UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
35th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 13 November 1990
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 35th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. **RANA** **(Nepal)**

CONTENTS

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/45/PV.35
14 November **1990**
ENGLISH

90-63214 2824V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 45 TO 66 AND 155 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I apologize to representatives for the delay in starting the meeting, which was caused by the fact that several delegations wanted a little more time to continue and finalize consultations.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 7, namely, A/C.1/45/L.1, L.18 and L.28. We shall then take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51, in cluster 8. After completing action on those draft resolutions, the Committee will move on to take action on one of the draft resolutions in cluster 9, namely, A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1.

(The Chairman)

In the light of ongoing consultations, and on the basis of special requests received from several delegations, consideration of and action on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1 in cluster 6 and draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.39 A and B and A/C.1/45/L.45 in cluster 7 have been deferred to a later stage. Similarly, consideration of and action on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1 in cluster 9 have also been postponed to a later stage.

Before we proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions, I call on the Secretary of the Committee to make some announcements.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/45/L.17, Chile: A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1, Costa Rica; A/C.1/45/L.31, Togo and Cape Verde; A/C.1/45/L.51, Ecuador, New Zealand, Suriname, the Central African Republic, Barbados, Togo and Nigeria: and A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1, Samoa.

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

Mr, MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): A priority question in the area of disarmament, the total. prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, has for more than 30 years now had a prominent place on the annual agendas of the General Assembly, The 1963 Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water is an important landmark in the history of this item. Its negotiation, in the midst of the cold war was the result of tenacious efforts by the leaders of the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union owing in large part to the pressure of world public opinion, for the world was alarmed by the dangers to everyone's health posed by nuclear-test

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

explosions, especially those in the atmosphere which produced ominous clouds. However, the main nuclear Powers had already found a way to carry out those tests underground, and since 1963 there have been about 1,200 of these tests, primarily with the objective of qualitatively improving nuclear arsenals.

Nuclear tests carried out underground were lost sight of, and public opinion almost forgot about them in spite of the many ongoing multilateral efforts to ban them. Indeed, year after year the General Assembly has taken a stand on this question and for nearly three decades the Conference on Disarmament has been considering it. But the five nuclear-weapon countries have continued testing, while the impatience of the other countries has been growing; hence, the initiative of Indonesia, Peru, Sri Lanka, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Mexico and the request by more than one-third of the States Parties to the partial test-ban Treaty to convene a conference to consider an amendment that would convert the Treaty into a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. On the basis of resolution 44/106 of 15 December 1989, the Meeting Organization of the Amendment Conference was held this year and the Conference itself will be held in New York from 7 to 18 January 1991.

In connection with this item, I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31, sponsored by the following 49 countries: Afghanistan, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cape Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, kalaysia, Mauritius, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Mexico,

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

The draft resolution is fundamentally procedural. In its preamble reference is made to resolution 441106 and the conviction is reiterated

"that a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty is the highest-priority measure for the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and for the achievement of the objective of nuclear disarmament".

Reference is also made to resolution 1910 (XVIII) of 27 November 1963, in which the General Assembly noted with approval the partial test-ban Treaty and requested the Conference on Disarmament "to continue with a sense of urgency its negotiations*' to achieve a complete ban on nuclear tests. Similarly, it is recalled that the convening of the Amendment Conference was requested by more than one third of the parties to the Treaty. The conviction is reiterated

"that such a conference will facilitate the attainment of the objectives set forth in the Treaty and thus serve to strengthen it".

The draft resolution takes note with satisfaction of the holding from 29 May to 8 June 1990 of the Meeting for the Organization of the Amendment Conference and, in operative paragraph 1, notes that the Amendment Conference will be held in New York from 7 to 18 January 1991.

Operative paragraph 2 calls upon all parties to the Treaty to participate *in,* and to contribute to the success *of,* the Amendment Conference. In the next paragraph, the General Assembly reiterates its conviction that, pending the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, the nuclear-weapon States should suspend all nuclear-test explosions through an agreed moratorium or unilateral moratoria.

The sponsors *are* convinced that the success of the Amendment Conference should be measured in the light of its contribution to the achievement of a

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

complete nuclear-test ban. Hence, operative paragraph 4 recommends

"that arrangements be made to ensure that intensive efforts continue, under the auspices of the Amendment Conference, until a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty is achieved*'.

At the same time, it is recommended that the Amendment Conference

"establish a working group, or other means it deems appropriate, to study, inter alia, the organization of control, institutional mechanisms and legal aspects of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty and to report its conclusions to the Conference".

(M r .)

In view of the efforts that have been made in other forums on this subject the draft resolution emphasises the importance of bringing about proper co-ordination between those forums. The Conference is thus part of a multilateral effort that is of concern and is imperative to all of us. There is no doubt that the holding of the Conference will serve to promote a debate on this priority disarmament question and to facilitate a solution. We are sure that the States parties to the 1963 Treaty are prepared fully to carry out the commitments set forth in the preamble.

THE CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Pakistan, who will introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/45/56/Rev.1 and A/C.1/45/L.51.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): It gives me great pleasure to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons**, contained in document A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1. This draft resolution is sponsored by Australia, Bangladesh, Bulgaria. the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar. Nepal, New Zealand, Samoa, Sri Lanka and Pakistan.

In previous years the General Assembly adopted two separate resolutions on the issue of negative security assurances, submitted by Bulgaria and Pakistan, respectively. This year also, two separate draft resolutions, contained in documents A/C.1/45/L.9 and A/C.1/45/L.19, were submitted by Bulgaria and Pakistan, respectively. However, taking into consideration the views expressed by a number of delegations at the last aessioa of the General Assembly, as well as in the general debate in the First Committee this year, sincere efforts were undertaken by Pakistan and Bulgaria, along with other interested delegations, to come up with a tingle draft resolution,

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

It gives me great pleasure to intorm the Committee that, sfter a great deal of concerted and time-consuming efforts, a single text has been agreed upon, and it is now before the Committee in document A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1. The merger of draft resolutions L.9 and L.19 reflects the spirit of mutual understanding and accommodation and is in keeping with the efforts of this Committee to rationalize its work. Obviously, L.56/Rev.1 replaces the earlier draft resolutions, L.9 and L.19, both of which are withdrawn.

Pollowing agreement on the text of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56, some further changes were proposed to improve the new draft resolution even further. In a spirit of accommodation and flexibility some of them were agreed upon. Those modifications are now reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1.

May I now point out these changes: first, the sixth preambular paragraph has been dropped, as it duplicated the earlier third preambular paragraph; secondly, a minor drafting change has been made in the ninth preambular paragraph, where the following words in the second and third lines - namely, "constitute an important positive contribution" - have been replaced by the expression "contribute positively**; thirdly, a new fifth preambular paragraph has been added. which reads as follows: "Welcoming the progress achieved in recent years in both nuclear and conventional disarmament". These three changes are all reflected in document A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1.

We have consistently expressed deep concern over the threat posed to non-nuclear-weapon States by the nuclear arsenals of nuclear-weapon States. The most effective assurance against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons would be their complete elimination. However, until this objective is achieved the non-nuclear-weapon States must be provided with credible and legally binding guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, Such assurances are necessary to enhance the sense of security in non-nuclear-weapon States. The

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

slow pace of negotiations on nuclear disarmament makes such assurances even more imperative.

The merged text of the draft resolution on this issue reaffirms the urgent need for reaching an agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. It appeals to all States to demonstrate the necessary political will to reach an agreement on a common approach and to move towards the adcption of an international instrument of a legally binding character on this issue of vital importance to the security of non-nuclear-weapon States.

I should like to take this opportunity to thank all those delegations that have played an important and constructive role in helping the delegations of Bulgaria and Pakistan in our common effort to evolve a merged text on the subject.

May I, finally, express the hope that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1, which I have just introduced and which replaces L.9 and L.19, will enjoy the support of the entire membership of this Committee.

I have the honour now to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Regional disarmament", contained in document A/C.1/45/L.51, on behalf of Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, the Central African Republic, Colombia, Comaros, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Djibouti, Egypt, Germany, Guinea, Italy. Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Ueneauela, Zimbabwe and Pakistan.

May I point out a minor typographical error in operative paragraph 3 in the English version of this document, where a comma should be added in the first line after the words **wherever possible".

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

Since its inception the United Nations has provided a focal point for the international community in its efforts to promote the maintenance of international peace and security through disarmament, the peaceful settlement of disputes and general co-operation. From the very beginning, disarmament emerged as a major element in the move towards global security. As the world prepares to enter the next millennium, disarmament stands at the heart of any long-term solution to the problem of international peace and security.

The essential guidelines for progress towards general and complete disarmament were adopted at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Unfortunately, these goals and objectives are still far from being achieved.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

We are however encouraged by the improvement in the international political climate and by the prospects of genuine progress towards general and complete disarmament engendered in recent years as a result of the virtual end of ideological confrontation, and the new spirit of mutual co-operation and understanding between the long-term adversaries.

In the post-cold-war *era*, regional disarmament has assumed increasing importance in the context of global peace and security. We all agree that a global response to disarmament must continue *to* be pursued sincerely. Simultaneously with global efforts, it is imperative that collective endeavours are made by all countries at the regional level to promote disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and confidence-building measures wherever and whenever possible. These measures must of course take into account the specific characteristics of each region, and must be taken with the free agreement of the States concerned.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51 treats these elements together in a comprehensive manner, without singling out any one of them. It therefore transcends any particular point in time or any particular region. It complements the existing global efforts and existing arrangements, *and* in no way undermines any of them.

Regional disarmament is thus an indispensable corollary to the global efforts towards the achievement of the objective of general and complete disarmament. The global and regional approaches to disarmament complement each other and should be pursued simultaneously with a view to promoting regional and international peace and security. The objective of peace and security is so important and compelling that all *efforts*, both global and regional, have to be deployed with a view to achieving that end.

This is the essence of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51. The *draft* resolution, which is the result *of* the collective endeavours of a number of countries

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

representing various regions of the world, is transparent, realistic and forward-looking. It has equal relevance and applicability now and in the future, and for all regions.

It is the expectation of the sponsors that this draft resolution will receive the widest support of this Committee.

Mr. STANKOV (Bulgaria): The Bulgarian delegation has asked to speak in order to announce that it has withdrawn draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.9 entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons**.

We take this opportunity, Sir, to express the belief that the merged texts on this item as contained in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1 is well-balanced and leaves open all possible avenues for making headway on the issue of negative security assurances. Accordingly, we hope that it will receive the support of all delegations.

We wish also to express our gratitude to all delegations with which we have fruitfully co-operated in materializing the overwhelming will expressed in the Committee, namely to rationalize common efforts on this issue.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the following draft resolutions in cluster 7: A/C.1/45/L.1, A/C.1/45/L.18 and A/C.1/45/L.28.

I now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than explanations of their positions on the draft resolutions in cluster 7.

Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation wishes to comment on item 49 of the agenda, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", and item 61, '*Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace".

At the outset I wish to express my delegation's appreciation to the Secretary-General, the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs and three independent consultant experts for preparing a comprehensive study on effective and verifiable measures which would facilitate the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, contained in document *A/45/435.*

My country was pleased to play host on two occasions to the experts and other officials of the Department for Disarmament Affairs who were conducting the study. In the course of their visits, fruitful discussions were held between the officials and experts of our country and the members of the mission. We are of the view that this comprehensive study could serve as a sound basis for promoting future action towards the realization of such a zone. Therefore, it deserves to be examined and carefully considered by all parties concerned. At the same time, one cannot lose sight of the fact that a selective approach towards the content of this study could be destructive and could backfire.

The overall political and military situation in the Middle East in recent years can hardly be compared with that of 1974, when my country initiated *the* proposal *for* the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone owing to the rapid dissemination of nuclear technology in the region.

(Mr. Moradi. Islamic Republic of Iran)

Politically, not only has no progress been made in the settlement of long-standing problems of the region, including the question of the occupation of Palestine by the Zionist regime, the occupation of southern Lebanon and foreign interference in the internal affairs of the region, but also there has been a further deterioration in the situation.

Militarily, on the one hand the most advanced and sophisticated weapons have been put at the disposal of the Zionist **régime** by certain big Powers; on the other hand, the flow of arms to the arsenals of the countries in the region has increased the current state of insecurity and instability in the region.

It is ironic tbat the said Powers are calling for the promotion of peace and security in the Middle East. In short, the problems of this region are becoming more complicated and thus more dangerous.

(Mr. Moradi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

The situation in the Middle East rouses serious doubts with regard to ongoing positive developments in international affairs and as to whether the international community will enter a new era of co-operation and détente. This unfortunate reality is partly due to the fact that such developments have not yet been institutionalised in various areas of international relations. It emanates also from the absence of a collective security arrangement among the Muslim countries in the Middle East. Such a security system, enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, could, as a rule of conduct, harmonize the relations among these States on the basis of common aspirations and mutual interests and could prevent potential threats and conflicts in the region. In this regard, the ideal of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East would contribute enormously to filling the gap caused by the absence of a collective security system.

The realisation of such a zone demands confidence-building measures, which have always been considered as facilitating and complementary to disarmament initiatives. The Islamic Republic of Iran, committed to such measures, has adopted confidence-building measures, some of which are mentioned in document A/45/397, since the very inception of the Islamic revolution. Although the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has been prevented, owing to circumstances beyond its control, from continuing and strengtheaiag such measures, in 1986 it proposed to the Persian Gulf States the establishment of collective security arrangements in the region. In that regard the Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country submitted a letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, contained in document S/18387 of 16 October 1986.

The realizatioa of international peace and security is not feasible without a secure and stable Middle East. There is no doubt that the Security Council in discharging its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations caa play a

(Mr. Moradi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

significant role in establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. The Muslim countries of the region that would lose their security because of the establishment of such a zone deserve the right to be guaranteed unconditionally by nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Another issue closely related to a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East concerns the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, This Declaration - almost two decades have elapsed since its adoption by the General Assembly - demonstrates the will and desire of Governments and nations of the region to create a safe and secure environment conducive to mutual co-operatioa and collaboration. Regrettably, some of the ultra-regional States that consider the creation of such a zone inconsistent with their own interests have resorted to numerous means to prevent the convening of the Colombo Conference for the implementation of that Declaration. My delegation believes that, had the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a toae of Peace been implemented earlier, many of the regional conflicts would have been prevented.

Mr. NEGROTTO CAMBIASO (Italy): On behalf of the European Community and its member States, the Italian delegation wishes to make a statement on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.28, on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 44/104 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco).

The Twelve believe that the Treaty of Tlatelolco continues to represent a particularly important element in the process of preventing a proliferation of nuclear weapons and of promoting peace and security. In this context, the Twelve believe it is inappropriate to continue the practice of singling out oae country while omitting mention of others which have not become full parties to the Treaty.

(Mr. Negrotto Cambiaso, Italy)

The Twelve have expressed support for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world. We consider that the creation of such zones could contribute to stability in the areas concerned, to non-proliferation and to the disarmament process in general, provided that the States concerned are prepared to participate oa the basis of agreements freely entered into and in keeping with iaternationally recognized principles.

In that context, it is our view that the General Assembly may in the future wish to consider enlarging the scope of the pertinent agenda item to read "Implementation of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco) in all its aspects".

The CHAIRMAN: I call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes before a vote is taken on draft resolutions in cluster 7.

Mr. CHADHA (India): The Indian delegation wishes to place on record our views with regard to the draft resolution entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", document A/C.1/45/L.18, introduced by Pakistan.

The position of India on this issue is based on certain principles that form part of our disarmament policy. These are also contained in the consensus Final Document of the first special session of the Genera3 Assembly devoted to disarmament, held in 1978. We have consistently maintained that nuclear disarmament is a global and not a regional issue. Lasting world peace can only be built on the basis of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Within this process nuclear disarmament is accorded the highest priority, and this was accepted by the world community in the 1978 Final Document. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones does not, in our view, accord with the global approach, In the action plan for ushering in a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world order presented in 1988 at the third

(Mr. Chadha, India)

special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament we highlighted the importance of a global approach. Nuclear zoning measures of the kind visualized in resolutions such as that contained in document A/C.1/45/L.18 will not lead us to our common objective of a global nuclear-weapon-free zone.

The global spread of nuclear weapons and their deployment for possible use anywhere in the world renders illusory the notion of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. In addition, studies on the climatic and environmental consequences of a nuclear exchange, including the findings with regard to nuclear winter, have shown that there cannot be a distinction between combatant and non-combatant when nuclear weapons are involved.

(Mr. Chadha, India)

In spite of these reservations, we recognise the fact that nuclear-weapon-free zones hava been established in *other* parts of the world as a result *of* arrangements freely arrived at among the countries of the region. We have therefore participated in the global consensus in favour of these nuclear-weapon-free zones. These arrangements arise out of the shared perception of the States of the region regarding the special features and geographical extent *of the* regioa, and as *a* result of prior consultations carried out to reach a consensus. Only after a consensus is reached can the United Nations play a significant role in endorsing such au agreement.

The proposal contained in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18 does aot *carry* these *qualifications.* Since the proposal is clearly aot introduced in this forum with a view to achieving a regional consensus, it can only be concluded tbat the intent behind the draft resolution is not *serious.*

Draft resolutions such as this, introduced as a ritual and lacking in substantive content and necessary qualifications, run counter to the provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In 1974 we, too, intraduced a draft resolution on this subject. It was adopted by an overwhelming majority, but did not enjoy *a* consensus among the States of the region. We have *therefore* directed our efforts to *coaseasus* building *and* have aot engaged in the ritual submission of draft resolutions. A climate of trust and confidence must be created and consensus must be achieved on overcoming the practical difficulties of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone among the States of the region. This requires patience, perseverance and sincerity, not rhetoric or ritual draft resolutions.

For these reasons, my delegation will *vots* against draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18.

Mr. FERNANDEZ (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, since this is the first time that I have spoken in the First Committee, I wish to associate myself with other speakers who have congratulated you and the other officers on the successful manner in which you have been guiding our deliberations.

Bolivia's legal ties with the prohibition of nuclear weapons is nothing new and is not merely theoretical. It is a confirmation of a humanist conviction that involves repudiation of any form of violence, in particular the dissemination and use of nuclear energy as an instrument of destruction and genocide.

For this reason, my country. together with the rest of the 21 States of Latin America, signed the Treaty of Tlatelolco, joining the general trend in favour of prevention of the manufacture, posession and use of nuclear weapons in the southern hemisphere. It was an expression of our determined support for anything that would prevent war and its most evil expression - the use of atomic energy as a means of extermination.

In the years that have elapsed since the Treaty of Tlatelolco was signed, Bolivia has noted with great pleasure that the major nuclear Powers have become parties to the Treaty. However, we are profoundly concerned by the fact that the signing of the Treaty and its Additional Protocol I has in some cases not been followed by the necessary ratification.

As many delegations sai8 in the course of the general debate, the international community's main objective is, if possible, to prohibit completely the manufacture, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons. Therefore we commend the United Nations for the work it is doing in support of maximum guarantees for State. which neither possess nor wish to possess nuclear weapons but are doomed to suffer the consequences of tests that take place in diatsnt areas; tests which, although

(Mr. Fernandes, Bolivia)

they appear not to carry any risk, could result in atmospheric or climatic changes, such as prolonged flooding or droughts, with grave risks for the civil population.

Unfortunately, the developing countries, which lack sufficient resources to meet even their own most urgent needs, are the most exposed and defenceless in the face of the negative effects of radiation and the consequent environmental pollution.

The delegation of Bolivia views with great interest, and supports, draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.1. L.18 and, in particular, L.28, on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 44/104 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, which at least aims at the establishment regionally of nuclear-weapon-free zones and has as its objective the eradication of the nuclear weapon as a means of warfare.

Mr. NGUYEN DDC HUNG (Viet Nam): My delegation has asked to speak in order to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia".

As has been stated on many occasions by its leaders, Viet Nam supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all parts of the world because it views this as a positive and practical contribution to the attainment of the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament and thus the promotion of peace and stability in the various regions and throughout the world.

In this spirit, my delegation supports the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. At the same time, we deem it important to emphasize that, since the question is of concern to all countries in the region, the draft resolution should reflect the views of the countries concerned sad their consensus opinion.

(Mr. Nauven Duc Hung, Viet Nam)

Regrettably, draft resolution L.18 fails to achieve this. My delegation will therefore abstain on the draft resolution, and expresses the hope that the countries in the region will join together and introduce a consensus draft resolution in the near future.

Mr. TAEB (Afghanistan): The Republic of Afghanistan supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in every corner of the globe. We consider this positive process to be an integral part of general nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Taeb, Afghanistan)

However, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.", my delegation will abstain, as it has done on similar draft resolutions in the past. Our reason for taking such a position was explained in my statement in the Committee on 26 October.

In addition, I should like to make the following comments.

First, the draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia should be the subject, first, of consultations with the countries of the region, in order to reflect the collective view and position of the States directly concerned. We hope that the sponsors will keep that in mind in the future.

Secondly, the draft resolution should not be politically motivated and should address the question taking into consideration all the problems in this respect. We believe that such an approach is necessary if we really want to work constructively towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Thirdly, the sincerity of the main sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18 should be examined in the light of its refusal to accede to a universal agreement on nuclear disarmament, by which I mean the non-proliferation Treaty, and to accept International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. We therefore hope that the main sponsor will accede to the non-proliferation Treaty and accept the IAEA safeguatds. Furthermore, it must give up its attempts to produce nuclear weapons.

Lastly, we ate of the opinion that any linkage with accession to the non-proliferation Treaty is irrelevant,

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions in cluster 7, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

(The Chairman)

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee, on 9 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.1 is Egypt.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsor of the draft resolution has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia." This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18 are the following: Bangladesh and Pakistan.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho. Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Auaiast: Bhutan, India, Mauritius

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Iceland, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Mongolia, Myanmar, Norway, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18 was adopted by 98 votes to 3, with 26 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.28, entitled *'Implementation of General Assembly resolution 44/104 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 27th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors,

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.28 reads as follows: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas. Barbados, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested,

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti. Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamabiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar. Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia. Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Angola, Argentina, Cuba, France

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.28 was adopted by 126 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I call now on representatives who wish to explain *their* votes or positions on draft resolutions in cluster 7,

Mr. GEVERS (Netherlands): I should like to explain the position of the Netherlands on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.1, '"Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

As in previous years, my delegation went along with the consensus on the draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Indeed, the Netherlands fully supports the ambition *of* the States in the region to achieve such a zone.

My delegation listened with great interest and sympathy to the statement pertaining to this matter made by the representative of Egypt in this Committee on 9 November. At the same time, my delegation wishes to underline the fact that the objective of a multilateral agreement on a nuclear-weapon-free zone should be freely negotiated by all States directly concerned.

We believe that this element should have been brought more clearly into focus in draft resolution L.l. This does uot mean, however, that it is not possible in the meantime, to make efforts to ease *the* process leading to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. In fact, the report of the Secretary-General, including the commendable study on effective and verifiable measures that would facilitate the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free tone in the Middle East, shows that States both in and outside the region could take a *number of* steps that would *have* a beneficial, confidence-building effect on the present tensions in the region.

As is recognized in the report, the application of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards to all relevant installations in the region is one of the measures that would facilitate the establishment of a nuclear-weapou-free zone and

(Mr. Gevers, Netherlands)

could make a significant contribution to preventing the further proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Mr. GROOP (Finland): I wish to explain Finland's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free son8 in South Asia".

We voted in favour of the draft resolution because it is the general policy of Finland to support efforts to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones. At the Sam8 time, we consider that initiatives for the establishment of such zones should come from States within the region and that the process of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone should enjoy the support of all States concerned.

Mr. POERNOMO (Indonesia): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free tone in South Asia".

The position of my delegation on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is well known. It is based on the principle contained in the Final Document of the General Assembly's first special session on disarmament, which, among other things, stipulates that the establishment of such a zone should be based on arrangements freely arrived at between the States in the region concerned. As is reflected in the Secretary-General's report (A/45/462) on the subject, this requirement has not so far been fulfilled in respect of South Asia. In view Of this fact my delegation was constrained to abstain in the vote on draft resolution L.18.

Mr. GIEROW (Sweden): Sweden has on several occasions expressed its positive attitude with regard to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Such zones could have confidence-building effects, as well as a positive influence on the political climate and the security situation in the region8 concerned.

(Mr. Gierow, Sweden)

The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone requires that nuclear weapons are not possessed by States in the zone, as well as the absence and non-deployment of nuclear weapons in such States. Another essential element is the commitment by the nuclear-weapon States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against targets within the zone.

As to concrete proposals for such zones, however, one basic prerequisite must be acceptance of, and co-operation with regard to, the zonal initiative by all States in the region. In line with this principle, Sweden had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18, since some States concerned voted against the draft resolution.

Mr. BATIOUK (Ukrainian SSR) (interpretation from Russian): With regard to the draft resolution just adopted, the delegation of the Ukraine wishes to state that the Ukraine has been consistent in its support for the creation of a non-nuclear world. In the declaration of the sovereignty of the Ukraine, which was adopted by the Parliament on 16 July this year, it is stated that the goal of the Ukraine is compliance with non-nuclear principles. Therefore, we support all peoples who wish to free themselves from the nuclear threat, a8 well as the idea that this objective should be achieved through, inter alia, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world, with the participation and agreement of all the States in those regions. We therefore supported the adoption of draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.1 and voted for L.28.

However, in respect of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", my delegation was obliged to abstain in the vote, although we agree with the objectives of the draft resolution. We abstained, first, because there is not full agreement between the States of the region on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Secondly, as we see it,

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukrainian SSR)

the initiators of the proposal to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone there have not yet exhausted all opportunities to reach agreement and adopt a common stand on the issue.

We are sure that, if the States of the region are interested in implementing the positive ideas contained in draft resolution L.18 and if they take the steps necessary to ensure consideration at a future session of the General Assembly of a draft resolution agreed upon by all the countries of the region of South Asia, such a draft resolution will receive support in the General Assembly. Certainly the delegation of the Ukraine will support it.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's vote on the three draft resolutions the Committee has just adopted. Japan participated in the adoption without a vote of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.1, and voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.18 and L.28.

It has always been the view of the Japanese Government that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, in southern Africa, in Latin America or in any other region for that matter, would contribute to the objective of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as well as to the peace and security of the region in question.

My delegation, however, wishes to reiterate its view that the establishment of such a zone would not contribute to the strengthening of the security of the region in question unless certain conditions were met. Let me enumerate some of the most basic of those conditions: the establishment of such a nuclear-weapon-free zone should be agreed upon at the initiative of the countries in the region, and with the voluntary consent of all the countries concerned, including the nuclear-weapon States, as the case may be; also, a nuclear-weapon-free zone should be established in such a way that it would not only strengthen the peace and security of the region, but also of the world as a whole. Furthermore, adherence to the non-proliferation Treaty by all the countries of the region in question would be highly desirable in creating such a zone.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): I have two explanations of vote to make. The first concerns draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18.

The United States delegation this year again joined in supporting the traditional resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-frse zone in South Asia. I have two brief points in explanation of this vote. First, we trust that all States in the region will take particular note of paragraph 2, which urges them to refrain from any action contrary to the objective of the draft resolution.

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

Secondly, our delegation also wishes to note that the reference in the third preambular paragraph to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other regions of the world does not constitute endorsement by the United States of such zones on a universal basis. For us there are specific criteria which any proposed nuclear-weapon-free zone must meet in order to be recommended.

The second explanation concerns draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.28. Our delegation's vote on this draft resolution was in favour only because of the United States unwavering support for the Treaty of Tlatelolco. The draft resolution itself is seriously unbalanced, and it contains glaring shortcomings. We deeply regret that this draft resolution focuses only on Additional Protocol I and not on the issue of universal adherence by all eligible States. The draft resolution is consequently patently one-aided. It singles out one State for criticism rather than calling, as it should, on other eligible States in the region to become parties. Only when the Treaty of Tlatelolco together with its Protocols enters into force for all eligible States can it make its full contribution to regional and international security,

In sum, it is our considered view that this pioneering Treaty deserves a better resolution than this one.

Mr. JANDL (Austria) (interpretation from French): Austria abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. My delegation would like to emphasize that in general it supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, since such zones can make a valuable contribution to the maintenance of international peace and the reduction of international tensions, above all in the light of interaction between disarmament efforts at the regional and the global lavela.

However, my delegation believes that all the States of a particular region or subregion should first adhere to the idea of establishing a nuclear-weapon-frss

(Mr. Jandl, Austria)

zone in that region or subregion. Austria therefore believes that it is timely to propose the establishment of such a zone within the framework of a General Assembly resolution only when all the States of the region have given their agreement. The States of the region in question here have expressed reservations concerning the draft resolution, and Austria therefore decided to abstain.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51, which is listed in cluster 8. As there have been no requests to make statements on this cluster, I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. CHADHA (India): India fully supports proposals put forward in the First Committee for regional conventional disarmament and on confidence-building measures. Indeed we have joined in sponsoring draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.36 and L.44 on these subjects.

Unfortunately, draft resolutioh A/C.1/45/L.51 does not fall into the same category. This draft resolution combines unrelated approaches within the ambit of regional disarmament and thereby distorts the *focus* and undermines the simple objectives of the other resolutions on the subject. It introduces flawed perceptions about regional and even subregional non-proliferation. Such a text discards a consensus approach in favour of polemics. India will therefore abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

Mr. GROOP (Finland): I wish to explain the position of the delegation of Finland on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51, entitled "Regional disarmament".

In Finland's view, global and cegiooal disarmament efforts complement each other. The increasing attention devoted to the regional approach is welcome within the overall context of disarmament and international security.

(Mr. Groop, Finland)

The nuclear non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) has the widest adherence of all existing multilateral disarmament agreements. In Finland's view there is no better Treaty in signt. Finland considers that universal adherence to the NPT continues to be the best way to secure nuclear non-proliferation in all regions of the world.

It is in this light that Finland sees the reference to possible regional nuclear non-proliferation agreements in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51. Regional arrangements are complementary to and not a substitute for the existing global régime. We are pleased to note that this point was also stressed by the sponsors of the draft resolution in their introductory statement. With these considerations in mind, Finland will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51.

Mr. RASAPUTRAM (Sri Lanka): Regional disarmament is an important building-block in the field of total disarmament. Given its general nature, draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51 touches upon the subjects that have been discussed and on which some treaties have already been signed. Tensions have developed in the past and are likely to develop in the future unless steps are taken by all concerned to strengthen the commitments to provide greater confidence for both regional and international security.

Sri Lanka would even have sponsored this draft resolution, had there been reference only to regional matters rather than to subregional matters as well, We feel that reference to subregions might lead to narrow definitions of *geographical* subregions.

My delegation feels that the draft resolution provides a basis for the continuation of efforts for the achievement of total disarmament, global peace and the security of all nations. We *are* therefore happy to support it.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51, entitled "General and complete disarmament", subtitled "Regional disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 35th meeting of the First Committee on 13 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51 is as follows: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Barbados, Canada, the Central African Republic, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Germany, Guinea, Italy, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Nepal. New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela and Zimbabwe.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso; Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya. Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, 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, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Aaainst: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Bhutan, Brazil, Cuba. Ethiopia, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51 was adopted by 120 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

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

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): I wish to explain very briefly Japan's position on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51, which has just been adopted, as well as on draft resolutioa A/C.1/45/L.44, which was adopted yesterday.

Japan supported both draft resolutions. I will not repeat here what I said when we adopted draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.36 and A/C.1/45/L.37 last week. I just wish to stress again the fundamental importance of taking fully into account the specific characteristics of the region when considering regional disarmament issues. In this connection, we highly appreciate the realistic approach referred to in the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.44.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51, on which we have just taken a decision, and in addition refer to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.44, which was adopted yesterday.

There is no doubt that the subject of regional disarmament is one of particular importance and relevance. This is clearly reflected in the number of draft resolutions on this subject that have been introduced in the Committee this year . The delegation of Argentina has supported all of them, for, like draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.51 and A/C.1/45/L.44, they present the matter with the proper balance.

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Araentina)

Regrettably, however, this is not the case with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51, on which we have just had to abstain. We would have preferred to see this draft resolution take a broader approach and not a selective one with regard to regional disarmament. In such a subject we cannot pursue only partial goals or ignore other efforts such as unilateral initiatives and bilateral and multilateral negotiations. Neither do we believe that one can be selective as to the weapons covered in regional treaties and ignore the inclusion of certain types of weapons of mass destruction.

We hope that by giving greater thought to the subject and to the text of the draft resolution it will be possible to find a better balance that in future will be satisfactory to all.

Mr. RIVERO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): The draft resolution (A/C.1/45/L.51) on regional disarmament that has just been adopted contains many ideas which in our opinion are important, such as the link between regional disarmament and global disarmament and the need to bear in mind the guidelines adopted at the tenth special session of the General Assembly, which was devoted to disarmament, as a step towards general and complete disarmament. In the preamble to the draft resolution, reference is made to the desire for peace, the elimination of the danger of war and the release of economic and human resources now used for military purposes and their redirection to and the development of the peoples of the third world in particular. However, in none of the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution, which formulate specific action, is reference made to the fact that confidence-building and disarmament measures need to be the result of efforts in the region and should enjoy the support of all.

A matter which, in the view of my delegation, seems important, is that the text does not say that extraregional Powers must contribute to the establishment of clear equality, respect and confidence, which would permit the adoption of disarmament measures. Nor does it say that the nuclear Powers and extraregional Powers must assume responsibility and make a commitment with regard to confidence-building and disarmament measures that may be adopted.

Every region has its own characteristics and peculiarities. Disarmament can only be carried out in a climate of confidence, in a climate of full respect, one in which there are no practices such as the use of force or interference in the internal affairs of States, on military, economic or political acts of aggression. The presence of foreign military bases, especially when they exist against the will of the people and Government, certainly does not contribute to regional disarmament.

(Mr. Rivero, Cuba)

These matters, among others, constitute the basis on which international relations must develop and the same applies to disarmament. These questions are not dealt with concretely in the draft resolution, and for that reason my delegation had to abstain in the voting on it.

Mr. GAJDA (Hungary): Very briefly, the Hungarian delegation wishes to state for the record that the positive vote which it has just cast was based on the very same considerations as those that were explained in detail by the representative of Finland before the vote was taken.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now move on to cluster 9, to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1. As there has been no request to make a statement or to explain a vote before the voting on this text, we shall proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1, entitled **Science and technology for disarmament". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 25th meeting of the First Committee, on 5 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1 are as follows: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Mali, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Spain, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Venezuela.

I should like also to make a statement on behalf of the Secretary-General with regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1, entitled "Science and technology for disarmament*'. By the terms of operative paragraph 4 of that draft resolution the General Assembly would recommend that the United Nations

(Mr. Kheradi)

should give appropriate attention to the collection and dissemination of information on scientific and technological developments in the fields of verification and of compliance, by parties, with agreements on arms control and disarmament, application of technologies for improved means of verification and for weapons disposal. In carrying out this task the Secretary-General would take such actions as are practicable within the existing resources of the Department for Disarmament Affairs and therefore there would be no additional programme budget implications for the biennium 1990-1991.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None

The draft resolution was adopted by 132 votes to none.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of the United States for an explanation of vote.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): The United States delegation has asked to speak in order to explain its decision to join the broad consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1, entitled "Science and technology for disarmament*'. My delegation is grateful to the sponsors of this draft resolution for casting it in terms that, in contrast to those of a resolution on the same topic last year, placed the subject in a more realistic and therefore generally more acceptable context.

While the United States delegation was pleased to join in the adoption of this draft resolution, at the same time we wish to outline certain United States -understandings which underlie our approach to it. First, the detailed issues related to verification and compliance with any arms control agreement are matters for the parties to such agreements.' Consequently, the international activities and co-operation called for in the resolution must be based on voluntary participation or specific arrangements agreed between the interested States.

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

The relevance, effectiveness and utilization of any technology for arms control purposes can be determined only by the States directly involved in the specific agreements. This applies equally to conversion.

Secondly, United Nations assistance in the collection and dissemination of information on scientific and technological developments related to arms control and disarmament should be guided by similar considerations; in particular, a vote for such assistance is not an endorsement of a generic role for the United Nations in verification procedures or implementation.

Thirdly, the United States also understands that this draft resolution does not contemplate or endorse any new financial obiigations for the United Nations and in that regard notes with pleasure the statement that was just read out by the Secretary of the Committee on behalf of the Secretary-General.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded the consideration of and action on the draft resolutions in clusters 7, 8 and 9 for this morning's meeting. I am well aware of the intensive consultations taking place among the delegations concerned on various draft resolutions. To allow a little more time for consultations, I propose that we keep this afternoon free. In taking stock of the situation so far, I am in a position, first of all, to say that the Committee has accomplished solid work by adopting some 25 draft resolutions.

However, the mathematics of the situation are such that we still have some 29 draft resolutions and a considerable amount of consultations on some of them with three days left for us to conclude our work on the disarmament agenda items. Accordingly, I tppeal to all delegations kindly to expedite their efforts with a view to concluding their consultations in a timely fashion, In this way we will ensure that our work will be completed within the allotted time frame,

The next meeting of the First Committee will take place tomorrow morning at 111.30 a.m., when we shall take up draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.40 in cluster 4;

(The Chairman)

L.43 in cluster 5; L.56/Rev.1 in cluster 6: and L.21/Rev.1, L.46 and L.52 in cluster 10. We shall skip those in cluster 11 and move on to draft resolutions L.8, L.17, L.26 and L.32 in cluster 12.

The meeting rose at 1.15 P.m.