UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
36th meeting
held on
Friday, 15 November 1991
at 10 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 36th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MROZIEWICZ (Poland)

CONTENTS

Consideration of and action on draft resolutions under 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.1/46/PV.36
19 December 1991

ENGLISH

91-61767 7388V (E)

Best Copy Available

360

The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m

AGENDA ITEMS 56 TO 63 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: Today, we shall first take action on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.40/Rev.1, in cluster 2.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.40/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of Gabon at the 35th meeting of the First Committee, on 14 November 1991, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African states. Bolivia is also a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.40/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that it should 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.1/46/L.40/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their positions on the decision just taken on.draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.40/Rev.1.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia): My delegation has joined in the consensus in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.40/Rev.1, "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes". We did so because of our overall sympathy with the main thrust of the draft resolution, which draws attention to and expresses legitimate concern about the potential hazards underlying any use of nuclear wastes which ccru3.d constitute radiological warfare and its implications for regional and international security.

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

However, we would not wish our positive attitude to indicate unqualified agreement to all the termo of A/C.1/46/L.40/Rev.1. We feel some concern about the appropriate venue and organization for the consideration of a legally binding instrument, which needs to take into account the various competence8 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, 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 IAEA. The question of the prohibition of all radioactive-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. This may well lead to a legally binding global prohibition on the sea-dumping of all radioactive waste.

Land disposal of radioactive waste clearly comes under the responsibility of IAEA. However, we would prefer not to pass judgemeat one way or the other concerning IAEA's work on this matter until we have a better idea of what is intended. Indeed, at this stage, we are not in a position to judge what recommendations directed at what organization might be appropriate.

We also would not wish our positive attitude towards the draft resolution to indicate Australian opposition to the land disposal of radioactive wastes in itself, which at this stage is the only possible alternative to storing such wastes. We reaffirm, however, our unqualified oppoaition to such dumping of nuclear wastes by any State or organisation as would constitute radiological warfare and have grave implications for the national security of other States.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): The United States wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.40/Rev.1, *'Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes". In joining in the consensus on this draft resolution, the United States expresses its appreciation to the sponsors for recognising tho difficulties inherent in the wording of earlier versions of the text and for making the necessary changes.

We agree that radioactive wastes could be one source of radioactive material which has the potential to be used in radiological weapons and that this is the only aspect that it is appropriate to address in the ongoing rediologioal-warfare negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament and in the arms-control debate here in the First Committee.

The United States is not willing, however, to define radioactive-waste dumping as radiological warfare. In our view, radioactive-waete-dumping practices cannot be regulated by arms-control measures; nor are we willing to deal with radioactive-waete-dumping practices in the arms-control context.

Such practices are, at heart, environmental and public-safety issues, which are already addressed in other forums. We would point out in that regard, as the representative of Australia just did, that the ocean dumping of radioactive wastes in already governed by the London Dumping Convention and that the appropriate forum for considering the transboundary movement of radioactive waetee is IAEA. The IAEA Code of Practice, for example, seeks to enhance the protection of international transport of radioactive wastes, including transport into State territories.

Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom): My delegation would like to associate itself with the explanation just given by the United States.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kheradi has had to leave the podium to take part in some ongoing consultations. We should be taking a decision at this time on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.31, in cluster 3, but Mr. Kheradi's presence is needed for that. Therefore, I think we should proceed to cluster 4.

I can now call on Mr. Kheradi.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Mr. Chairman, I ark your indulgence, but I do hope that the statements in explanation of positions before the decisions are taken on this cluster have already been made. If so, I shall of course proceed to conduct the voting. As you know, remaining at the moment in cluster 4 are draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.24/Rev.1; A/C.1/46/L.41, whose programme-budget implications are stated in document A/C.1/46/L.46; and A/C.1/46/L.42/Rev.2.

The : I shall now call on those representatives who wish to make statements in explanation of their positions on the draft resolutions in cluster 4 just referred to by Mr. Kheradi.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia): I have asked to speak in order to make a statement before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.42/Rev.2, and I have the honour to speak on behalf of the following countries: Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Fiji, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Ukraine, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. On behalf of those delegations, I wish to share with other delegations the considerationa that have led us as a group to reconsider our approach to the issue of South Africa's nuclear capability.

First, we are conscious of the long aud troubled history that goes with this resolution. Indeed, it was because of that history that all of us were prepared to overlook the hyperbolic and grudging nature of some of the

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

paragraphs and to vote in favour of the draft resolution as it had appeared in earlier versions. In that regard, it is only fair to say that since acceding to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), South Africa has acted in an exemplary fashion. It has promptly concluded a safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which came into force upon signature, as indicated in document A/C.1/46/18, dated 12 November 1991. We see it as ironic, therefore, that the amendments now contained in draft resolution L.42/Rev.2 have been put forward by a number of countries which themselves have not concluded their own safeguards arrangements under the NPT and that those countries, rather than South Africa, are not complying fully with their treaty obligations. If this Committee is to take a position on the issue of nuclear safeguards and NPT obligations, it seems only fair that we should spread our focus rather more widely.

Additionally, we have particular concerns about two other countries, Iraq and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Those concerns have been addressed in what we view as a more appropriate context, that is, under plenary item 14, which dealt with the report of IAEA; accordingly, we shall not elaborate on them further here.

As I said at the outset, given the history of this issue, the countries on whose behalf I speak would have been prepared to overlook the hyperbole contained in draft resolution L.42 and to vote for the first time in favour of the resolution on South Africa's nuclear capability. Thus, we believe, the First Committee would most likely have reached consensus on this issue. Factors we consider extraneous to the issue have been introduced into the draft resolution: for instance, the oblique references to Israel. Regrettably, therefore, we shall abstain from voting on this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.41.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): u t i o n A/C.1/46/L.41 was submitted by tho delegation of Ethiopia at this session on 1 November 1991, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, This draft resolution has programme-budget implications which are contained in document A/C.1/46/L.46.

T h e : The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it should be adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly7

Draft resolution A/C. 1/46/L.41 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.42/Rev.2.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): t resolution A/C.1/46/L.42/Rev.2 was introduced by the representative of Gabon at the 35th meeting of the First Committee, on 14 November 1991, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States.

The CHAIRMAN: Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.42/Rev.2.

I now put to the vote the tenth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Central African Republic, Cyprus, Fiji, Gabon, Greece, Grenada, Ireland, Jamaica, Liechtenstein, Malta, Mauritius, Paraguay, Portugal, Turkey, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Zimbabwe

The tenth preambular paragraph was retained by 82 votes to 32, with 24 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.42/Rev.2.

---

* Subsequently the delegations of Congo, Gabon and Zimbabwe advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yuqoelavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, *France*, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Côte d'Ivoire, Fiji, Gabon, Greece, Grenada, Ireland, Jamaica, Liechtenstein, Malta, Mauritius, Paraguay, Portugal, Turkey, Uruguay

Paragraph 3 was retained by 89 votes to 31, with 19 abstentions. *

The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.42/Rev.2, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

---

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippinea, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.42/Rev.2, as a whole, was adopted by 94 votes to 1, with 46 abstentions.*

---

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

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.24/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.24/Rev.1 has the following sponsors: Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the representative of Israel for an explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. YATIV (Israel): Once again this Committee is dealing with a draft resolution - A/C. 1/46/L. 24/Rev. 1 - that should not have been on its agenda. This year, more than ever before, this pernicious ritual is casting doubt on the sincerity of the workings of the United Rations. This draft resolution is out of tune with the developments that have occurred on the international scene in general and in the Middle East in particular.

First and foremost, the Gulf war has revealed that threats to peace in our area emanate from Iraq's aggressive posture. The international community chose to ignore Israel's apprehensions and to castigate Israel for putting the Iraqi reactor out of action in 1981. Israel cannot but contemplate its situation in the light of the facts as they stand starkly revealed. It was the contingency of the Gulf crisis, and unfortunately not Israel's warnings, that unmasked Iraq's clandestine nuclear activities.

Furthsrmore, it is evident that today Israel is the threatened party. For its part, it has never threatened a neighbouring country. Iraq successfully sponsored similar draft resolutions in the past, thereby

(Mr. Yativ, Israel)

diverting attention to a non-existent threat. It is in the face of such threats that for the past 11 years Israel has been proposing the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, following free and direct negotiations and on the basis of mutually satisfactory assurances.

During the Committee's general debate I gave an elaborate presentation of the principles on which Israel bases this concept, The Searetary-General, in his report on the Establishment of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in the Region of the Middle East, stresses the need to establish such a zone in that region. According to that report, in the conditions prevailing in the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone would be even more effective than the non-proliferation Treaty. The validity of that concept is borne out by Iraq's aggression and threats. The non-proliferation Treaty has not prevented a single local war, and manifestly it did not prevent Iraq from developing its nuclear-weapon potential. Israel believes - as it has always believed - that in the absence of regional dialogue and understanding between the countries most immediately involved, international dispositions concerning resolutions such as this draft resolution cannot contribute to the promotion of regional détente.

I should like to draw the Committee's attention to the incipient face-to-face talks which, we may hope, will be conducive to a peaceful settlement of the problems that divide the States of the region. It is preposterous that during this process Israel should be subjected to continued bashing, supposedly as a means of promoting peace. The adoption of this draft resolution will not contribute to the ongoing peace process. It will not enhance Israel's confidence in those parties outside the region that have done so much to secure its participation in the present process on the basis of their realistic and constructive approach. Therefore, if Israel is to be

(Mr. Yativ, Israel)

assured of this Organization's impartiality in the process towards securing peace in the Middle East, the First Committee should stop this action against Israel and vote against this draft resolution as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.24/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swamiland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, Romania, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.24/Rev.1 was adopted by 65 votes to 3, with 64 abstentions.*

---

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

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

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands) : I wish, on behalf of the European Community and its member States, to explain the Twelve's collective abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.24/Rev.1, entitled **Israeli nuclear armament".

The Twelve agree with the call, contained in the draft resolution, that Israel should put all its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, but they believe that such a call should not be focused exclusively on Israel while there are other States that have not yet plaaed their facilities under IAEA safeguards. Indeed, the Twelve have said so repeatedly.

This year the opening of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East offers interested parties the opportunity of direct dialogue, which is also an appropriate means of furthering disarmament in the Middle East, All Staten should appreciate the delicacy of that process and should refrain from hurling accusations at one another. There should be a call for cooperation and for the necessary political will to discuss all items of mutual interest. The Twelve support efforts towards progress on nuclear disarmament in the Middle East. To that end, they call upon all States in the region to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty and to place all their nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards.

In this context, the Twelve recall their support for the initiative of President Mubarak to have the Middle East turned into a zone free of weapons of mass destruction. That should have been the message of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.24/Rev.1.

Mr. COLLINS (Ireland): I should like to explain Ireland's vote on the draft resolution just adopted, contained in document A/C.1/46/L.42/Rev.2 and entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa".

The delegation of Ireland regrets that it felt constrained to abstain in the vote on this draft resolution for the second year in succession. In our explanation of vote on the relevant text last year, we expressed the hope that the draft resolution to be presented in 1991 would take account of our reasons for abstaining, so that we could renew our positive vote.

Until yesterday, it seemed to us that the draft resolution of A/C.1/46/L.42 on the table would have enabled us to cast such a positive vote. However, the new amendments submitted yesterday in A/C.1/46/L.42/Rev.2 introduce a contentious element into the text, in particular by singling out one oountry, albeit obliquely, in a way which is unacceptable to my delegation. For that reason, we felt obliged to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution again this year.

Mr. ASMAN (Ukraine) (interpretation from Russian); The delegation of Ukraine would like to make a statement concerning its vote on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/46/L.24/Rev.1 and A/C.1/46/L.42/Rev.2, on Israeli nuclear armament and on the nuclear capability of South Africa.

Guided by its consistent policy of opposing nuclear weapons as a means of warfaro and taking account of the need for immediate measures to prevent their proliferation and to ensure their elimination, Ukraine has always supported and continues to support any international efforts to prevent the nuclear arming of Israel, South Africa, or any other country concerning which there is reason to suppose that it is in fact endeavouring to acquire nuclear means of mass destruction.

(Mr. Asman, Ukraine)

Our support for the relevant general Assembly resolutions was also due to the faat that Israel and South Afriaa refused to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty as non-nuclear States and that their nuclear ambitions aould be viewed against the baakground of a policy which was a source of tension and an unremitting threat to international peace and security. By no means all of the factors I have mentioned have ceased to exist. Nevertheless, at thia time, when the parties to the Middle East conflict have shown their preference to sit down at the negotiating table with a view to finding by peaceful means a mutually acceptable and just solution of the problems that divide them, we have serious doubts about the appropriateness of adopting draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.24/Rev.1, which repeats almost word for word the previous General Assembly resolutions on the subject.

Ukraine weloomes South Africa's accession to the non-proliferation Treaty a8 *a* non-nualear-weapon State. Despite the fact that its accession on 10 July 1991 does not provide conclusive proof that South Africa *has* no nuclear capability and cannot in itself dispel existing concerns *on* this question, the international community, assisted by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), needs time to ascertain that South *Africa* is discharging in good faith its obligations under the non-proliferation Treaty.

At a time when South Africa, having acceded to the Treaty, has thereby shown its readiness to cooperate with the international community in the matter, it would seem that appeals to it which were dictated by earlier events and address it in a way that suggests disbelief concerning its intention to live up to its obligations under the Treaty are, at the very least, premature. The changes made in the text in reviewing the original draft

(Mr. Asman, Ukraine)

resolution and the addition of a preambular paragraph have further reduced the possibility of achieving a aompromise in this matter.

In view *of* the foregoing, the Ukrainian delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolutions on Israeli nuclear armament and on the nuclear capability of South Africa.

Mr. (Japan): In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.24/Rev.1, on which Japan voted to abstain, my delegation wishes to state the following for the record.

Japan, as a strong supporter of the non-proliferation Treaty regime, is very much *concerned* at the persistent stories about possible Israeli nuclear aapability. While Japan wholeheartedly welcomes the recent accession to the non-proliferation Treaty by Moaambigue, Zambia, the United Republic *of* Tanzania, Zimbabwe, South Africa and Lithuania, as well as the announcements by France and China of their decisions to accede to the Treaty, Japan earnestly hopes that Israel and other countries not parties to the Treaty will accede to it as early as possible, thus further strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime and removing the concerns of the international community.

Japan also believes that compliance with the obligations of the Treaty is of similarly great importance in order to uphold the credibility *of* the Treaty regime among the States parties to the Treaty.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia): My delegation has a number *of* reservations concerning draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.24/Rev.1, which has just been adopted. Australia'8 abstention, however, should not be interpreted as less than full and strong support *for* calls on Israel to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty and to accept full-scope safeguards on all its nuclear activities.

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australi

Australia has consistently enjoined Israel and other States not parties to the non-proliferation Treaty - particularly those that operate unaafeguarded nuclear facilities - to take such action. I would draw attention in particular to Australia's interventions concerning the fact that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has been hesitant to sign and implement its non-proliferation-Treaty safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency.

This is an issue of the greatest concern to my Government. Similarly, Iraq's violation of its obligations under the non-proliferation Treaty has been and remains a challenge to the incarnations1 community and clearly also merits the attention and concern of this Committee.

Mr. NEAGU (Romania) : I have asked to speak in order to present the position of the Romanian delegation with respect to the draft resolution that has just been adopted, contained in document A/C.1/46/L.24/Rev.1 and entitled "Israeli nuclear armament".

First of all, I wish to underline that we have profound respect for the delegations that initiated this draft resolution and that we share their preoccupation concerning a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

The position of Romania on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is well known. As my delegation stated during the general debate in this Committee,

"Since the beginning of 1990, Romania has been fully committed to, ard has actively participated in, the current multilateral efforts to strengthen the global non-proliferation regime." (A/C.1/46/PV.8, p. 64)

The statement continued:

"Romania considers the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a cornerstone of the international regime of nuclear non-proliferation". (ibid.)

Romania, in keeping with this position, supported the proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle Rast region,

We have noted that Israel also is in favour of the establishment of such a zone; we have also taken note of Israel's commitment not to be the- first to introduce nuclear weapons to the Middle East.

As is well known, as a result of the dramatic changes that have occurred in the world, parties confronting each other in the Middle East have finally sat down together at the same table to discuss their problems in order that mutual condemnation may be replaced with mutual confidence. Our vote on the draft resolution to which I have referred takes these developmenta into consideration, and we view our vote as a constructive effort, in keeping with the spirit which prevailed at the Madrid conference. Romania, by voting in this manner, wished to make its contribution to seeking and promoting new language for the dialogue on the quest for a constructive and lasting solution to the Middle East conflict,

Mr. KRASULIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation wishes to explain the reasons for its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.24/Rev.1.

The Soviet Union has consistently supported strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime and has been an active advocate of making the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) universal. We favour uniting all the efforts the whole international community is making at both the global and the regional levels. We are convinced that accession to the non-proliferation Treaty by those Middle Eastern States that have not already done so, subjection of all the nuclear activities of the States in the region to International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, and the adoption of practical steps to create a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East will provide a significant boost to progress towards solving the problems of nuclear non-proliferation and of strengthening peace and international security. In this regard, much, of course, depends on the position of Israel, and we hope that Israel, for its part, will take steps which will be in harmony with the currently evolving positive tendencies in the world in respect of the limitation and elimination of nuclear weapons.

At the same time, we believe that this time of favourable changes for humankind and the ever more powerful spirit of cooperation and interaction in international relations these days require of us, the States Members of the United Nations, that our decisions should be carefully weighed and balanced. Only if there is total renunciation of an unjustified spirit of confrontation, on a basis of reciprocity and common agreement, can we move ahead. We believe that this is particularly relevant today in so far as the Middle East is concerned because of the process towards a peaceful settlement which has now

(Mr. Krasulin, USSR)

begun and the opportunities which are opening up for real movement to break the log-jam in the longest-running conflict of the twentieth century.

Taking into aaaount today's realities, the Soviet delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1.

As for the reasons behind our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.42/Rev.2, we wish to point out that the question of South Africa's nuclear aapability has been on the agenda of the United Nations for many years. Today we can see that the attitude of the international community to this problem has resulted in positive changes in South Africa's nuclear policy, chief *among* them South Africa's decision to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty and to sign a safeguards agreement with IAEA.

It is gratifying to note that a whole group of African States - Mozambique, Angola, Zambia and the United Republic of Tanaania - has acceded to the NPT alongside South Africa. These actions constitute an important step towards making non-proliferation universal and strengthening the non-proliferation regime. At the same time, they make a valuable contribution to enhancing predictability and stability in southern Africa.

Obvioualy, South Africa's decision was also prompted to some extent by the internal political processes in South Africa towards dismantling apartheid and by the tack South Africa has taken towards rejoining the international community.

Taking into account the favourable changes that have occurred in South Africa and the *region* as *a* whole, including changes in the area of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and with a view to promoting further Positive stags in this field, the Soviet delegation abstained in the vote on this draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.42/Rev.2 as a whole.

Mr. FUJITA (Brazil): I wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.24/Rev.1, concerning Israeli nuclear armament, which has just been adopted.

Although Brazil had traditionally voted in favour of draft reeolutions on this subject, this year - in the light of the developments under way in the political picture of the Middle East - my delegation decided to abstain. We did so in the expectation that thia gesture will be interpreted as a signal that we are in favour of the much-needed relaxation of tensions between the parties involved and as an incentive to further the peace process in the region.

In this connection, Bras11 strongly supports the establishment of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, and welcomes the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.35/Rev.1 without a vote.

My delegation reaffirms its support for all resolutions and initiatives which contribute to fostering confidence and understanding between the parties in the Middle East. We do so in the belief that through these resolutions and initiatives the United Nations is helping to establish the prerequisites for a just and lasting solution to the problems of the region.

Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland): I am speaking in order to explain the votes of the five Nordic countries - Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and my own country, Finland - on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.42/Rev.2, subtitled *'Nuclear capability of South Africa".

The Nordic countries were very much encouraged by the significant movement towards a generally acceptable text on the question of South Africa' nuclear capability, as contained in the revised text of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.42. In fact, we would have voted in fsvour of draft resolution

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

A/C.1/46/L.42/Rev.1 had it been put to the vote. Moreover, we would have felt. no need to explain our vote in favour.

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

We wish to rsaord our appreciation for the efforts made to produce a text in keeping with the significant positive developments in that area. However, much to our regret, the text of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.42 was revised, Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.42/Rev.2 reintroduces controversial elements that detract from the main objective of strengthening international support for the denuclearization of Africa.

The tenth preambular paragraph is a thinly disguised attempt at name calling, which the Nordic countries deplore. Continued and arbitrary singling out of individual countries is inappropriate and counter-productive.

As regards operative paragraph 3, the Nordic countries continue to believe that the General Assembly should addreaa itself to governments and not to corporatiana, institutions and individuals. The Nordic countries welcome the accession of South Africa to the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty and to the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards regime, which they have long called for, and proceed from the assumption, which is fundamental under international law, that pacta sunt servanda unless proved otherwise.

For those reasons the Nordic countries were obliged to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.42/Rev.2 as a whole and to vote against the tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3.

Mr. ARRIA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): o f Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela, my delegation wishes to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.24, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament".

The swift and profound changes occurring in the world today show that the international community must work towards atrengtnening a process in which

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

dialogue, openness, aooperation and negotiation replace the rigid positions and confrontation that have characterised the long-standing conflicts, threatening international peace and security.

We therefore believe that the solution to the situation in the Middle East should be baaed on the premise that it should be solved by peaceful means. Hence, all States should undertake to adopt means that would guarantee security in that region, in order to remove the threat posed by the existence of nuclear weapons there.

Accordingly, we support the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free sone in the Middle East.

The beginning stage, in Madrid, of the Peace Conference on the Middle East, which we trust will initiate a process leading to definitive peace in the region, offers a promising scenario in which understanding and negotiation can prevail.

In the light of those new, important realities, we felt that it would be more appropriate and more positive to abstain in the voting. However, we assure the Committee that we shall follow the development of the attitudes and policies of the parties involved in the negotiationa and, if necessary, we shall reconsider our position.

Mr. STELZER (Austria) : Austria wishes to explain its abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.42/Rev.2.

Like other countries which have expressed their regrets concerning revision 2 of this draft resolution, Austria would have been prepared to vote in favour of the original version of the draft resolution, which took into account the factors that had caused our abstention in the voting on last year's draft resolution *on* this subject. Austria could not, however, support

(Mr. Stelzer, Austria)

the singling out of one country, as is done in the tenth preambular paragraph of the revised draft resolution, nor could it vote in favour of operative paragraph 3. Hence, Austria had to abstain in the voting.

Mr. GURECKAS (Lithuania): The delegation of Lithuania abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.24/Rev.1, on Israeli nuclear armament. My delegation shares the reasons for abstaining on this draft resolution outlined in the statement made by the representative of the Netherlands on behalf of the 12 States of the European Community.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.31/Rev.1, in cluster 3.

I call on the representative of Pakistan, who wishes to introduce the draft resolution.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): I have the honour 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.1/46/L.31/Rev.1. This draft resolution is sponsored by Bangladesh, Bolivia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Pakistan.

Over the years we have expressed deep concern at the threat posed to non-nuclear-weapon States by the nuclear arsenals of nuclear-weapon States. Obviously 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 legally binding assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons that would address their security concerns.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.31/Rev.1 web prepared basically along the same lines as resolution 45/54, which was adopted last year. at the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly, by an overwhelming majority in favour, with none against and only three abstentions. In view of the recent positive developments on the international political scene and after taking into consideration the conatruotive views expressed by interested delegations, the sponsors made some modifications in the text of the draft resolution in order to gain it even wider acaegtability. Accordingly, the third preambular paragraph in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.31 has been replaced in the revised draft resolution by a new preambular paragraph, numbered as the fourth, end the original fifth preambular paragraph has been placed after the second preambular paragraph in the revised draft resolution, to make the text read more logically.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

The sixth preambular paragraph has been redrafted to read:

"Determined strictly to abide by the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations on the non-use of force or threat of use of force".

The sixteenth preambular paragraph in the old version has been partially modified and the former nineteenth and twentieth preambular paragraphs have been merged into a new nineteenth preambular paragraph in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.31/Rev.1.

In the operative section the only minor change is in operative paragraph 3 where the expression "demonstrate the political will and flexibility necessary to reach" has been replaced by the words "work actively towards an early" in A/C.1/46/L.31/Rev.1.

The draft resolution now before us reaffirms the urgent need to reach 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 work actively towards an early agreement on a common approach and, in particular, on a common formula that could be included in an international instrument of a legally binding character to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. We hope that the draft resolution will enjoy the widest support of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on the representative of France, who wishes to make a statement other than in explanation of vote.

Mr. ERRERA (France) (interpretation from French): I wish to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.31/Rev.1, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

(Mr. Errera, France)

My delegation, which last year abstained in the vote on resolution 45/54 will this year aaat an affirmative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.31/Rev.1. The reasons for the change are as follows:

First, after intensive consultations with the sponsors of the draft resolution my delegation notes with satisfaction that the amendments we proposed in order to improve its text have, for the moat part, been accepted. In particular, in the sixth preambular paragraph my delegation had sought not only a strengthening of the mention of the principle of the non-uae of force or threat of the use of force, which is the foundation of international security, but also a reference to the rignt to self-defence, whfoh underlies France's strategic doctrine. It would have been more satisfactory had that reference been more explicit. None the leas, my delegation interprets the revised text as encompassing Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

Furthermore, my delegation considers that the new text of operative paragraph 3 emphasisea clearly that responsibility in efforts to secure an agreement in the field of negative security guarantees is incumbent on all States and is not to be borne only by tne nuclear Powere.

Secondly, as is well known, France, like the other nuclear military Powers, has already entered into solemn commitments concerning the non-uae of its nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. But, as we have eought to demonstrate, particularly through our positive attitude in the Conference on Disarmament, France is also committed to a multilateral, equitable and effective solution to the problem of negative security guarantees. My delegation believes that such a solution should help to strengthen most particularly the security of States that have renounced the acquisition of nuclear weapons in a legally binding instrument on non-proliferation. That is

(Mr. Errera, France)

why we confirm our support for the efforts of countries that advocate legally binding guarantees for the benefit of non-nuclear-weapon States having themselves accepted similar obligations. We intend to continue to contribute to the negotiations in this field.

My delegation trusts that its affirmative vote will be interpreted both as an encouragement for progress in this direction and as confirmation of its commitment to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.31/Rev.1. I first call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.31/Rev.1 has seven sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 36th meeting of the First Committee, on 15 November 1991. The list of sponsors is as follows: Bangladesh, Bolivia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka.

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, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Corta Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Csechoelovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republia, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Moroaoo, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaoiland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republia, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.31/Rev.1 was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

---

* Subsequently the delegations of the *Congo* and Ecuador advised the Secretariat that they ha& intended to vote in favour.

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

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia): Australia and New Zealand voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.31/Rev.1 concerning the conclusion of effective internationa. arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, a subject more commonly referred to as negative security assurances. As parties to the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty and the Treaty of Rarotonga, Australia and New Zealand consider that negative security assurances have a useful role to play in enhancing international security and preventing the spread of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.31/Rev.1 helps to guide international efforts to develop effective negative security assurances, and for this reason we support it. We think that all States should contribute to efforts to make further progress on the subject.

We aaknowledge that in its revised form a number of improvements have been made to the text. We weloome these changes, We also hope that in future years it might be even further improved by referring to the importance of nuclear non-proliferation commitments to the subject of negative aeaurity assurances.

Australia and New Zealand consider that effeativo and legally binding commitments not to possess, develop or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons are of arucisl importance to the question of negative security assurances. It is through a commitment to legally binding non-proliferation arrangements that non-nuolear-weapona States *are* beat able to demonstrate their commitment not to use *or* threaten to use nualear weapons and to receive corresponding assurances from nuclear-weapons States.

Australia and New Zealand believe that it is important to strengthen ouch assurances and the complementary and related norm of nuclear non-proliferation. We hope that this view will be *taken* into aaoount in the future consideration of the subject.

Mr. DEYANOV (Bulgaria) : The delegation of Bulgaria voted in *favour* of draft resolution A/C.1/L.31/Rev.1 on the aonalueioa of effective international arrangements to assure non-nualear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, This is an expression of our continuing aupport for the general aonaept of negative security assurances extended in a

(Mr. Deyanov, Bulgaria)

legally binding form by all nuclear-weapon States to non-nuclear-weapon States.

Last year the First Committee managed to adopt a single resolution on this item, merging two drafts that had usually been submitted to the First Committee separately by Bulgaria and by Pakistan. However, the delegation of Bulgaria decided not to sponsor this year, as it had in previous years, the draft resolution on negative security assurances submitted to the First Committee. The reason is that we seek now to natively support only approaches which could lead to solutions with realistic chances for progress that could enhance the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons,

It seems to us that the adoption for more than a decade of similar negative security assurances resolutions along the lines of the present one have, unfortunately, not helped much the negotiations in the Ad Hoc Committee on Security Assurances of the Conference on Disarmament to reach an agreement on arrangements acceptable to all. At the same time, we recognise that interesting proposals have been submitted and analysed in depth in that Conunittee, some of which have a good chance of becoming promising focal points of successful future efforts.

My delegation believes that in the present changing situation real prospects for progress on the negative security assurances issue may have already emerged, particularly in the framework of the preparatory process lending to the fifth non-proliferation Treaty Review Conference to be held in 1995. The existing common ground between the positions held by the nuclear-weapon States indicate that interim or more far-reaching solutions could be attainable with respect to "security assurances" to

(Mr. Devanov, Bulgaria)

non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the non-proliferation Treaty. The search for such legally binding international arrangements may be greatly facilitated by the presence of all five nuclear-weapon States among the States parties to that Treaty.

In view of this prospect, it is unfortunate that the negative security assurances resolution just adopted does not focus on, and even does not mention, such realistic opportunities for progress as those which exist in the framework of the non-proliferation Treaty. We are glad to note that other countries maintaining an active position on the negative security assurances issue share our assessment, as seen from some of the explanations of vote. The changes made in the draft this year seem to be important but still do not touch upon the substance of the issue of negative security assurances.

It remains our hope that a future draft on the negative security assurances item would more adequately reflect the new situation, particularly by not overlooking tho most prospective areas of progress, which would undoubtedly help it widen its support.

Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom): I would like to give an explanation of vote on resolution A/C.1/46/L.31/Rev.1 entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapons States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

Whilst we recognize the improvement in this year's resolution, the United Kingdom is still unable to vote in support. The main reason for our abstention is that the resolution does not deal with the necessary relationship between a security assurance given by a nuclear-weapons State and tha necessity for a binding commitment from recipient States on nuclear non-proliferation, for example, and in particular by memberehip of the

(Mr. Taylor, United Kingdom)

non-proliferation Treaty, This relationship is spelt out in our unilateral declaration on security assurances which is referred to in the resolution. However, the United Kingdom is prepared to negotiate in good faith on this issue at the Conference on Disarmament.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.