having had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60. The French authorities have duly welcomed the announcement of a meeting at Geneva between President Reagan and the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gorbachev. Like most other States represented here, we hope that that meeting will lead to more active bilateral negotiations on nuclear weapons in
outer space. Since those two countries possess the largest arsenals, the verifiable reductions which could result from these negotiations - after what we all know could be a fairly long interval - represent a necessary condition for the beginning of a multilateral process of nuclear disarmament.

That is why we have difficulties with drafting of paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60. It is clear that the negotiations in question constitute a very important stage, but they alone cannot solve all the problems. Consequently France cannot agree with the assertion that these negotiations are directed towards preventing an arms race in outer space and terminating the arms race on Earth, or with the view that their ultimate goal is the complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere.

Moreover, my delegation does not consider it appropriate for the General Assembly to appear in this way to be giving a general mandate to the two parties to the Geneva negotiations.

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): At the outset, when draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60 was introduced, Canada wanted a consensus. We share entirely the viewpoint of the representative of the United States, that only a consensus on this draft resolution would have any real meaning and value. We believe that had there been more time, had there been a greater effort, the negotiations might have produced a consensus. But, as we recognize, the clock ran out.

Faced with a decision on the draft resolution as it stands - and we believe it to be imperfectly drafted for a reason I shall come to in a moment - and faced with the over-arching importance of the summit to take place next week, Canada has taken the view that the full thrust of what this draft resolution is trying to say should be supported.
Prime Minister Mulroney of Canada has stated publicly that the summit leaders should go the extra mile for peace with security and justice in the world. Canada, being of the view that this is a historic opportunity, cannot do other than to give its support to this message to the two leaders, a message which is saying essentially that the world is waiting for progress, that the world wants progress, that the world must have progress. Given that interpretation we cannot turn our backs on paragraph 1, which calls for a decisive impetus to the current bilateral negotiations.

Canada voted in favour of the draft resolution because we want some impetus, and we believe that the summit is eminently capable of providing that impetus.

This is an imperfectly drafted text. We find that paragraph 4 is badly drafted and is susceptible of different interpretations, particularly on the subject of outer space and the prevention of an arms race there. Canada disclaims any interpretation of paragraph 4 according to which Canada, in having voted in favour of this draft resolution as a whole, thereby supports negotiations on outer space at this time in the Conference on Disarmament. Rather, it has been and continues to be the Canadian position that the kind of mandate that the Conference on Disarmament invoked in 1985 - which led to some nine meetings - established a solid basis on which to move forward in these discussions. It is that kind of mandate we are in favour of continuing.

Thus, with that disclaimer on paragraph 4, and for the reasons I have given, we believe that, on balance, the draft resolution was worthy of support.
Mr. van SCHAIRK (Netherlands): This morning we asked for some delay in proceeding with this issue. We had hoped that consensus would be reached because it is an important issue and we attach the greatest importance to the bilateral summit to be held in Geneva next week. We regret that the delay has been to no avail. Our abstention should be seen as a reflection of our disappointment that at this important moment the Committee cannot be united. We believe that with a little more flexibility it ought to have been possible to reach agreement on the basis of an adjusted draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 2: A/C.1/40/L.2/Rev.2, L.48, L.51 and L.57.

With regard to A/C.1/40/L.53/Rev.1, I have a request from its sponsors that action on it be postponed, perhaps until tomorrow morning, because of ongoing consultations. If I hear no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on representatives wishing to make statements on the draft resolutions in cluster 2.

Mrs. URIBE de LOZANO (Colombia)(interpretation from Spanish): Although I intended to speak this morning, at this time my delegation's presence is no more than a physical presence, because Colombians are overwhelmed by the tragedies that have struck us. In addition to the tragedy of last week, last night a volcano erupted in Colombia, and at this moment at least 20,000 to 30,000 Colombians lie buried by this eruption. We do not know the exact number. I regret that my own personal strength of mind is not equal to such an event, and I am not able to make a statement at such a time, although I should really have liked to support Peru's proposal with the same arguments and the same lucidity as Peru.

I am very sorry, but I cannot continue.
Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): Before I make my statement on the draft resolutions in cluster 2 now under consideration, I should like to express my delegation's sympathy to the sister Republic of Colombia on the tragic events to which the Colombian representative referred.

We have no serious difficulty with any of the draft resolutions before us, and I shall therefore confine myself to making a few comments on two of them.

First, we congratulate the delegation of Peru for its initiative in submitting the draft resolution on conventional disarmament on a regional scale. The later changes have undoubtedly improved the original text. As can be seen, the draft resolution is sponsored by a group of delegations from various regions of the developing world. Venezuela will support any efforts made to achieve disarmament of any kind. Consequently we consider this draft to be an important supplement to the efforts being made to contain the arms race in other areas, in particular nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. We trust that all Member States will continue their efforts and respond favourably to the appeals contained in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.2/Rev.2.

The other draft resolution on which we should like to make specific comments is contained in document A/C.1/40/L.57 and deals with the report of the Conference on Disarmament. While it is true that during the past year the Conference on Disarmament achieved some results that might be described as positive, including the establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of the Arms Race in Outer Space, and some progress on chemical and radiological weapons, those results are insignificant when compared with the magnitude of the task that the Conference is facing on other items on its agenda. Thus, we entirely concur with the disappointment expressed in operative paragraph 1 of the draft emphasizing that in this year, as in previous years, the Conference on Disarmament has not succeeded in reaching concrete agreements on any disarmament issues on its agenda.
We reiterate our full support for the work of the Conference on Disarmament and our intention of continuing to make every possible effort to help ensure that substantive negotiations on all the agenda items will be initiated. At the same time, we appeal to Member States, in particular to the more militarily powerful States and above all to the nuclear-weapon States, to make a positive contribution to the Conference's work.

The first step should be to co-operate in ensuring immediate implementation of the appeal contained in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.57, so that the Conference will have available to it at the beginning of its 1986 session all the machinery it needs to undertake its substantive work on all the priority agenda items. We trust that next year the work in the Conference will not be delayed or impeded by prolonged, complicated and largely sterile negotiations on issues relating to the definition of the mandates of the Ad Hoc Committees as a result of the reluctance of some countries to agree that the Conference should serve as the sole multilateral negotiating body for disarmament, as mandated by the international community.
Mr. MacFHIIONNAIRRE (Ireland): I should like to address draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.57, "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

There is only one draft resolution before the Committee on the report of the Conference on Disarmament. In view of the status of this draft resolution as the only one on the subject on which we have the opportunity to act, it is important that, when adopted, it should meet with maximum approval.

In my delegation's view, it goes a long way in representing majority concerns and aspirations regarding the work of the Committee and the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. However, there is one operative paragraph which I believe does not contribute to maximizing consensus. I refer to operative paragraph 5, which

"Urges the Conference on Disarmament to undertake, without further delay, negotiations with a view to elaborating a draft treaty on a nuclear-weapon-test ban;".

In my delegation's view, the formulation at the end of this paragraph "nuclear-weapon-test ban" is not one which will elicit the maximum possible consensus this draft resolution deserves. The reason is that such a formulation does not take into account the various viewpoints on a number of issues relating to the nature of an eventual treaty. We have before the Committee three draft resolutions on the question of a cessation to nuclear-test explosions.

Operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.35 calls for a "complete cessation of nuclear-test explosions". Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.42 - which was introduced by a group of socialist States - calls for "a treaty that would effectively ban all test explosions of nuclear weapons by all States everywhere and would contain provisions, acceptable to all, preventing the circumvention of this ban by means of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes".
And operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.73 contains a call for "a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty".

In addition, the recently concluded Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) calls for the conclusion of a comprehensive multilateral nuclear-test-ban treaty banning all nuclear tests by all States in all environments for all time - a conclusion adopted by 130 parties to that Treaty representing the largest consensus on this question since the conclusion of the Final Document.

However, we are not all parties to the NPT - and this we must recognize. In seeking to improve the consensus, which would include my delegation, in our reference in an important draft resolution such as A/C.1/40/L.57 - the sole draft resolution on the report of the Conference on Disarmament - my delegation proposes that from among the formulations I have just brought to the Committee's attention, in all of which can be perceived an approach that is largely if not entirely similar, a slight amendment in operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.57 drawing its language from that of operative paragraph 5 of A/C.1/40/L.35 - an important draft resolution submitted by a group of neutral non-aligned States.

I propose to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.57 that, in the interest of improving the acceptability of this important draft resolution, in operative paragraph 5 the words "nuclear-weapon-test ban" be replaced by the words "complete cessation of nuclear-test explosions" which are taken from draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.35, sponsored by a group of neutral and non-aligned States.
With my delegation's slim resources, we have consulted with as many
delegations as has been possible and it is our belief that this amendment would be
acceptable. We hope that it will be acceptable to all the sponsors of this draft
resolution without recourse to a vote.

In conclusion, I firmly propose the amendment as I have read it out.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): Before
I explain my delegation's views on these draft resolutions, I should like to convey
to Colombia, currently Chairman of the Latin American Group, Costa Rica's feelings
of solidarity in these difficult moments of tragedy its people and Government are
suffering. We hope that similar to what occurred with another serious natural
disaster that has afflicted another country of our region, Mexico, the internatinal
community will give tangible expression of its generosity.

We should like to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.2/Rev.2. We thank the
delegation of Peru for having taken such a constructive initiative on the question
of conventional disarmament on a regional scale. This is an item to which my
delegation has always attached great importance. We entirely agree with the terms
of this draft resolution in all aspects, and we hope that it will enjoy consensus
in the Committee.
Mr. GONSAVES (India): The delegation of India fully appreciates the objectives and aspirations of its original sponsor, but it will nevertheless abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.2/Rev.2. The main thrust of this draft resolution — namely, conventional disarmament on a regional scale — is, in our considered view, considerably at variance with the letter and spirit of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2). According to paragraph 81 of this Document:

"... the limitation and gradual reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons should be resolutely pursued within the framework of progress towards general and complete disarmament."

Unfortunately, this global and wider perspective is, in our view, not adequately reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.2/Rev.2, and the question of regional initiatives for arms limitation and the reduction of military expenditures appears to us to have been organically de-linked from the fundamental goal of general and complete disarmament. We are, in fact, greatly alarmed at the increasing tendency to distort the priorities achieved in a balanced manner and by consensus in the Final Document.

In maintaining its focus on regional initiatives, draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.2/Rev.2 has also failed to take fully into account the Political Declaration of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which referred squarely to:

"... new attempts at strengthening strategic groupings, military blocs and alliances, attempts to secure and build up military bases and facilities and other interlocking arrangements conceived in the context of great power conflict in various regions of the world which only aggravate insecurity in the international environment." (A/38/132-S/15675, p. 51)
Although draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.2/Rev.2 recalls the priority assigned to nuclear disarmament in the Final Document, the main thrust of this draft resolution does not, in our view, adequately reflect that priority. According to paragraph 55 of the Final Document:

"Real progress in the field of nuclear disarmament could create an atmosphere conducive to progress in conventional disarmament on a world-wide basis."

Our question is whether there has been any progress at all on nuclear disarmament. As a matter of fact, the only available avenue to general and complete disarmament lies at present in the negotiations on a comprehensive programme of disarmament, which, unfortunately, have been stagnating for the past seven years in the Conference on Disarmament because of the total lack of consensus on suitable texts relating to nuclear disarmament. It is striking that the only part of the text of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament which relates to conventional disarmament and which still remains in brackets pertains to the most heavily armed region of the world, namely, Europe.

We have offered these brief comments with a view to suitably modifying the impression which is created by the draft resolution about the blanket feasibility of regional initiatives on conventional disarmament in an international situation snarled by the compulsions of great Power rivalry.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Today many delegations have made oral amendments. This is their right, which the rules of procedure grant us, but let me request that those delegations that would like to submit amendments do so in such a way as not to create problems for other delegations. In particular, with respect to A/C.1/40/L.57 — which, by
the way was distributed on 7 November, a whole week ago - we find a new oral amendment being proposed just prior to the vote.

In this connection, I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to postpone the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.57 until tomorrow, especially since we do not know what the attitude of the more than 20 co-sponsors is towards this amendment.
The CHAIRMAN: In response to the remarks of the representative of the Soviet Union, I should like to say that it is indeed the Chairman's intention to postpone the taking of a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.57. This is also in keeping with a request received from its sponsors, since they have indicated that it will take some time for them to be able to respond to the oral amendment just made. We shall therefore postpone taking action today on that draft resolution.

The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolutions in cluster 2. We shall first take up draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.2/Rev.2. This draft resolution has 20 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Peru at the twenty-fifth meeting of the First Committee on 4 November 1985. The sponsors are: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Romania, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Uruguay and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, 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, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe
Against: None

Abstaining: Angola, Cuba, Egypt, Ghana, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.2/Rev.2 was adopted by 107 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.48. The draft resolution has 17 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Czechoslovakia at the 36th meeting on 13 November 1985. The sponsors are: Afghanistan, Angola, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America
Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Morocco, Niger, Paraguay, Sweden

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.48 was adopted by 91 votes to 19, with 14 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.51. This draft resolution has two sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Iraq at the 35th meeting of the First Committee on 12 November 1985. The sponsors are Iraq and Jordan.

The sponsors have requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. Are there any objections?

Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): The United States would ask that a recorded vote be taken.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested by the representative of the United States of America.

* Subsequently the delegation of Botswana advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.
A recorded vote was taken.

**In favour:** Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

**Against:** None

**Abstaining:** Austria, Belgium, Canada, Ethiopia, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Luxembourg, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.51 was adopted by 111 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.
The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on representatives wishing to explain their positions after the Committee has taken decisions on draft resolutions in cluster 2.

Ms. ANDERSON (Australia): Australia does not share the view that unilateral disarmament measures are an effective means of bringing the arms race to an end, but we have nevertheless decided to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.2/Rev.2, on conventional disarmament on a regional scale, because we believe that there is a pressing need to halt and reverse the conventional arms race. Australia also attaches special importance to quantitative and qualitative limitation on conventional arms transfers and to reductions in military budgets and expenditure. The need for such measures is set out strongly in the draft resolution.

We also fully support the recognition in the draft resolution of the important contribution regional initiatives can make to the realization of conventional disarmament on a regional scale.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): Let me begin by saying that we too were horrified to hear of the appalling natural disaster which has struck Colombia.

I should like to make a statement in explanation of my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.51, on which we abstained. We wish to see all States participating in the disarmament process, but we consider that participation in the Conference on Disarmament is a matter for the Conference, to be decided in accordance with its rules of procedure, and that it is not an appropriate matter for the General Assembly to make a recommendation on.

Mr. LECHUGA HEVIA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): We wish first of all to convey to the delegation of Colombia our deep sorrow at the tragedy that occurred in its country yesterday as a result of the volcanic eruption which has claimed thousands of victims.
(Mr. Lechuga Hevia, Cuba)

I wish now to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.2/Rev.2, introduced by the delegation of Peru. I wish to make it plain that had this draft resolution been adopted by consensus, we would have joined in that consensus – although we should still have wished to explain our position. In the event, however, we abstained.

We share the concern of the delegation of Peru about the burden imposed by conventional armament on the economies of developing countries, and join in the appeal made in the draft resolution that when the regional situation so permits and on the initiative of the States concerned, countries consider and adopt measures at the regional level with a view to strengthening peace and security through the limitation and reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons. That addition to the text was contributed by Peru and we consider that it is a great improvement.

As far as my country is concerned, the scope of such a measure would have to be broader than the mere region to which we belong, the Caribbean region. Otherwise it would be meaningless. I shall be saying nothing new if I repeat that as long as the United States continues its policy of hostility against Cuba and its economic and trade blockade, as long as it continues its provocations such as the recent flight of a SR-71 spy plane which overflew our island twice, violating our airspace, and leading to protests from our Government, and as long as the threat of military aggression continues, we shall not relinquish our sovereign right to defend ourselves with the weapons we deem to be appropriate.

It is impossible to permit the victims being stripped of their defences while the aggressor continues to accumulate increasing numbers of nuclear and conventional weapons of growing destructive power. Unilateral measures are impossible when a neighbouring country continues to occupy a part of our territory, as is the case with the military base which has been rejected by the people and the Government of Cuba.
We abstained in the vote because, although we share the concern which underlies the initiative, we continue to face the situation we have just outlined. Moreover, as the General Assembly has repeatedly stressed, inter alia, in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, nuclear weapons are one of the greatest and most urgent concerns of the day and pose a great threat to peace. That threat is inherent too in the attempt being made by the United States Government to militarize outer space.

We should have liked all those concerns to be more fully reflected in the text of the draft resolution.

Mr. RAEMMAECKERS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I wish first of all to convey my delegation's profound sympathy to the representative of Colombia regarding the tragic events which are afflicting her country.

I should like now to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.2/Rev.2. The Belgian delegation stresses its great satisfaction at the adoption of that draft resolution. We consider the draft resolution to be a significant initiative in the context of the regional approach to disarmament, on which subject last year the General Assembly adopted by consensus resolution 39/63 F, of which my country was a sponsor, along with several other countries whose names appear as sponsors of the present draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.2/Rev.2 makes a specific reference to resolution 39/63 F, which remains the basis for a regional approach which could make a contribution to peace and security.

My delegation expresses its congratulations to the delegation of Peru, which initiated this draft resolution, and to the other sponsors.
Mr. EKEUS (Sweden): I wish first of all to associate myself with other
delegations which expressed sympathy with the delegation of Colombia regarding the
catastrophe which has taken place in that country.

I should like to explain the vote of the Swedish delegation on draft
resolution A/C.1/40/L.51, on which we abstained. The reason for our abstention is
that the draft resolution implies that all States not members of the Conference on
Disarmament have the right to participate in the work of the Conference’s plenary
meetings, the rules of procedure of the Conference notwithstanding. Participation
in the work of the Conference on Disarmament must be decided upon by the Conference
on the basis of its rules of procedure.

Having said that, I wish to underline the firm support of the Swedish
Government for the participation of all non-members of the Conference on
Disarmament in its work in accordance with the rules of procedure of the Conference.

Mr. LE HOAI TRUNG (Viet Nam): We wish to explain our abstention in the
vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.2.Rev.2. The question of the use of
conventional weapons has long been a concern of Viet Nam. As a victim of the
barbarous use of all kinds of weapons, short of nuclear weapons, for the past
40 years, the Vietnamese people, more than any other, demands full compliance with
the rules laid down in the 1949 Geneva Convention on the protection of the victims
of war and the 1977 Additional Protocols, and in the 1981 Convention on
Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be
Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, and the three
Protocols annexed thereto.

Nevertheless, the delegation of Viet Nam wishes to emphasize that Viet Nam
completely shares the conviction overwhelmingly reflected in all important
documents of the United Nations and of the Non-Aligned Movement that removing the
threat of a world war - a nuclear war - is the most acute and urgent task of the
present day, and that effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war have the highest priority. Besides, we are acutely alarmed by the attempts of some, especially of those who have repeatedly resorted to or connived at the use of conventional weapons against other nations, to take advantage of the legitimate concern of the world's peoples over conventional weapons to divert attention from the issues of the prevention of nuclear war and to diminish international criticism of the doctrine of nuclear deterrence.

Mr. SERAJZADEH (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.51. In my delegation's view, the Conference on Disarmament is a negotiating forum rather than a deliberative body. Thus we believe that the rules of procedure of the Conference on Disarmament should not be interpreted in such a way as to change the nature and aims of the Conference.

Mr. de la BAUME (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation too wishes to convey to the representative of Colombia, Mrs. Uribe de Luzano, its deepest and most heartfelt condolences on the occasion of the disaster which has struck her country.

The French delegation wishes now to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.51. By voting in favour of the text, it wished to indicate its agreement with the general aim of the draft resolution. My delegation considers that all Member States of the United Nations should be enabled to make statements at plenary meetings of the Conference on Disarmament. That seems to us to be in conformity with the spirit of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and, more generally, with the right of all States to express their views on disarmament matters.

But the French delegation wishes to state quite clearly its reservations with respect to the wording of paragraph 2, which could be interpreted as an invitation
to the States members of the Conference on Disarmament to reject the provisions of the rules of procedure concerning the adoption of decisions, which is something we could not accept. In our view, it would have been preferable for the General Assembly to confine itself to expressing the hope that the States members of the Conference on Disarmament would respond favourably to requests to speak at plenary meetings of the Conference submitted by States which are not members.

Mr. NOUANETHASING (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from Russian): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.2/Rev.2. We abstained in the vote on that draft resolution for the following reasons. In the first place, the contents of the draft resolution do not meet the primary requirements of the solution of the problems of the day. Secondly, a partial, regional approach to conventional disarmament is not always acceptable in all regions of the world, especially in regions where aggressive nuclear-weapon States exist and carry out policies hostile to their neighbours. Under such conditions, nuclear Powers freely and continuously threaten other States with their nuclear weapons.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded our work on those draft resolutions in cluster 2 indicated for action at this stage.

I wish at this stage to express my own sense of shock and my deep sorrow at hearing of the tragic disaster that has struck the people of Colombia. May I, on behalf of the members of the Committee and on my own behalf, convey our deepest sympathy and condolences to the people and the Government of Colombia, through the representative of Colombia present here. May I also express the hope that the international community will show its solidarity with the Colombian people at this tragic hour.
I shall now call on representatives who had wished yesterday to speak in exercise of the right of reply. Statements in exercise of the right of reply will be limited to two per delegation.

Mr. MILAD (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic):

Yesterday morning, the representative of the Zionist entity spoke before this Committee on agenda item 64, on Israeli nuclear armament. That representative made reference to a number of Arab countries, including my own, and to several other countries, including India and Pakistan. Owing to the lateness of the hour, I decided to postpone replying to that representative to today's meeting.

The representative of the Zionist entity asserted that Libya openly purchased bombs and other armaments and that it had acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty only after it had failed to achieve its goals in that sphere. I wish to emphasize that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty in conformity with its position in favour of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and as an expression of its belief that peace and security in the world will be achieved only through general and complete disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament.

The Zionist representative asserted too that Libya, Syria and Iraq head the list of third-world arms-importing countries. In that connection, we would note that those and other countries possess not even a fraction of the Zionist entity's arsenals of all types of weapons.

Israel's nuclear armament is among the most important of its means for realizing its strategic military doctrine of, first of all, deterring the Arabs from launching a war which would threaten the status quo and have a heavy cost in life and property. The second aspect of this Israeli doctrine involves convincing the Arabs that they can never win a war, either now or in the future, and that they
will never achieve their goal through the elimination by force of an artificial
entity. Thirdly, it is the intention of the Zionist entity to lend a kind of
permanence to the situation once it has achieved what it considers to be a
satisfactory strategic position. In other words, its strategic aims are deterrence
and persuasion for the present and, in the long run, the imposition of peace on its
own terms.

Developments since June 1967 have introduced a new element: A realization by
the Zionist leaders that enormous expansion has been achieved at the expense of the
myth of weakness of that entity, which in the past had gained it the sympathy of
Western countries, and that the gains must be protected.

In my statement of 7 November 1985, I noted that the Zionist entity was
striving to acquire nuclear weapons and that it made use of various means to
acquire the uranium and the other materials it needed to manufacture nuclear
weapons. We wonder why it has not signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and why it
has not placed its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency
(IAEA) safeguards.

It is no secret that the intentions of the Zionist entity are aggressive. It
is not satisfied with its inhuman practices within the occupied Palestinian
territories; it has extended the circle of its aggression, reaching as far as
thousands of kilometres away in South-West Asia and North Africa. As we all know,
the Zionist entity launched a surprise attack on Iraqi nuclear installations; that
attack could have brought about serious contamination as a result of radioactive
leakage had it not been for the precautions taken by Iraq. The Zionist entity also
launched a deliberate attack on civilian districts of Tunis, resulting in the death of
many innocent people, including women, children and old people. In that way,
the Zionist entity violates all the norms of international law, which points up its
aggressive intentions and its lack of respect for those norms.
The list of Israel's inhuman practices is long, so I shall limit myself to mentioning those I have cited above.

The CHAIRMAN: The Observer of the League of Arab States has asked for the opportunity of replying to a statement made at a previous meeting. It is my intention, in conformity with resolution 477 (V) of 1 November 1950, to call upon that representative. I call on him now.
Mr. El-MAY (League of Arab States) (interpretation from Arabic): I shall set forth the Arab League's point of view with regard to the allegations of the Israeli representative during his statement yesterday concerning the item on South Africa's nuclear capability and Israeli nuclear armament in that connection.

I would have confined myself to the United Nations Secretary-General's report contained in document A/40/520, about which the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research consulted the Arab League and its sister body the Organization of African Unity (OAU), had the Israeli representative not intervened before the introduction of the draft resolution on Israeli nuclear armament in his habitual evasive and misleading manner to state his country's well-known position, that is, its refusal to comply with international resolutions and its disregard of the will of the international community.

At a time when the peoples of the world aspire to peace and impatiently await a glimmer of hope by the achievement of an agreement by the two super-Powers to avert the risk of nuclear war and its aftermath, the representative of the Zionist entity reiterated once again the refusal of his régime to subject its nuclear activities to International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspection and safeguards. We also witness its persistence in not signing the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

Israel's possession of nuclear weapons perpetuates an unceasing hotbed of tension in the Middle East resulting from its policy of recourse to hostilities to achieve deterrence, instead of the prevailing doctrine of using deterrence to avert hostilities. That is a natural result of the expansionist policy pursued by Israel with a view to becoming a regional super-Power adopting the theory of imposing absolute security for Israel which, in turn, means absolute threat to others. That is a well-known Nazi doctrine from which many countries of the world have suffered,
(Mr. El-May, League of Arab States)

and I need not go into an analysis of that doctrine. Such a policy has led Israel to disregard the principles of the United Nations and international laws and norms, to the extent that its high officials have publicly declared that Israel's political borders are at the farthest reaches of the Israeli Army using its available conventional or nuclear forces.

Israel declares its intention to negotiate with the Arabs while at the same time it undermines attempts to pave the way towards such negotiations. It speaks of confronting terrorism at a time when it perpetrates massacres and resorts to the most hideous forms of racial discrimination against the Arabs who live in the occupied territories, in order to force them to leave those territories so as to be free to establish settlements and replace the Arabs with another people; not to mention its overt resort to international terrorism against the territories of independent sovereign countries, on the pretext of pursuing Palestinians everywhere. Is that not a genocidal war in practice? That is the kind of security problem and the solution to it the representative of Israel has asked the Committee to understand.

We view it as extremely irrelevant to refer here to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which has been invoked by the representative of the Zionist entity, since that is a Treaty that was concluded in an already nuclear-weapon-free zone. We wish to recall that the situation in the Middle East is completely different, since Israel actually possesses nuclear weapons. The Treaty of Tlatelolco stipulates that the countries of Latin America are entitled to acquire the nuclear facilities they require to accelerate their peoples' economic and social development.

However, Israel has denied the exercise of that right to the Arab States when it attacked the Iraqi nuclear reactor, which was subject to international control
and devoted to peaceful purposes. That became quite evident from the following statement by the then Prime Minister, Mr. Begin in the wake of the strike against the Iraqi reactor:

"We shall strike any reactor that Iraq attempts to construct again. If Saudi Arabia should build a reactor we would destroy it too."

Israel claims that it desires peace; it claims that it desires to solve problems by means of negotiation. We seek peace; our hope is pinned on peace based on justice. We do not trust Israel's claims and we shall not agree to negotiate with Israel except in the presence of witnesses. Hence we support the call for an international peace conference.

The League of Arab States, which has been attacked in this Committee by the representative of the Zionist entity, strictly observes all international instruments, resolutions and norms. In this connection, it co-operates with the United Nations, pursuant to General Assembly resolutions on such co-operation. That is based on the third paragraph of article III of the League’s charter, which states that part of the task of the League’s Council consists of deciding ways of co-operation with international organs to ensure peace and security.

The General Assembly was suspicious of Israel's intentions from its inception. The resolution on its admission to membership of the United Nations included the following condition that was not mentioned in the case of any other State:

(spoke in French)

"The General Assembly ..."

"Decides that Israel is a peace-loving State which accepts the obligations contained in the Charter and is able and willing to carry out those obligations." (resolution 273 (III))
(continued in Arabic)

Has Israel adhered to that condition? I believe - and so does the Committee - that it has not. Its representative has declared in advance in this Committee that Israel would not adhere to the draft resolution the Committee would adopt. That is one simple, concrete example; there are many others.

As to the claim of the representative of the Zionist entity that there is no collaboration in the nuclear field between racist Israel and South Africa, it is worth mentioning that Jan Smuts, the leader of the white settlers in Pretoria, has been an admirer of the Zionist movement on the basis of its identification with the policy and goals of the whites in Pretoria. There are similarities between the white-settler community in Africa and the Zionist settlers in Palestine. He finds that:

"They carry the mission of the Jewish and Christian civilized world to backward, primitive societies, whether they be black Africans or despicable bedouins, namely, the Arabs."

It is on that foundation that the growing and continuous collaboration between the two racist régimes in all fields is based - to such an extent that Israel has given South African industries access to United States and European markets, through the "made in Israel" trademark, so as to circumvent United Nations resolutions on a boycott of the South African régime. In return, South Africa provides Israel with uranium to assist it in the field of nuclear armaments.
If the representative of the Zionist entity insists on his denial of Israel-South Africa nuclear collaboration, he must go back to the statement issued in 1967 after the visit of John Vorster, then Prime Minister of South Africa, to Israel in which there was announced the establishment of a Joint Ministerial Committee composed of the Ministers of Defence of those two countries to supervise co-operation in three sectors: nuclear collaboration, manufacture of and trade in conventional arms, and resistance to what the statement described as "the actions of saboteurs" –

The CHAIRMAN: I apologize to the Observer of the League of Arab States, but the representative of Israel wishes to raise a point of order. I call on him.

Mr. ISSACHAROFF (Israel): I was of the impression that a right of reply was being made, not that the general debate was being reopened. I would therefore ask you, Mr. Chairman, to curtail the speaker.

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the Observer of the League of Arab States, I wish kindly to remind him that indeed, under the rules of procedure, the right of reply should not exceed 10 minutes. I invite him to continue his statement, while observing that rule.

Mr. EL-MAY (League of Arab States) (interpretation from Arabic): I shall observe the prescribed time-limit.

One of the results of that agreement in the nuclear field was Israel's participation in the nuclear explosion carried out by the Pretoria Government on 22 September 1979 near the island of Prince Edward. That was confirmed by the information gathered by a United States satellite and Israel's participation in the explosion process has been confirmed by two Israeli journalists, Ami Dor and Eli Tachir in their book No One Will Live After Us. They told a broadcaster of CBS network that they gathered their information from Knesset Member Bleyah Speizer and his friend Shimon Peres.
(Mr. El-May, League of Arab States)

We advocate peace, but we do not accept surrender. The declaration of the Middle East as a nuclear-weapon-free zone is necessary and must be achieved. However, within a policy that eventually achieves it, we must first guarantee that the region is free from nuclear weapons and all types of related laboratories and activities. What would be the use of a declaration that would serve as a cover for a growing cancerous tumour that seriously threatens our future and that of succeeding generations or would be used to impose an unjust stability that would be more like surrender than peace?

Mrs. URIBE de LOZANO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): On behalf of my delegation, my Government and people, as well as on my own behalf, I should like to express my sincere thanks for the condolences that you, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the officers of the Committee, and many delegations have extended to us on the tragedy that has occurred in my country.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: Before I adjourn the meeting, I should like to inform members that tomorrow we shall first take up draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.69, on which we postponed taking action this morning.

In accordance with our programme of work, we shall then take action on those draft resolutions contained in cluster 3. In the course of tomorrow's meetings, we shall of course take up also whatever other draft resolutions on which action has been postponed today. However, we must first ascertain when these can be taken up by the Committee depending on the stage reached in their preparation.

With regard to cluster 4, a number of delegations have approached me indicating that on some of the draft resolutions contained in that rather extensive cluster consultations are apparently still going on. I would therefore propose to the Committee that we postpone taking up the draft resolutions in cluster 4 after
(The Chairman)

we have exhausted those in cluster 3 and go on to the draft resolutions in cluster 5, which it would seem do not pose any such difficulties. I am aware that I have already indicated my preference for taking up the clusters in sequence. However, I have also indicated that I would of course exercise the necessary degree of flexibility.

If the Committee agrees, tomorrow after we finish cluster 3 we shall go on to cluster 5 and postpone to a later time - which shall be decided upon by the Committee - taking action on cluster 4. We shall begin the morning meeting by taking up draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.69.

If there are no comments or objections, we shall proceed accordingly.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.