

UNITED NATIONS
General Assembly
FORTY-FIFTH SESSION
Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
36th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 14 November 1990
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 36th MEETING

Chairman:

Mr. **RANA**

(Nepal)

CONTENTS

Consideration of and action on all disarmament agenda items (continued)

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/45/PV.36
15 November 1990
ENGLISH

The meetina was called to order at 11.20 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 45 TO 66 AND 155 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will first proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions **A/C.1/45/L.40**, listed in cluster 4; **A/C.1/45/L.43**, listed in cluster 5; and **A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1**, listed in cluster 6. Subsequently, the Committee will proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions **A/C.1/45/L.21/Rev.1**, **A/C.1/45/L.46** and **A/C.1/45/L.52**, which are listed in cluster 10, and then on draft resolutions **A/C.1/45/L.8**, **A/C.1/45/L.17**, **A/C.1/45/L.26** and **A/C.1/45/L.32**, which are listed in cluster 12.

First, I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that Cyprus has become a sponsor of the following draft resolutions: **A/C.1/45/L.21**; **A/C.1/45/L.31**; and **A/C.1/45/L.52**.

The CHAIRMAN: As there are no requests to introduce any of the draft resolutions, the Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.40**, listed in cluster 4.

Since no delegation wishes to make a statement other than an explanation of vote or to explain its vote before the voting on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.40**, the Committee will now proceed to vote on the draft resolution.

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

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The draft resolution is sponsored by Sierra Leone on behalf of the members of the African Group of States.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.40**, entitled "General and complete disarmament: prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes". It was introduced by the Representative of Sierra Leone, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the African Group of States, at the 27th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1990.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.40** was adopted by 117 votes to none, with 9 abstentions,*

* Subsequently the delegations of Papua New Guinea and Sierra Leone advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in **favour**.

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

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): For a number of years, the First Committee has been called upon to take action on a draft resolution pertaining to the issue of a "prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes**.

On behalf of the delegation of the Netherlands, I would like once again to state clearly and unequivocally in this forum that indeed we do **sympathize** strongly with the concerns which led the sponsors of this draft resolution to the initiative they have taken, It is a subject which should interest all delegations since proper care for the environment is increasingly becoming a priority for our Governments, Inasmuch as this subject is being dealt with in the **United Nations**, it should get due attention in the proper forum,, that is, in the Second Committee, not the First.

Last year, quite a few delegations, including **my** own delegation, worked together constructively in drawing up resolution **44/116 R**. In the same spirit, we have attempted, in close co-operation with **some** other delegations, to introduce a number of improvements in draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.40**.

These efforts were made in a positive spirit in order to bring the draft up to date. We find it odd, for example, that draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.40** refers to a 1989 resolution of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) instead of the more recent IAEA resolution 530 of 21 September 1990, which established by consensus a code of practice on the international transboundary **movement** of radioactive wastes. **IAEA** resolution 530 was an African initiative. So why ignore in New York the practical progress made in Vienna?

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

I shall refrain from citing other examples which **could** have brought the text of draft resolution **L.40** more in line with carefully worded **language** arrived at in the IAEA and in the Conference on Disarmament. We deeply regret that none of the proposed amendments proved acceptable to our African friends, especially since, in most cases, they concerned language which **was** the result of negotiations on the basis of African initiatives. We can therefore not support draft resolution **L.40**.

We sincerely hope that in the future a greater sense of accommodation will be shown.

Miss SOLESBY (United **Kingdom**): The United Kingdom fully endorses the points made by our colleague from the Netherlands concerning draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.40** on the "**Prohibition** of the dumping of radioactive wastes".

We share the strong sympathy he expressed for the concerns which led the sponsors of the draft to the initiative they have taken as well as the concerns he has voiced.

We have one additional concern about the title of the draft resolution and the agenda item as it appears in operative paragraph 7. For the United Kingdom there can be no question of a prohibition of the disposal of radioactive wastes. Such a prohibition would logically entail a prohibition of all uses of nuclear energy, including peaceful **uses**.

We understand that this was not the intention **of** the authors in using the phrase "dumping of radioactive **wastes**", and we continue to interpret the phrase in the sense of "**any** use of nuclear waste which would constitute radiological warfare". This is the formulation found in the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. The United Kingdom asks our African colleagues to consider this linguistic problem in the future.

Mr. RITTER von WAGNER (Germany): While associating itself with the points made by the representatives of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, Germany wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.40**, "Prohibition of dumping of radioactive wastes".

Germany understands the potential problems raised by African countries in the draft resolution. The German Government is fully aware that irresponsible disposal of radioactive wastes can cause serious problems, and it is willing and ready to co-operate in solving such problems should they arise.

Nevertheless, the German delegation had to abstain in the vote. We did so for the same reasons as already pointed by the representatives of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

Additionally, we would like to draw the Committee's attention to the following **points**. First, precisely because of the ambiguity of the term "dumping" to which the British representative has alluded, the Conference on Disarmament in its consideration as well as in its report - to which the draft resolution refers - avoids the term "dumping". Therefore, preambular paragraph 7 and operative paragraph 1, which use the term "dumping", are misleading. Secondly, in preambular paragraph 5 and in operative paragraph 2 the draft resolution seems to point to the possibility of nuclear waste being used for radiological warfare. It is **my** Government's opinion that such a possibility is far-fetched and rather unrealistic. Thirdly, operative paragraph 4 gives rise to the assumption that "deliberate employment **of** nuclear wastes to cause destruction" in fact has already taken place or is imminent. In such **a** case, **Germany** would advocate much **more severe** action than just adopting a resolution. **Xf**, however, proof of such a deliberate employment cannot be established mention **of** it in this way **may** lead to misunderstandings which Germany wishes to avoid,

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

Let me conclude by confirming that **Germany** will support the supposed aims of draft resolution **L.40** in the appropriate forum and in the appropriate context at any time.

Mrs. LETTS (Australia): **My** delegation voted in favour of draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.40**, on the "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes", We did so because of our overall sympathy for the main thrust of the draft resolution, which draws attention to and **expresses** legitimate **concerns** about the potential hazards underlying any use of nuclear waste which would constitute radiological warfare and its implications for regional and international security.

However, we would not wish our positive vote to indicate unqualified agreement to all the terms of **L.40**. We have **some** concerns about the appropriate venue and **organization** for consideration of a legally binding instrument which needs to take into account the various competencies and ongoing **work** of the Conference on Disarmament, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the International Maritime **Organization**.

In the case of sea dumping, for example, the appropriate **organization** is, of course, the International Maritime Organization, which is responsible for **the** London Dumping Convention and which receives **some** technical advice from the **IAEA**.

The question of the prohibition of all radiological waste dumping at sea involving also a comparison between sea **and** land disposal is, in fact, currently being examined by a subsidiary body established by the London Dumping Convention consultative parties which may lead to a legally binding global prohibition on the sea dumping **of** all radioactive waste.

As far as land disposal of radioactive wastes is concerned, this is indeed the responsibility of the IAEA. However, we would prefer not to pass judgement one way or the other on the **IAEA's** work on this matter until we have a better idea of **what**

(Mrs. Letts, Australia)

is intended. At this stage, we are not in a position to judge which recommendations directed at which organisation might be appropriate.

We would also not wish our positive vote for the draft resolution to indicate Australian opposition to land disposal of radioactive waste as such which, at this stage, is the only possible alternative for storing such waste. We affirm, however, our unqualified opposition to the dumping of nuclear waste by any State or organization which would constitute radiological warfare and have great implications for the national security of all States.

Mr. AMIGUES (France) (interpretation from French): o n o f France abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.40, on the "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive waste", for the following reasons.

First, as we have repeatedly stressed, France continues to believe that the question of the dumping of radioactive waste is not in itself within the competence of the First Committee but, rather, that of the Second Committee. Secondly, the draft resolution refers, in its preamble, to resolution 44/116 R, in the vote on which France abstained.

(Mr. Amigues, France)

Thirdly, in the **preambular** part of the draft resolution there is mention of resolution GC **(XXXIII)/RES/509**, adopted in 1999 by the General Conference of **the** International Atomic Energy Agency, but there is **no** mention of resolution **530**, of 1990, **which** established a code of conduct on the international **transfer** of radioactive wastes.

Fourthly, draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.40** does not reflect the **progress** made at the Conference on **Disarmament in** defining the scope of a convention banning radiological weapons. As **is** stated in the 1990 report of the Conference on **Disarmament**, such a convention would prohibit the deliberate dissemination of any radioactive **matter**, including radioactive wastes, with the aim of causing injury, death, **damage** or destruction through radiation directly or **indirectly** produced by the disintegration of that matter. It is clear, **therefore**, that **not** all **dumping** of radioactive wastes can **a priori** be attributed to radiological weapons.

Finally, France believes that it is for the **International Atomic Energy** Agency (IAEA) and its States *members* to decide whether the code of conduct in that area **already** drafted should be replaced by a legally binding instrument.

Mr. HOULLEZ (Belgium) (interpretation from **French**): My delegation abstained on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.40** for the reasons given by the delegations of the **Netherlands**, the United **Kingdom and** Germany, but chiefly because we believe that this matter should be dealt **with** in the **existing** competent

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN: The committee will now turn to draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.43**, in cluster 5.

I call on **the** representative of Canada, **who** will **introduce** the draft resolution.

Ms. MASON (Canada): Canada is once again introducing the draft resolution entitled "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes", which this year is contained in document **A/C.1/45/L.43**, dated 31 October **1990**. It is sponsored by Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Botswana, the **Byelorussian** Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Romania, Samoa, Sweden, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay and Canada - a group which, once again, is drawn from every continent and every group of countries.

It is our view that this draft resolution makes an important statement. It is a reminder that there are several differing paths that need to be followed in our shared pursuit of a nuclear-weapon-free world. A comprehensive test ban will certainly contribute to the attainment of that end, but even the total cessation of nuclear testing can be no guarantee in itself that the manufacturing and updating of **nuclear** weapons could not continue. Thus, a ban on the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes constitutes another important element in **any** progress towards nuclear disarmament. The objective of this draft resolution, therefore, is to complement the nuclear-test-ban approach.

We believe that this is a realistic draft resolution, because it takes the position that progress towards the achievement of a ban on production is related to progress towards the realisation of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban.

In conclusion, I urge all delegations to give their support to this draft **resolution, which** the sponsors sincerely hope will continue to attract strong and broad support.

Mr. NEGROTTO CAMBIASO (Italy): In expressing its positive attitude to draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.43**, "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes", the delegation of Italy wishes to make a specific statement concerning the fourth paragraph, which deals with the progressive conversion and transfer of stocks of fissionable material to peaceful uses.

Italy is convinced that the cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes would be a very important step in the process of nuclear disarmament and that the efforts deployed to reach that goal will have to stretch over **some** time in order to take into consideration all aspects of the problem. In this **context** Italy believes that due consideration should **be given** to evaluation of the possibility of converting fissionable material to peaceful uses.

My delegation would like to recall that **some** studies on this subject promoted by an important group of scientists and experts are under way in Italy. Those **studies** have already produced **some** preliminary conclusions, prompting the Government of Italy to circulate them in Geneva at the Fourth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, as **document NPT/Con.IV/29**. On that occasion Commission I of the Conference approved by consensus a paragraph of its draft report to the Conference by which an appeal was addressed

"to nuclear-weapon States to find ways to convert the peaceful uses for the material released from dismantled nuclear warheads as a consequence of nuclear arms negotiations".

As **we** all know, **the** Conference, unfortunately, could not agree on a final **document**.

(Mr. Negrotto Cambiaso, Italy)

We should also like to stress in this forum a further aspect **of** the proposal which was given favourable consideration in Geneva at the Fourth Review Conference: the hope that if at least some **of the resources** made available by placing on **the** market the surplus fissionable materials were set aside that would, above all, satisfy the call for solidarity, the need for which is felt especially **keenly** in the current **economic** situation of the world.

As I have mentioned, these studies are still continuing. I should **like** to inform the Committee that the Italian organization that promoted them has expressed its willingness to share and discuss with interested parties its conclusions on this **very** complex issue.

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.43**.

I call on **the** representative of India who wishes to explain his vote **before** the voting.

Mr. CHADHA (India): My delegation is constrained to abstain on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.43**, entitled "Prohibition of **the** production of fissionable material **for** weapons purposes'".

The Final Document adopted by consensus in 1978 at the first special session devoted to disarmament clearly sets out the stages for the process of nuclear disarmament in paragraph 50, subparagraph (b) of which reads:

"Cessation of **the** production of all types of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, and of **the** production of fissionable material **for** weapons **purposes**". (resolution S-10/2)

The intent behind the draft resolution is laudable. However, such a partial approach as is represented by the draft resolution in question is not in conformity with the Final Document, which correctly views the issue in its totality. In our **view** there should be a simultaneous stoppage in the production of nuclear weapons and all fissionable material for weapons purposes. Only by such a total approach can **we** introduce a **universal**, equitable and non-discriminatory **system** of international safeguards on all nuclear facilities.

We believe draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.33** on this subject correctly reflects the goals set out in the Final Document.

The CHAIRMAN will now proceed to vote on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.43**, entitled "**Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes". This draft resolution has been introduced this morning by the representative of Canada.

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.43** reads as follows: Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Botswana, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, **the** Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Romania, Samoa, Sweden, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, 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, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, **Côte d'Ivoire**, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, **Greece**, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, 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, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, **Myanmar**, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, **Viet** Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: France

Abstaining: Argentina, China, India, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States *of* America

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.43 was adopted by 125 votes to 1 with 5 abstentions.*

* Subsequently the representative **of** Papua New Guinea advised the Secretariat that he had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN!: I call on the representative of Brazil, who wishes to explain his vote.

Mr. DA COSTA e SILVA (Brazil): Brazil voted in favour of draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.43** because we believe that an adequately verified cessation and prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes would be an important measure leading to the cessation of the qualitative and quantitative nuclear-arms race. It is our view that the final objective to be pursued by this and other measures in the area of nuclear disarmament is a universal and non-discriminatory system for the cessation of the production of nuclear **weapons**, and their prohibition and complete elimination.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now move on to draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1**, in cluster 6.

Mr. ADANK (New Zealand): New Zealand is pleased to associate itself with other States in sponsoring draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1**, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

Following the adoption of two resolutions on the subject at the forty-fourth session, we urged the sponsors of both resolutions to examine closely the merits of drafting a single text for the forty-fifth session. We saw such a move as being consistent with the objective which I think we all share of rationalising the work of the Committee. We also thought that a single text would give us the opportunity to speak for the first time with one voice on the important subject of negative security assurances.

We are pleased to see that our hope for a single text has now been realised in draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1**, which was introduced yesterday by the representative of Pakistan.

(Mr. Adank, New Zealand)

The main sponsors of draft resolutions **A/C.1/45/L.9** and **L.19**, Bulgaria and **Pakistan**, should be commended for the spirit of compromise and the flexibility they have demonstrated in undertaking the task of merging the two texts.' Clearly, in approaching this exercise a good deal of attention has been paid to accommodating the broad range of views which exist on the topic of negative security assurances in order to ensure the broadest possible support.

A number of elements in the new text should be noted. **In** particular, we welcome the new reference in the preambular part to the progress now being made in **nuclear** and conventional disarmament. We also wish to draw attention in particular to the preambular paragraph by which the Assembly would take note of the unilateral negative security assurance declarations already provided by the nuclear-weapon States.

The most important feature of the new merged draft is that it does not prejudge the work of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament on negative security assurances. For this reason, we think it provides a sound basis for the Conference's continued discussions on this subject, particularly with regard to pursuing the **search** for a common formula or approach.

One final but important aspect of the new draft **resolution** is the inclusion of a preambular paragraph which notes the greater willingness which is now evident to **overcome** difficulties **encountered** on this **subject** in **past** years,

(Mr. Adank, New Zealand)

We think that the constructive discussions on negative **security assurances at** the recent **NPT** Review Conference provide a clear indication of **the better climate** now prevailing for discussions on this issue. As **we** noted in our general **debate** statement in the **First Committee some** weeks ago, it was New Zealand's **hope** that this better climate would manifest itself in a single text which could **command the overwhelming** support of delegations within the First **Committee** at this **session of** the General Assembly.

We would hop8 in particular that all States which share concerns over rationalisation of the **work** in the First Committee would demonstrate that **commitment** by supporting this draft resolution, which represents the **clearest** manifestation of the willingness of sponsors of important parallel draft resolutions to **merge** them in a forward-looking approach.

The CICommittee will now proceed to vote on draft **resolution A.C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1**, entitled "Conclusion of effective **international arrangements** to assure non-nuclear-weapon-States against **the** use or threat of **use** of nuclear-weapons". This draft resolutioa was introduced by the **representative** of Pakistan at the thirty-fifth meeting of **the** First Committee, **on 13 November1990**.

I call on the **Secretary Of the Committee** to read **outthe list** of **sponsors**.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the **Committee**): Draft **resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1** has the following **sponsors**: Australia, Bangladesh, **Bulgaria**, **Islamic** Republic of Iran, Madagascar, **Nepal**, New Zealand, Pakistan, **Samoa** and Sri Lanka.

The CHAIRMAN: draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1** to **the** vote . . recorded **vote** has **been requested**.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, **Côte d'Ivoire**, Cuba, 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 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, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1 was adopted by 130 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

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

Mr. DA COSTA e SILVA (Brazil): Brazil voted in favour of draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1** in recognition of the efforts of the sponsors to arrive at a common text, merging the text of draft resolutions **A/C.1/45/L.9** and **A/C.1/45/L.19**. We hope that this positive development will give the necessary impetus to the Conference on Disarmament in carrying out negotiations on the question of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against **the** use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, pending effective measures of nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Da Costa e Silva, Brazil)

It is the view of my delegation that the most effective guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. Since nuclear weapons are weapons of mass destruction, the non-nuclear-weapon States should be given unconditional and legally binding assurances, on a non-discriminatory basis, against the **use** or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Brazil also believes that there is a need to establish effective measures of verification on the compliance of nuclear-weapon States with these guarantees in the instruments related to the creation and implementation of nuclear-weapon-free zones, in order to maintain a balance between the nuclear Powers and the non-nuclear-weapon States members of such zones.

Mr. AZIKIWE (Nigeria): I should like to explain Nigeria's vote on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1** entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

Over the years, Nigeria has been making consistent efforts at various multilateral disarmament forums for the realization of the objectives of the draft resolution. Nigeria has made substantive proposals aimed at finding a realistic solution to the question at the Conference on Disarmament.

Nigeria has always been opposed to pursuing the question in a way likely to undermine existing disarmament instruments, such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and imperil the non-proliferation **régime**. Nigeria would like to recall that the concept of negative security assurances **was** born in the mid-1960s during the negotiations of the **NPT**, when the non-aligned and non-nuclear-weapon States sought assurances that the renunciation **of the nuclear**

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

option would not place them at permanent military disadvantage and make them vulnerable to nuclear intimidation in the nuclear era.

Negative security assurances are not an end in themselves but a means to an end. It should therefore not be pursued in total exclusion **from** its ultimate objective **of** nuclear disarmament.

It is within the context of the foregoing that Nigeria would like to **express** reservations on some provisions of the draft resolution. Nigeria would like to reiterate that voting in favour of the draft resolution does not signify consensus on the question of common formula or **common** approach. Nigeria will not join in **consensus** for the consideration of this question at any disarmament forum on the basis of common formula.

Nigeria believes that after 12 years of consideration of this question at the Conference on Disarmament, with&t any positive result, a more realistic approach, one that would take into consideration the reality **of** the security situation of the present day and the sacrifices made by the non-nuclear-weapon States in the interest of humanity, should be adopted. Unless the sacrifices made by the non-aligned non-nuclear-weapon States are recognised and appreciated, negative security assurances may remain unattainable.

Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom): I should like to explain the United Kingdom's vote on a draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1**.

The United Kingdom wishes to negotiate in good faith at the Conference on Disarmament, but feels **that** the search for an international agreement on this subject still looks to be very difficult. The text as drafted seems to us, therefore, to go too far towards prescribing a solution.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 10: **A/C.1/45/L.21/Rev.1**, L.46 and L.52.

Mr. HOULLEZ (Belgium) (interpretation **from French**): My delegation has already stated, during the general debate, that we deplore the fact that the results of the negotiations in Geneva at the last session of the Conference on Disarmament were rather disappointing, apart from some progress on technical details. We attribute those disappointing results to several factors: first, the fact that basic problems necessarily arise at the end of negotiations; secondly, a general worsening of the climate of confidence because of the recent threats **by one** State to use chemical weapons; thirdly, the persistence of proliferation; **and, fourthly**, the absence of a political momentum similar to that given by the Paris Conference to achieve quickly a convention on the total, final, **universal** prohibition of chemical weapons and their use.

We hope that the impetus given by the commitment of the **United States** and the Soviet **Union** to cease all production and start destroying chemical weapons will be followed by other initiatives, so that negotiations may be resumed **in** the necessary conditions of trust, transparency and goodwill.

We are **convinced** that this was also the desire of the sponsor8 of **the three** draft resolutions in cluster 10 on chemical and bacteriological **weapons**, and that their goal is also to improve the **chances** of achieving a universal **convention as** soon as **possible, while** strengthening the commitment to the **1925 Geneva** Protocol,

(Mr. Houlliez, Belgium)

in order to lessen, by the combined action of the Secretary-General and the Security Council, the risks of the use or threat of use of chemical weapons.

General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus **can** make an important contribution if they have substance and therefore send a clear, substantive, unambiguous message. The efforts to achieve a combination of those qualities were real and commendable, and we hope that the energy expended with such generosity will be acknowledged by acceptance of the draft resolutions without a vote and also on the resumption of negotiations in Geneva. As I have said, this will depend on the extent to which the draft resolutions help to increase confidence and transparency.

My country, **which** has declared publicly and solemnly that it wants to be among **the** original signatories to the future convention, is happy that draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.21/Rev.1** notes with appreciation the increasing **number** of States that have declared that same intention, and stresses the particular importance of declarations by States whether they possess chemical weapons. My delegation welcomes the emphasis on the declarations, which will create confidence. **At the same time**, we regret that it has not been possible to extend consensus to active formulations and that there is not a **more** resolute looking to the future, with specific commitments that would **remove** all ambiguity about the real desire of all countries to work positively and specifically to eliminate and ban chemical weapons.

My delegation can understand **some** of the arguments advanced, but it regards them as **an** insufficient basis for refusing clarification, particularly with regard to declarations on possession, which are neither speculation about the future nor a **legal commitment** but a statement **of fact** accompanied by the political will to put an end to **these weapons**.

(Mr. Houlliez, Belgium)

We know that the road to disarmament is long and demands much patience, but I repeat that in particular it requires mutual confidence. We hope that the will to achieve it will become apparent in the near future. Otherwise, we shall have the unbearable responsibility of again seeing terrible pictures of the victims of **chemical** weapons.

Mr. MORRIS (Australia): On 12 November my delegation introduced draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.52**, entitled "**Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol". We wish to reaffirm that its central purpose is to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of **Asphyxiating**, Poisonous or **Other** Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare.

As my delegation said on 12 November, the most definitive and effective way to ensure that such weapons are not used again is through the conclusion of a global and comprehensive chemical weapons convention. Accordingly, we reaffirm **that** we attach the utmost importance to the earliest conclusion in the Conference on Disarmament of a global and comprehensive chemical weapons convention.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.21/Rev.1**, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". **This** draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Poland at the 34th meeting of the First Committee, on 12 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.21/Rev.1** are the followingr Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, **Brazil**, Bulgaria, the **Byelorussian** Soviet

JP/j1

A/C.1/45/PV.36

29 - 30

(Mr. Kheradi)

Socialist Republic, Canada, Costa Rica, Cyprus, **Czechoslovakia**, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece. Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, **Myanmar**, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Turkey, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet **Socialist Republics**, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and **Viet** Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.21/Rev.1** have requested that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee 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.1/45/L.21/Rev.1** was **adopted**.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.46**, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction and preparations for the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Austria at the 25th meeting of the First Committee, held on 5 November 1990.

Associated with this draft resolution is an oral **statement** by the Secretariat.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. **KHERADI** (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.46** are the following: Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, the **Byelorussian** SSR, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, **Czechoslovakia**, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, **Mexico**, Mongolia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname. Sweden, Togo, Turkey, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR, the United Kingdom, the United States, Uruguay, **Venezuela**, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

I shall now **read** out, on behalf of the Secretariat, the oral statement to which the Chairman referred,

(Mr. Kheradi)

"By the draft resolution contained in document **A/C.1/45/L.46**, entitled *Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the **Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction and preparations for the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention**', the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services as may be required for the Third Review Conference and its preparation. It should be noted that the Conference will be a conference of States parties to the Convention. Other conferences of multilateral disarmament treaties - for example, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the sea-bed Treaty and the Amendment Conference of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water - included in their rules of procedure provisions concerning the arrangements for meeting the costs of the appropriate conference and any sessions of its preparatory committee. Under these arrangements, no additional cost was borne by the regular budget of the **Organization**.

"Accordingly, the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under the draft resolution to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services as may be required for the Third Review Conference and its preparation would have no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that the associated costs would be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the parties to the Convention.

*'Furthermore, all activities related to international conventions or treaties which under their respective legal instruments are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations **may** only be undertaken when sufficient resources to cover the activities in question have been received from the States parties at least six weeks in advance.**

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.46** have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee 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.1/45/L.46 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.52**, entitled *'Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol**'. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 34th meeting of the First Committee, held on 12 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.52** are the **following:** Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, **Cameroon**, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, **Hungary**, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, **Norway**, Papua New Guinea, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, the USSR, the United Kingdom, the United States, **Viet Nam**, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.52** have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee 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.1/45/L.52 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on delegations wishing to explain their position on the draft resolutions in cluster 10 that have just been adopted,

Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation is pleased that draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.52** on measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol has once again been adopted without a vote. However, we believe that that draft resolution could have been drafted more scrupulously.

The 1925 Geneva Protocol is the single most important international instrument prohibiting the use of chemical weapons. Therefore, all initiatives aimed at **strengthening** this instrument should take due account of the positive achievements of international forums. In other words, building on past achievements is the closest way towards our final goals.

The loopholes of draft resolution L.52, which are due to reservations with regard to the Geneva Protocol by **some** of the draft resolution's sponsors, are as follows. First, in the first preambular paragraph there should have been a specific reference to Security Council resolutions 612 (1988) and 620 (1988). It goes without saying that those are the single **most** important reactions of the Council to cases of violations *of* the Geneva Protocol. Secondly, the way the first **preambular** paragraph has been drafted has overlooked the extensive use of chemical weapons in the recent past. Thirdly, operative paragraph 4 could have sent a strong message if, **instead** of "noting", the General Assembly had "**recognized**" the continuing significance of the Security Council decision.

In sum, my country, as the one **most** victimised by the **use** of chemical weapons, believes that the decision to submit draft resolution **L.52**, and, indeed, the General **Assembly's** continuing approach to measures to uphold the authority ~~of~~ the Geneva Protocol, is a step in the right direction. We wish, however, to note that the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus should by *no* means be construed as approval *of* its shortcomings by **my** delegation.

Mr. AWAD (Syrian Arab Republic)(**interpretation from Arabic**): Once again I should like to explain my delegation's position on the draft resolutions on chemical weapons that the Committee has just adopted by **consensus**.

The Syrian Arab Republic has a vital national interest in the prohibition of chemical weapons. While supporting the concept of the complete destruction of all chemical-weapon stockpiles, my delegation opposes the concept of security reserves that have been advanced by some major Powers. The Syrian Arab Republic believes that that concept runs counter to the essence of the draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and leads to making that draft convention devoid of all meaning.

This is the same position voiced by the Group of 21 at the meetings of the **Ad Hoc** Committee on Chemical Weapons at its summer session at Geneva. The Syrian Arab Republic calls for a ban on all other weapons of mass destruction in our region, in particular, and throughout the entire world, in general. Syria has reaffirmed that position by accepting the Final Document of the Paris Conference of 1989. We reiterate the need for a linkage between the prohibition of chemical weapons and the prohibition of nuclear weapons in accordance with the priorities set forth in paragraph 45 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in 1978.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take decisions on the following draft resolutions, which are listed under cluster 12: draft resolutions **A/C.1/45/L.8, L.17, L.26** and L.32.

The representative of Italy has asked to make a general **statement** before the voting on the draft resolutions in cluster 12, and I **now** call upon him.

Mr. NEGROTTO CAMBIOSO (Italy): The Italian delegation, **on** behalf of the **European** Community and its **member** States, wishes to **make a** statement on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.17**, "Prevention of an arms race in **outer** space".

The Twelve are pleased that the combined efforts of various delegations have made it possible this year to draft one single draft resolution instead of the four traditional texts that **were** a feature of recent sessions.

It is the view of the Twelve that this reflects the mounting interest in **certain** aspects of the issue of preventing an arms race in outer space and that it constitutes an encouraging sign for the continuation of the work at the Geneva Conference on this subject, which this year has already given some initial, more positive indications.

The Twelve therefore regard the draft resolution as a promising achievement of this session.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote before the voting.

Mr. RITTER von WAGNER (Germany): I am speaking again to explain the position of the delegation of Germany on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.32**, entitled "Comprehensive programme of disarmament".

Germany will abstain on the draft resolution as a whole since we are of the opinion that **the** framework for any future work on a comprehensive programme of disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament and the validity of the ideas underlying the programme require thorough discussion within the Conference on Disarmament itself, the outcome of which should in no way be prejudiced by this draft resolution,

We regret that efforts to replace the wording in operative paragraph 1 by the wording in paragraph **1** of last year's **resolution** were not successful. We are **therefore** forced to take a decision now on the question of the establishment **of an ad hoc committee**.

It seems to us far from evident that the re-establishment of an ad hoc group on the comprehensive programme of disarmament would prove to be a promising step. The sponsors of this draft resolution refer **to** developments in Europe **to** justify the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee. We think, on the contrary, that the fundamental changes under way in East-West relations, and in the field of disarmament in Europe in particular, are striking evidence of the fact that disarmament is something that cannot be achieved, **or** even promoted, by **elaborating** the theoretical disarmament programme with artificial deadlines,

Moreover, we already see **difficult** tasks ahead **of us at** next year's **session of** the Conference on Disarmament. Not only will the Ad Hoc Committee **on** Chemical Weapons have to make a major effort to conclude **negotiations**, but **unlike** the

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

situation years ago the Ad Hoc Committee on a Comprehensive Test **Ban**, which we hope will be re-established at the beginning of next year's session, will also require our full attention. With such a work-load ahead of **us**, we do not consider it helpful to fragment delegations' scarce **resources** further. **Germany** will therefore vote against operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft **decision A/C.1/45/L.8**, entitled "**Naval armaments and disarmament**". This draft decision was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 31st meeting of the **First Committee**, on 8 **November** 1990.

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

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): This draft decision is sponsored by Sweden.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, **Bangladesh**, Barbados, Belgium, **Benin**, Bhutan, **Bolivia**, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, **Burundi**, **Byelorussian** Soviet Socialist Republic, **Cameroon**, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, **Côte d'Ivoire**, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, **Egypt**, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, 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 **Jamahiriyah**, Liechtenstein, **Luxembourg**, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, **Mozambique**, **Myanmar**, **Nepal**, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, **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, **Sudan**, Suriname, **Swaziland**, **Sweden**, **Syrian Arab** Republic, Thailand, Togo, **Tunisia**, **Turkey**, **Uganda**, **Ukrainian** Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, **United Arab Emirates**, **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**, **United Republic of Tanzania**, **Uruguay**, **Venezuela**, **Viet Nam**, **Yemen**, Yugoslavia, **Zaire**, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Draft decision A/C.1/45/L.8 was adopted by 130 votes to 1.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.17, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka at the Committee's 26th meeting, 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): o f d r a f t resolution A/C.1/45/L.17 are Bangladesh, Brazil, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ireland, Jordan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Myanmar, Nigeria, Peru, Somalia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe.

The CHAIRMAN: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.17 was adopted by 109 votes to 1, with 21 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.17** as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei **Darussalam**, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, **Cameroon**, Canada, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, **Congo**, Costa Rica, **Côte d'Ivoire**, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, 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 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**, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, **Sweden**, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: United States of America

Draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.17**, as a whole, was **adopted** by 129 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

The CHAIRMAN: I have just been informed that, in view of the ongoing consultations and the possibility that there will be a revised* improved text, the sponsors of draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.26** have requested that consideration of that draft resolution be deferred until the next meeting. With the permission of

* Subsequently the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

(The Chairman)

the Committee, I agree that we should defer consideration of this draft resolution until the next meeting.

The Committee shall now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.32**, entitled ****Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". and subtitle "Comprehensive-programme of disarmament".** This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 24th meeting of the First Committee. on 2 November 1990.

I shall call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of

.....

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.32 are:** Bolivia, Indonesia, Mexico, **Myanmar**, Peru and Sri Lanka.

The CHAIRMAN: A separate, recorded vote has been requested **on** operative paragraph **1** of draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.32**.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, **Brazil**, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central **African** Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, **Côte d'Ivoire**, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan **Arab Jamahiriya**, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, **Mozambique**, **Myanmar**, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, **Oman**, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, **Samoa**, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, **Sri Lanka**, Sudan, **Suriname**, **Swaziland**, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, **Togo**, **Tunisia**, **Uganda**, **United Arab Emirates**, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, **Venezuela**, Viet Nam, **Yemen**, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, **Czechoslovakia**, **France**, Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Austria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Malta, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.32 was adopted by 96 votes to 13, with 20 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote ~~on~~ draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.32** as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, **Cameroon**, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, C&e **d'Ivoire**, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti. India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, **Mongolia, Morocco**, Mozambique, **Myanmar**, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua **New Guinea**, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka; Sudan, Suriname, **Swaziland**, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic ~~of~~ Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet **Nam**, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, France, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.32**, as a whole, was adopted by 102 votes to **6**, with 22 **abstentions**.

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

Mrs. MIEDEMA (Netherlands): On behalf of the **delegations** of Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands, I would like, for the record, to explain our vote on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.32**, entitled "Comprehensive programme of disarmament".

In 1989 we welcomed the conclusion of the Conference on Disarmament **concerning** the comprehensive programme of disarmament, as stated in its report, that the outstanding issues should be reviewed when circumstances were more conducive to making progress in this regard.

This year's report of the Conference on Disarmament, which reflects a consensus, states on this subject that the organizational framework for dealing with the **comprehensive** programme of disarmament would be considered at the beginning **of** its 1991 session.

It is in the Conference on Disarmament therefore that this issue will soon be taken up. This should be the point of departure here in this year's session of the General Assembly. When considering the issue in the Conference on Disarmament, the delegations to the Conference will have to keep in mind the priorities of the various items on the agenda of the Conference.

The delegations on whose behalf I am speaking today do not consider **it** opportune to reactivate the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament early in 1991. We are engaged in various negotiations on specific disarmament items, both in and outside the Conference on Disarmament. It is this far more direct approach that is yielding substantial results and continuing to do **so**. The indirect approach of formulating a broad programme has proven to be of lesser expediency.

(Mrs. Miedema, Netherlands)

If necessary, the practice of dealing with the comprehensive programme of disarmament, in formal or informal plenary debate, could be continued.

An attempt now to push the subject back to the level of work in a separate ad hoc committee pre-empts the outcome of planned consultations on the subject in the Conference on Disarmament in 1991, thereby deviating from the recent agreement reached on the issue in that forum. We regret, therefore, **that** such an attempt is again being made in draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.32**, about which our delegations have reservations.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): 'The United States has asked to speak in order to explain its votes on draft resolutions **A/C.1/45/L.8** and L.17.

First, our negative vote on draft resolution L.8, entitled "Naval armaments and disarmament". The requirements for naval armaments and the naval activities of various nations are inherently asymmetrical. They are based on different geographical, political and strategic considerations. For example, separated by the sea from most allies and bounded on both sides by oceans, the United States relies most profoundly on maritime activities and freedom of navigation under international law to protect its security and trade interests. We are not unique in this regard. It is our strongly held view that the relationships among the various naval forces of the world are so different as to preclude a common basis for the negotiations on such forces. Therefore, the United States cannot agree to any limitations or constraints on its naval activities. Further, the United States does not believe that this is an appropriate agenda item and for this reason we voted against the draft resolution,

Secondly, although we abstained in the vote on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.17**, on the "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", we wish to acknowledge that the overall text is a qualitative improvement over its recent predecessors. Careful negotiations have produced a more constructive, objective and positive draft

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

resolution. The United States has not identified issues appropriate for outer-space **arms** 'control negotiations in any forum other than those under consideration in the bilateral nuclear and space talks in Geneva. Consequently, we voted against operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution. No one should interpret language in other parts of the draft resolution as in any way modifying this firm policy. *Of course*, when the Ad Hoc Committee on outer space convenes in Geneva, the United States delegation will join its colleagues in the Conference on Disarmament in seeking to enhance understanding of the many complex issues in disarmament in outer space.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded consideration of and action on draft resolutions listed for this morning's meeting.

At our next meeting, to be held **tomorrow** morning, the Committee will **take up** the following draft resolutions: in cluster 4, **A/C.1/45/L.38**; in cluster 5, **A/C.1/45/L.5** and **L. 35**; in cluster 7, **A/C.1/45/L.39 A** and **B**; in cluster 9, **A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1**; in cluster 12, **A/C.1/45/L.26**; in cluster 13, **A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1**, **L.42**, **L.49** and **L.50/Rev.1**.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like **to draw** the attention of **members** of the Committee that, in accordance with its programme of **work** and timetable, on Monday, 19 November, **the** Committee is scheduled to begin **the** general debate and consideration of and action on draft resolutions under agenda item 67, entitled "Question of Antarctica". It would be appreciated, therefore, if delegations wishing to speak on this item kindly inscribed their **names** on the list of speakers as early as possible.

I should also **like to remind representatives that** the deadline for submission of draft resolutions **under agenda item 67 is also Monday**, 19 November, at 12 noon.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.