UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
37th meeting
held on
Thursday, November 15 1990
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 37th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. RANA (Nepal)

CONTENTS

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/45/PV.37
21 November 1990
ENGLISH

9043226 3104V (E)

39p.

The meeting was called to order at 12 noon.

AGENDA ITEMS 45 TO 66 AND 155 (pontinued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will first take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, in cluster 4, and on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1, in cluster 9. Subsequently, the Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1, A/C.1/45/L.42 and A/C.1/45/L.50/Rev.1, in cluster 13.

In addition, it is my understanding that this morning the Committee is in a position to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1 in cluster 12. Draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.5 and A/C.1/45/L.35, in cluster 5, and draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.39 A and B, in cluster 7 have been postponed to allow for more consultation among delegations. We may be in a position to take action on them at our next meeting.

I have just been informed by the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.11 that, following consultations with concerned delegations, the sponsor will not now press that draft resolution to a vote. In the light of this information the Committee will not take action on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.11 and the subsequent amendment to that draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/45/L.57.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to make an announcement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I wish to inform the Committee that Panama has become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1 and A/C.1/45/L.42; and Costa Rica and Panama have become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: As no delegation wishes to introduce a draft resolution, the Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, in cluster 4. I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than explanations of their position on the draft resolution.

Mr. AGAYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): My delegation has asked to speak in order to draw attention to a technical misunderstanding that took place when the votes on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.17, "Prevention of an arms race *in* outer space", were recorded. We discovered to our amazement and regret that the position of our delegation was not reflected on the voting display. We wish to confirm that our delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.17.

The CHAIRMAN: The position of the Soviet Union will be duly reflected in the record.

Mr. JANDL (Austria): In the light of recent discussions, allow me to make some brief comments on the content of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, entitled *'Prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities", which was introduced by the representative of Hungary and which is also co-sponsored, inter alia, by my delegation.

Operative paragraph 1 of this draft resolution states that the General Assembly

> "Recognizes that an armed attack or a threat of armed attack on a safeguarded nuclear facility, operational or under construction, would create a situation in which the Security Council would have to act immediately in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including measures under Chapter VII".

(Mr. Jandl, Austria)

I might add that this language comes from the consensus language of the 1985 Third Review Conference of the States Parties to the non-proliferation Treaty.

In this regard I want to emphasize my delegation's understanding that an armed attack on any kind of nuclear facility, be it safeguarded or not, constitutes not only a major threat to and breach of international security and peace but is certainly a deplorable and reprehensible method of warfare. However, we must bear in mind that the international community, through the conclusion and implementation of the non-proliferation Treaty, has set certain standards of quality for nuclear facilities. These standards of quality constitute precisely the safeguards which, in the light of the provisions of article 3 of the non-proliferation Treaty, apply to the nuclear facilities of those States that are parties to that Treaty. My delegation is of the opinion that this qualitative difference between nuclear facilities under safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and facilities without those safeguards has a certain significance. That is why we support the formulation contained in the aforesaid draft resolution and we hope that an overwhelming majority of member States will find themselves in a position to vote in favour of the text. At the same time, we call on those countries that have not placed their nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards to do so in the near future.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Pakistan, who wishes to explain his vote before the voting.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): I should like to explain Pakistan's position on the draft resolution entitled "Prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities**, contained in document A/C.1/45/L.38.

It is generally recognized that an armed attack on a nuclear facility or installation would result in radioactive releases with grave consequences within and beyond the boundaries of the State which has been attacked. Such an attack would cause not only severe damage to the environment, but also incalculable loss of human life.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38 duly recognizes that fact in its preambular paragraphs. Unfortunately, in its operative paragraphs it somehow inserts an irrelevant distinction between safeguarded and unsafeguarded facilities. From the point of view of the consequential danger from radioactivity, there is no difference in the results and that categorization is thus unnecessary.

Similarly; an attack or the threat of an attack on a nuclear facility would endanger international peace and security irrespective of whether the nuclear facility in question was safeguarded or unsafeguarded. In such an eventuality, the Security Council, which has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, would be required to act immediately in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter. While we fully support the idea of the prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities, we are disappointed that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/45/L.38 tries to create an unrealistic and ill-founded distinction between the effects of attacks on safeguarded and the effects of attacks on unsafeguarded nuclear facilities. We are of the considered view that that distinction is based on invalid assumptions.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

In view of the foregoing, we should have preferred it if the sponsors had agreed to our proposal to delete the word "safeguarded" from operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution. In view of the inability of the sponsors to agree to our proposal, my delegation will be constrained to request separate votes on paragraphs 1 and 2, in which we intend to vote against those paragraphs. We intend to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole, and shall do so with a heavy heart.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, entitled "General and complete disarmament: Prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November 1990.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee, who will read out the list of

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38 has the following sponsors: Australia, Austria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Germany, Hungary, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Netherlands, Sweden and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The CHAIRMAN: I r a t e , recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin.. Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, 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, Egypt., Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, 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, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Auainst: France, Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstainingt Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, India, Israel, Mexico, Namibia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38 was retained by 115 votes to 6, witb 9 abstentions,

The CHAIRMAN: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia. Botswana, Brunei Datussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia. Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, 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, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal. Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: Pakistan, United States of America, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador, France, India, Israel, Mexico, Namibia, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanaania

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38 was rewed by 115 votes to 4, with 12 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38.

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, Ryelorussian 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, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland. Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, 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: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Israel

Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38 was adopted by 126 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38 as a whole. A recoded 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, 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, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, 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, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, France, India, Namibia, Pakistan, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain an3 Northern Ireland, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, as a whole, was adopted by 121 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

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

Mr. **BELLINA** (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to explain the position of Peru in respect of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, entitled "Prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities**, which the Committee has just adopted.

My delegation, overcoming major difficulties posed by the text, and in strict accordance with the principles that guide our foreign policy on disarmament, voted in favour of the draft resolution, in particular operative paragraphs 1 and 2. Armed attacks on nuclear facilities, as well as being unacceptable acts of

(Mr. Bellina, Peru)

violence, can have serious consequences for individuals and for the environment because of the harmful effects of the atomic radiation that they can cause.

In this respect Peru firmly supports all initiatives submitted to the United Nations General Assembly, the Conference on Disarmament, the General Conference of the Organization of American States and other forums and designed to bring about the prohibition and prevention of such attacks. My country firmly supports the holding of a diplomatic conference to give thorough consideration to all aspects of this question, in particular, those relating to the protection of civilians and the environment in the case of attacks on nuclear facilities.

This is why my delegation is extremely concerned that operative paragraphs 1 and 2 are confined to action by the international community in respect of cases in which attacks are perpetrated on nuclear facilities that are under the safeguards system. This restriction, far from helping to build an international consensus on the subject, causes a dangerous vacuum, because it leaves out the potential harmful effects of attacks on nuclear installations that are not under the safeguards system.

We hop8 that, next year, the sponsors of the draft resolution on this subject will take into account the comments that have been made by my delegation.

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel): We voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38 because we are in full agreement with its thrust. However, we would hav8 preferred operative paragraph 1 to be worded differently. The Government of Israel has on many occasions officially declared that its policy is that nuclear facilities dedicated to peaceful ends should be inviolable and that it will not attack or threaten to attack any peaceful nuclear facilities.

Mr. RENYON (United Kingdom): I should like to explain the United Kingdom's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, entitled "Prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities'*. The United Kingdom's policy is to maintain negotiations on this subject in the Conference on Disarmament. In our view, operative paragraphs 1 and 4 are inconsistent with that approach.

Mr. RIVRRQ (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation takes this opportunity to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, which has just been adopted.

The Cuban delegation voted in favour of the text as a whole because we believe that attacks on nuclear facilities must be prohibited. This matter has been considered in the multilateral negotiating body, the Conference on Disarmament, in which body my country has worked consistently, and will continue to work, for a ban on attacks on nuclear facilities. But we must be frank and make it clear that our vote in favour of this draft resolution does not in any way mean that we do not have differences with regard to some of the ideas contained in the text.

First, we deeply regret the way in which the text was, so to speak, negotiated. We also regret the fact that the main sponsors did not allow for the kind of negotiations that would have made it possible to avoid the resultant text, bearing in mind the various issues contained therein.

My delegation feels that there are certain inconsistencies. In some places there is reference to safeguarded nuclear facilities, whereas in other places there is reference simply to nuclear facilities. For the purposes of the work that we are doing, and with a view to achieving our objectives, it would have been much better to refer to nuclear facilities for peaceful purposes. We believe that this would have enabled us to avoid the problems that are reflected in the results of the voting.

(Mr. Rivero, Cuba)

Furthermore, operative paragraph 2 calls upon all States "to abide by any decisions taken by the Security Council". In the view of my delegation this is a vague way to make an appeal to States in connection with decisions of the Security Council; it does not specify the decisions that are at issue and this could lead to different interpretations. We would have preferred either to eliminate the confusing reference in paragraph 2 to decisions of the Security Council, especially as paragraph 1 already contains the idea, or to refer to clearly defined decisions of the Security Council. The reference to "any decisions" is too vague,

(Mr.Rivero, Cuba)

We are talking about the maintenance of international peace and security, and Member States must be clear about which decisions by the Security Council are involved: it is not a question of abiding by "any decisions".

In respect of operative paragraph 4, my delegation has no formal objection to Member States considering the possibility of the diplomatic conference mentioned here: we believe that this might be another way to try to protect or expand the protection of nuclear- facilities, but that this does not mean that we should not continue the work within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament that we have been doing despite a number of difficulties. For this reason, we would have preferred to see, in operative paragraph 3, a much clearer reference to the Conference *on* Disarmament, to the effect that it should step up its work, and an appeal to the participants in that Conference to exert all possible efforts.

This brings me to something that is striking in its absence from the draft resolution, and that is - if we are really talking about prohibiting or preventing attacks on nuclear facilities - a paragraph that condemns or rejects such attacks on nuclear facilities. In our delegation's view, the lack of such a paragraph in this draft resolution is a serious omission.

To sum up, Cuba's general objective has been to improve this text. We would urge that next year, when we are called upon to consider a similar text, we should have broader consultations and the opinions of other countries should be taken into account.

Mrs. MANTILLA (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to give a brief explanation of its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38. Ecuador voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, and in favour of operative paragraph 4 specifically: however, we abstained when operative paragraphs 1 and 2 were put to the vote because we believe that all nuclear

(Mrs. Mantilla, Ecuador)

facilities should be covered by the obligation not to use force, in other words, by the obligation not to attack them.

Ecuador believes that the obligations contained in the instruments that refer to the need to submit all such facilities to United Nations safeguards mechanisms should be complied with. Furthermore, Ecuador considers it essential to avoid any type of assertion that might be interpreted as encouraging the Security Council to act in certain cases, or placing conditions on such action. The Charter of the United Nations states specifically the circumstances in which the Security Council can and should act and gives it the necessary authority to take decisions to that end.

Mr. AGAYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation wishes to explain the reasons for its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38.

The Soviet Union is a convinced supporter of the view that practical measures to prohibit attacks on nuclear facilities should be worked out as soon as possible.

I should like to take this opportunity to recall that since 1982 we have on more than one occasion put forward specific proposals on this issue for consideration both by the General Assembly and by the Conference on Disarmament. The Soviet Union has ratified Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, which prohibits attacks on nuclear power stations. and considers that the international legal régime protecting nuclear facilities needs further strengthening.

During the consideration of this issue in the Geneva Conference's Ad hoq Committee on Radiological Weapons, the Soviet Union has adopted a flexible position aimed at seeking mutually acceptable decisions on all the problems involved. Thus, while preferring that the issue of prohibiting attacks on nuclear facilities be

(Mr. Agayev, USSR)

considered separately from that of banning radiological weapons in the traditional sense, we have stated that we are prepared for these issues to be settled within the framework of a single agreement. The drafting of two separate conventions on these issues by the Conference on Disarmament would also be acceptable to us, on the understanding that they must enter into force at the same time.

As for the category of nuclear facilities which should be protected from attack, the Soviet Union has specifically expressed its agreement to having protection both for peaceful and for military nuclear facilities, with the exception of those facilities associated with weapons systems.

We are ready to examine constructively all possible variants for a solution to the problem of preventing attacks on nuclear facilities, in the interest of seeking a compromise outcome. In our view, draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.38,** just adopted, is, on the whole, a proper response to the need to step up multilateral consideration of the issue of prohibiting attacks on nuclear facilities, and takes fresh approaches into account. The Soviet delegation therefore voted in favour of it.

Mr. **CHADHA** (India): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.38,** entitled "Prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities".

It is an undisputed fact that an armed attack on any nuclear installation, safeguarded or not, could result in radioactive releases with grave consequences within and beyond the boundaries of the State which has been attacked. Consequently, there is a need to improve the present **régime** with regard to the protection of all nuclear facilities. Resolution **GC(XXXI)/RES/475,** adopted by the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency on 28 September 1987, which is quoted in draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.38,** also mentions the need to protect all nuclear installations in this context.

(Mr. Chadha, India)

Operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution we have just adopted, however, mention safeguarded facilities only, thus eliminating from the resolution's purview other nuclear installations and, in an indirect manner, condoning attacks on other nuclear installations. My delegation therefore abstained from voting on these paragraphs and on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. AMIGUES (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, concerning the prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities.

My delegation abstained from voting on this draft resolution as a whole and voted against operative paragraphs 1 and 4, for the following reasons. First, France does not share the view of the sponsors of the draft resolution that the threat of an armed attack against a nuclear facility should automatically entail an obligation for the Security Council to act. Secondly, France considers that the Conference on Disarmament is not the proper forum for dealing with the issue of attacks on nuclear facilities, which is an issue of humanitarian law in armed conflicts - a fact recognized, indeed, in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. The deadlock on this matter - which has lasted years now - at the Conference on Disarmament justifies, a posteriori, France's non-participation in its work. Thirdly, turning to the Protocol of 1977 additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949, France did not subscribe to all the provisions of the Protocol for reasons relating to France's security policy, but has no objection to a diplomatic conference with a view to strengthening the existing régime.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.38** as a whole and **on** operative paragraphs 1 and 2. With regard to our abstention on paragraph 1, we do not agree with its content, inasmuch as it departs from the criterion of mass destruction which should be observed in dealing with the subject.

Moreover, in our opinion, it contains serious gaps from a technical standpoint, since there are certain installations which, in accordance with the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), do not need safeguards and which we feel should be protected, since their destruction, if they were to be attacked, could result in radioactive dissemination and have effects similar to those weapons of mass destruction.

We believe **that** this type of selective draft resolution does not constitute the best way of dealing with the subject of the prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities, and that such selective draft resolutions in fact are directed at other collateral objectives.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1,** in cluster 9.

Mr. **CHADHA** (India): Draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1,** entitled "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security", covers a theme which should be of universal concern since it pertains to the qualitative improvement of weapons and weapons systems, their impact on the global security environment and the need to channel scientific and technological developments for peaceful needs and the benefit of mankind. The considerations behind the draft resolution were spelled out by my delegation while introducing the draft resolution earlier in the current session of the General Assembly,

(Mr. Chadha, India)

The draft resolutions on the subject received wide support during the last two sessions of the General Assembly, and it is our hope that that support will be further increased when the draft resolution is voted upon today, so as to express the universality of the concern in the Committee on this important issue.

It has certainly been the objective of our delegation to hold extensive consultations towards this end, and draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1 represents the results of that effort. We thank the delegations which have co-operated with us.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1, entitled "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security**. Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24 was introduced by the representative of India at the 29th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1990.

There is an oral statement in connection with the draft resolution.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1 are the following: Afghanistan, Bolivia, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Costa Rica, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Peru, Sri Lanka and Venezuela.

I have to make the following statement on behalf of the Secretary-General with regard to the draft resolution.

By the terms of operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to follow scientific and technological developments in order to make an assessment of emerging "new

(Mr. Rheradi)

technologies" and submit to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session a framework for technology assessment guided, inter alia, by the criteria suggested in his report.

In carrying out this task, the Secretary-General would take such actions as practicable within the existing resources of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, and therefore there would be no additional programme budget implications for the biennium 1990-1991.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Paso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti. Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1 was adopted by 113 votes to 3, with 16 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on representatives who wish to explain their votes.

hrs. MIEDEMA (Netherlands): The Netherlands, regrettably, could not support draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1 on scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security. Although the draft resolution has been improved, it still does not have, in our view, the right conceptual point of departure. We accept the sincere motivation of the authors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1, but we believe that the most appropriate way of dealing with these concerns would have been to incorporate them in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1. However, this did not happen, so now we have to address draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1 on its own merits.

The pursuit of scientific and technological development is in itself, in our view, an abstract - that is, an unqualifiable - process. It is the application of scientific and technological research that may have a beneficial, a neutral or a negative effect, This holds true, also, for military applications, which may hamper disarmament efforts but are equally likely to enhance and strengthen international security.

(Mrs. Miedema, Netherlands)

To mention one example, scientific and technological developments as applied, for instance, to satellites could further transparency as well as better knowledge of military capabilities. In the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1, the Assembly would stress the possible negative impact of scientific and technological developments on the security environment and on the process of arms limitation and disarmament. The Netherlands, however, holds the view that modern military technology, if properly used, may very well serve stability and enhance security.

These reasons prompted us to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1.

Mr. KENYON (United Kingdom): Now that we have completed action on the two draft resolutions on the subject of science and technology in relation to disarmament - cluster 9 - I should like to explain why it was that, while the United Kingdom was able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1, it felt obliged to vote against A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1.

In giving approval for future consideration of issues, including the commitment of resources, it is essential that the work involved is clearly defined, realistic and directly in support of the objectives of the First Committee. It is the United Kingdom's view that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1 meets these criteria. This draft resolution is focused on the positive contribution that science and technology could make to arms control and disarmament, in particular in the field of verification of compliance with agreements and treaties.

In draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1 the Secretary-General is asked to undertake a wide-ranging task in assessing the whole field of emerging technologies in relation to the disarmament process in general. In our view, to undertake such a task effectively would demand a great deal of resources.

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

We welcome the report of the Secretary-General entitled "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security" (A/45/568). We must be selective in considering how to follow up the conclusions of that report.

We consider that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1 represents the most practical and cost-effective step forward.

Mr. JANDL (Austria): Austria voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1, entitled **Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security". As in previous years, we have supported the draft resolution on this subject because we are in agreement with the basic thrust of the text. At the same time, we are quite aware of the dual applicability of technological advancements. Although they are a priori neutral in their essence, they can entail negative effects for peace and security if applied with hostile intent. The potential to create new weapons systems or refine existing ones and make them more sophisticated can contribute to decreasing stability and, in certain circumstances, increase the probability of conflicts.

On the other hand, my delegation wants to emphasize that science and technology can also have very positive effects on peace and security, in particular in the field of the implementation and verification of disarmament agreements, as well as in connection with the task of weapons disposal. These aspects are appropriately reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1, of which my delegation has the honour to be a sponsor and which was adopted by the Committee unanimously.

I should like to add that the fact that scientific and technological advancements can have both negative and positive effects on international security was also elaborated on at the Sendai seminar earlier this year, which is mentioned in the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1. In this

(Mr. Jandl, Austria)

context, let me quote from the statement of Under-Secretary-General Yasushi Akashi at the Sendai meeting:

"I hope that we shall be better able to identify the scientific and technological developments that offer the greatest prospects for building mutual confidence and understanding, for preventing accidents and unwanted escalation and for assisting in the verification of international agreements. I also hope that we are able to gain a clearer perspective on developments which may pose the greatest risk of exacerbating vulnerability, arms races or instabilities that complicate efforts to negotiate lower levels of force."

hearing in mind the negative as well as the positive applications of scientific and technological developments in the military and related fields and hence their positive and negative impacts on international security, and in the hope that the sponsors might take up this dual aspect next year, Austria voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1.

Ms. MASON (Canada): I have asked to speak to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1, entitled "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security".

My delegation abstained on this draft resolution primarily because it continues to contain elements that we cannot fully support. We would have preferred to be able to vote in favour of it, particularly since it is evident that the draft resolution's sponsors made very considerable efforts to recognize the complexity of the issues involved in this area, the diversity of views and the need for closer co-operation among States to assess how best to deal with these.

We note that there had been some discussion this year of the possibility of merging this draft resolution with the parallel draft resolution, of which we are a sponsor, on *'Science and technology for disarmament*@. We regret that in the event

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

this did not prove possible. We hope that this apparent inclination to seek a comprehensive expression of the international community's diverse concerns in this area will become, through further consultations and exchanges, a clear trend and that in the near future we shall be able to support a single draft resolution on this issue.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1, in cluster 12.

Mr. GAJDA (Hungary): The Hungarian delegation wishes to make a short statement in connection with the draft resolution that will be acted upon today and in that context to say a few words on another draft resolution that was put to the vote at our last meeting. Originally they were both scheduled for action yesterday.

(Mr. Gaida, Hungary)

It is with great regret that the Hungarian delegation notes the unfortunate fact that the report of the Conference on Disarmament has again this year become the subject of sharp exchanges.

As long as the single multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament matters operates, and most pertinently so, on the basis of consensus, and its yearly report to the General Assembly is drafted and adopted in the same manner, that report in our considered view should be the subject of a non-controversial, in essence procedural, draft resolution.

This, however, has not been the case for some time and is not the case at the present session either. The wording of the draft resolution before our Committee (A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1) simply precludes its adoption without a great number of dissenting votes, including the votes of numerous members of the Conference on Disarmament as well.

Hungary, a member of the Conference on Disarmament, is always eager and ready to contribute its share to progress in negotiations on real problems. It is also ready to engage in debate on matters of real substance where the common goal is to achieve agreement on important issues. We are not, however, willing to get locked into never-ending, self-generating polemics which cannot take us anywhere and which in the end can become even counter-productive to negotiations. We simply cannot be part of such exercises.

It was with that consideration in mind that the Hungarian delegation was unable to support the draft resolution on a comprehensive programme of disarmament contained in document A/C.1/45/L.32, which was voted upon at the previous meeting.

At a time when the future of the Conference on Disarmament - and, in fact, the multilateral disarmament negotiating process as a whole - is the subject of

(Mr. Gajda, Hungary)

agonizing debate, not to mention many chastising criticisms, it is simply unrealistic to try to force upon the Conference on Disarmament topics that have long proved unproductive.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1, which is now before the Committee, reflects similar designs, disregarding facts of life and previous conclusions. It is therefore with great regret that the Hungarian delegation finds itself obliged to abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: 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.26/Rev.1 are Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". This draft resolution was introduced by Yugoslavia at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1990.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, 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, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar. Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Liechtenstein, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1 was adopted by 108 votes to 8, with 16 abstentions.*

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

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

Mr. AGAYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation voted for draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament'*. We support it5 critical tone. At the same time the draft could, in our view, have more fully reflected the real state of affairs at the Conference, including the positive aspects connected to the process of rationalization of the work of that forum which has begun.

It is true that we cannot reconcile ourselves to the fact that the negotiation process at the Conference is clearly lagging behind the dynamism of world developments and is proceeding at a pace characteristic of the post-war period. The first steps to enhance the effectiveness of the Conference's work undertaken during its summer session, although still clearly insufficient, nevertheless are in the right direction. The most important thing is that at the Conference a purposeful collective search has begun in today's rapidly changing world. As we see it here, we cannot bank on simple decisions, and in drawing them up it will be necessary to take into account a great number of factors, including the real progress made in discussion of one or another issue at the Conference. The Soviet Union firmly favours having the Conference in fact reaffirming its capability to go from an exchange of views to drawing up responsible decisions on matters on its agenda. In our view the Conference's primary objective is still the speediest conclusion of negotiations to draw up a convention on a full and effective ban on producing, acquiring and storing all forms of chemical weapons and their destruction. We sincerely hope that in 1991 the last remaining obstacles to agreement on a convention on chemical weapons will be overcome.

In the Conference's work, we must concentrate our efforts on such priority areas a8 the cessation of nuclear tests. It is high time to begin multilateral negotiations on drawing up an agreement on a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests. A

(Mr. Agayev, USSR)

substantive intensification of work is also needed for consideration of issues connected with preventing an arms race in outer space. It is important, finally, more fully to highlight possible practical measures in other areas as well. We welcome the efforts being undertaken to enhance the effectiveness of the Conference on Disarmament, in the framework of the present session of the General Assembly, including consultations which are being held by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban, Ambassador Donowaki. I should like to express the hope that these efforts will in the last analysis lead to having appropriate resolutions on the report of the Conference receive general support by delegations at the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Agayev, USSR)

We are sincerely convinced that the Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, will in the near future be able to demonstrate its important role in negotiations on disarmament issues of truly high priority. For our part, we are ready to promote the implementation of the objectives before us.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): "Consensus" is the key word applicable to the Conference on Disarmament. In that single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum views are expressed across the whole spectrum of political articulation. How could the work of that forum be done otherwise than by consensus? Would it not therefore be preferable for the report of the Conference on Disarmament, containing rather diverging views on all sorts of political issues, to be presented to the General Assembly by all States members of the Conference on Disarmament together? In our view, the consensus reached in the Conference on its annual report should have its echo in the General Assembly, in the same way as the General Assembly deals with the report of the Disarmament Commission, that is, by adoption of a consensus resolution,

The General Assembly addresses all items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament by means of specific resolutions pertaining to the subject-matter of the respective items. There is no good reason to deal with the name issues again in the resolution on the report of the Conference on Disarmament, a resolution which should be of a general and non-controversial nature.

As is known, the Netherlands delegation has been exerting its beat efforts in the last few years to arrive at the adoption of a draft resolution under agenda item 60(b) along the lines I have just mentioned, with a view to enabling the General Assembly to endorse the report of the Conference on Disarmament without a vote - but to no avail, Again, the First Committee has bean called upon to take

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

action on a clearly controversial draft. To what end? Is the General Assembly supposed to resolve the political difficulties that manifest themselves between delegations of the Conference on Disarmament as well as the ensuing differences in approach to the organization of work in that body? The fear seems warranted that the effect of the language used in document A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1 might be rather counter-productive.

The Netherlands delegation regrets that the General Assembly will once again be unable to adopt a widely sponsored draft resolution without a vote. We should have preferred the matter of substance under consideration to have been dealt with in a procedural way, in conformity with the high status of the Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum.

Mr. KENYON (United Kingdom): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1, on the report of the Conference on Disarmament, I should like to associate the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland with the explanation of vote given by the representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

Mr. MORRIS (Australia): Although Australia voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1, we must express our regret that this year yet again it has not been possible for the sponsors of the text to produce a resolution capable of enjoying consensus support.

The Conference on Disarmament works by consensus, and its annual report is adopted by consensus. It follows that in the First Committee draft resolutions on the Conference should also be susceptible to consensus. We are aware of and appreciate the efforts to negotiate a single text, but Australia hopes that next year a greater and even more concerted attempt can be made to produce a text capable of support by all members of the Committee.

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

On the substance of the text, we note that in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26 the General Assembly would urge the Conference on Disarmament to provide negotiating mandates to ad hoc committees on all of its agenda items. Australia would not object to the establishment of ad hoc committees with negotiating mandates on any item on the agenda of the Conference if consensus to do so existed. However, we also note that the Conference on Disarmament has various alternative methods at its disposal which may occasionally be more appropriate, especially when these might be the only way to advance the work of the Conference.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): On behalf of the United States of America I, too, should like to associate myself fully with the comments made by the representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the following draft resolutions in cluster 13: draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1, A/C.1/45/L.42 and A/C.1/45/L.50/Rev.1.

As no delegations wish to explain their vote before the voting, the Committee will now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space: confidence-building measures in outer space". This draft resolution has programme budget implications, as set out in document A/C.1/45/L.59.

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

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The list of sponsor8 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1 are: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mexico, Peru, Sweden, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, 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, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, 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, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar. Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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: None

Abstaiaing: United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1 was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will not proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.42, entitled "Verification in all its aspects: study on the role of the United Nations in the field of verification". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 28th meeting of the First Committee on 6 November 1990. An oral statement will be made with regard to it.

I shall now call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of co-sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.42 are as follows: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

I should also like to make the following statement on behalf of the Secretary-General with regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/45/L.42, entitled "Verification in all its aspects: study on the role of the United Nations in the field of verification".

"By the terms of operative paragraph 5, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to take appropriate action within available resources on the recommendations of the Group and, by operative paragraph 7, would request the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session on actions taken by Member States and by the United Nations Secretariat to implement these recommendations.

"In carrying out these tasks, the Secretary-General would take such actions as are practicable within the existing resourcea of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, supplemented by any relevant voluntary resources that may be received to implement the recommendations of the Group. There would therefore be no additional programme budget implications for the biennium 1990-1991."

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.42 be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly,

It was so decide@.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.50/Rev.1 entitled "General and complete disarmament: defensive security concepts and policies'*. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the 27th meeting of the First Committee on 6 November 1990. The draft resolution has programme budget implications, contained in document A/C.1/45/L.61.

Before proceeding to the vote, I shall call on the Secretary of the Committea to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.50/Rev.1 are as follows: Australia, Austria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Sweden and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.50/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, 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, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar. Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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, Waited Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.50/Rev.1 was adopted by 124 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations which wish to explain their vote on the draft resolutions in cluster 13.

Mr. GALVAO (Brazil}: My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.50/Rev.1, because we agreed with the main thrust and objective of this text. Nevertheless, we believe that some of the elements in the draft resolution are not well defined. Certain terms referred to are not generally in use or are employed in a context in which they might be ambiguous. This is particularly true of the pairing of the words "security" and "stability" when it would certainly have been better to use the term "peace and security**.

We hope that the study to be undertaken by the Secretary-General will contribute to making the interesting and positive idea of defensive security concepts and policies conceptually clear and better defined.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): The United States abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1, entitled "Confidence-building measures in outer space", does not imply opposition either to the principle of confidence-building measures in outer space or to the idea of a study per se. We would have preferred, as a more economical step, for the draft resolution to state that the General Assembly invites Member States to present their views on the subject to the Secretary-General. Such views could have included the different technologies available for such confidence-building measures and mechanisms for international co-operation. Members could then have reviewed the compilation of views made by the Secretary-General to determine what steps should follow. We would certainly have joined the consensus had there been a draft resolution along those lines.

Mr. AGAYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) {interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1, entitled "Confidence-building measures *in* outer space". We share the view that in any expansion of the use of outer space there is a need for greater transparency and for a strengthening of confidence-building measures. The Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space of the Conference on Disarmament has been carrying out a great deal of work to highlight areas in which such measures could be adopted and we have a positive opinion of the results of that work. In that connection the Soviet delegation wishes to emphasize that in supporting the idea - to be found in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1 - of carrying out a study concerning such confidence-building measures in outer space. The Soviet delegation believes that *such* a study will not replace or duplicate *the* work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space of the Conference on Disarmament,

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded the consideration of and action on the draft resolutions prescribed for this morning.

At the next meeting of the First Committee, which will take place tomorrow morning, we shall take up all of the remaining draft resolutions, namely: in cluster 5, draft resolutions **A/C.1/45/L.5** and **A/C.1/45/L.35;** in cluster 7, draft resolutions **A/C.1/45/L.39** A and **B** and **A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1;** in cluster 11, draft resolutions **A/C.1/45/L.30, A/C.1/45/L.31** and **A/C.1/45/L.41;** in cluster 12, draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.12;** and in cluster 13, draft resolutions **A/C.1/45/L.10, A/C.1/45/L.49** and **A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1.**

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.