UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
38th meeting
held on
Friday, 16 November 1990
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 38th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. RANA (Nepal)

CONTENTS

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

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/45/PV.38
23 November 1990
ENGLISH

90-63232 321611 (E)

The meetinu was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 45 TO 66 AND 155 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will first take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.5 and L.35, in cluster 5, and draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.39 A and B and L.45/Rev.1, in cluster 7. Subsequently, the Committee will take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.30, L.31 and L.41, in cluster 11. Then the Committee will-take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.12/Rev.1, in cluster 12. After taking action on those draft resolutions, the Committee will take action on draft resolutions listed in cluster 13: A/C.1/45/L.10, L.49 and L.53/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I have to inform the Committee that Panama has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5.

The PRESIDENT: Before we proceed to take action on the draft resolutions I have mentioned, I shall call upon delegations that wish to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. MARIN BOSCB <Mexico) {interpretation from Spanish): The agenda item *'Cessation of all nuclear-test explosions** has been the subject of more General Assembly resolutions than any other, with the unfortunate exception of the question of apartheid. It is an item the international community defined and to which it gave high priority more than three decades ago. Stubborn resistance by some has prevented the cessation of test explosions, which would be of fundamental importance in stopping the nuclear-arms race. The vast majority of States must continue in the General Assembly and at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament to advocate the speedy adoption of such a measure and to explore other avenues for multilateral co-operation, such as the amendment procedures provided for in the

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

1963 partial test-ban Treaty. We must continue to struggle with the same enthusiasm as was shown more than a century ago by abolitionists the world over in the fight against slavery.

With regard to agenda item 46, "Cessation of all nuclear-test explosions", I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.30, which is sponsored by the delegations of Afghanistan, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, Myanmar. Peru, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Mexico. The text of the draft resolution is basically the same as that of last year's resolution 44/105. In the preambular part reference is made to the priority assigned to this question, which the General Assembly has been considering for more than 30 years and on which it has adopted more than 70 resolutions. In this connection, I have to amend the second preambular paragraph to read "seventy" rather than "fifty".

In the preamble, also, the undertakings under the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water are referred to and a 1964 statement by the Secretary-General, the 1988 affirmation by the leaders of the Six-Nation Initiative, and the document adopted by the 1989 non-aligned summit are recalled.

In the penultimate preambular paragraph note is taken with satisfaction of the progress made in the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts on seismic events; and in the final preambular paragraph the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban by the Conference on Disarmament at its summer session in 1990 is noted.

In the operative part of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.30, the General Assembly would reiterate

"its grave concern that nuclear testing continues unabated, against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of Member States"

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

and would reaffirm

"its conviction that a treaty to achieve the prohibition of all nuclear test explosions by all States for all time is a matter of the highest priority;"

and that

"such a treaty would constitute a contribution of the utmost importance to the cessation of the nuclear-arms race."

In paragraph 4 the' Assembly would urge

"once more all nuclear-weapon States, in particular the three depositary States of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water and of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to seek to achieve the early discontinuance of all test explasions of nuclear weapons for all time and to expedite negotiations to this end".

This means to negotiate a treaty in the Conference on Disarmament; and in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the draft resolution the modalities for such negotiations are set out.

(Mr. Marin Bosch. Mexico)

The sponsors hope that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.30 will gain strong support from the overwhelming majority of States Membersof the United Nations. The text was distributed on 31 October, more than a fortnight ago, but even before that we had entered into consultations with the delegations of Australia and New Zealand, the main sponsors of the other draft resolution on this subject, draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.41. Yesterday we believed that we had reached agreement on a single text, and we wish to express our appreciation to those two delegations, and in particular Mr. Morris of Australia, as well as to the other delegations that traditionally sponsor the other draft resolution on this item. This year's draft resolution will also enjoy Mexico's full support.

I said that we believed we had reached agreement on a single text. However, only a few hours ago we were told that a small group of countries had rejected what a large number of countries had negotiated and agreed upon. We regret this, inter alia because such an attitude runs counter to the spirit that should guide the work and consultations of the Committee.

Mr. MORRIS (Australia): I wish to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.41, entitled "Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty". The draft resolution has the following sponsors: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sweden, Thailand, Vanuatu and Zaire,

The draft resolution on this subject, of which Australia and New Zealand alternate as principal sponsor, claims the broad support of the international community. Indeed, last year it was supported by the overwhelming majority of Member States, with only two negative votes and six abstentions. The sponsors trust that it will again receive such support,

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

The central purpose of the draft resolution is to encourage and direct the work on a comprehensive test ban in the Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, where the test-ban question is the first item on the agenda. This year the Conference re-established late in its session an Ad Hoc Committee to focus on specific and interrelated test-ban issues, including structure and scope as well as verification and compliance. Time did not allow, however, such a.focused consideration to move very far. In operative paragraph 2, therefore, the General Assembly would call on the Conference on Disarmament to re-establish its Ad Hoc Committee at the beginning of its 1991 session in order to carry forward this work.

The detailed work of the Group of Seismic Experts, which, on the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, will make an essential contribution to the verification of such a treaty, is outlined and encouraged in paragraph 3. This, along with the work outlined in paragraph 2 referred to above, constitutes the most practical and feasible route to the multilateral preparation for a test ban currently available.

A few new elements appear in the draft resolution this year. In response to a wide range of concerns based on threats and potential threats to the environment from nuclear testing, we have included reference to such concerns. We also refer, naturally, to developments which have taken place during the year, including: the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee in the Conference on Disarmament; the agreement on a Treaty on peaceful nuclear explosions and a partial test-ban Treaty by the United States and the Soviet Union; progress in the sphere of nuclear disarmament? and the call by a large number of States parties to the 1963 Moscow Treaty - the partial test-ban Treaty - for an amendment conference to convert that Treaty into a compreheaaive test ban,

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

We consider that with these additions we again have a text which is representative of the views of the vast majority of Member States, and we strongly commend it to all for their positive support.

Having introduced draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.41, I should like to say a few words about the question of a single text on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. Member States will be aware that there are currently two draft resolutions on this subject before the First Committee. Australia, as a staunch supporter of a comprehensive test ban, supports both. Member States may be aware also that for the past four weeks an extensive and intensive series of negotiations has taken place between the authors of both texts with a view to reaching a single text that would command the overwhelming support of the international community. At this point I should like to pay a tribute to Ambassador Marin Bosch for the way in which he conducted the negotiations from his side.

The process was embarked upon by all involved in good faith, and creative new approaches were found. At one point it appeared that we might indeed have found a compromise text. That, unfortunately, proved not to be the case. A few States had difficulties with the concepts involved in the suggested text, and had we pursued that path we might have given the world the impression that the international demand for a test ban was waning. We are convinced that this is not the case. Australia hopes, nevertheless, that what was achieved will not be lost and that at the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly we shall achieve the single text that eluded us at this session.

Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom welcomes the adoption yesterday by consensus of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.42, on verification in all its aspects. In the draft resolution the report of the Secretary-General on the

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

subject is commended. In supporting that commendation, the United Kingdom would like to draw particular attention to an important section of the report, section II 6, which deals with verification measures and the need for treaty specificity. We much welcome the emphasis in this section of the report on treaty specificity. We find it difficult to envisage a single international system of verification which would cover a range of different multilateral agreements. Our experience of negotiation and implementation of arms-control and disarmament agreements demonstrates that, while there are some general principles that can be applied to verification measures, such measures and their method of implementation can vary significantly depending on the nature of the agreement.

It is essential that the method of implementation of verification provisions give the necessary degree of confidence in compliance for all parties to any particular agreement. This will mean that in many cases verification will be the responsibility of the States parties to an agreement and of the secretariat for that agreement. The forthcoming chemical weapons convention is a case in point.

I turn now to a draft resolution on which action will be taken today. I should like to introduce, on behalf of its sponsors, draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35, entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations".

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

The sponsors of the draft resolution are Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The sponsors feel that one of the most important factors in the current world situation is the increase in understanding and co-operation between the United States and the Soviet Union. International security is increased and our disarmament objectives are brought nearer to attainment when those two Powers are able to agree to substantive arms reductions, particularly nuclear arms reductions, and to other means of enhancing strategic stability.

We believe that any resolution on the question of bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union should be designed to welcome the achievements in that process to date and to encourage further progress. Clearly, such encouragement can be effective only if both the United States and the Soviet Union feel able to support the resolution itself. If, on the other hand, they feel that the resolution presses them too hard and, particularly, if it presses them to change the direction of their endeavours in ways unacceptable to them, it would not be productive.

It is also our opinion that, given the importance of the bilateral nuclear arms negotiations to us all, the Committee's objective should be a single draft resolution adopted by consensus. The text of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35 embodies the approach I have just described. St notes the important statements of the two Presidents of 1 June 1990, welcomes the prospect of a treaty on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms (START) in ths near future and the agreement to pursue new negotiations on nuclear and space arms following the signature of the START treaty. It calls on the two Governments to spare no effort in seeking the agreed objectives of the negotiations.

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

We recognize that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5 have other concerns which they feel it proper to put to the United States and the Soviet Union regarding the bilateral negotiations. We therefore felt it important to attempt a merger of our draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35 with draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5, sponsored by Yugoslavia on behalf of the Movement of Ron-Aligned Countries. We appreciated that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5 was much closer to our ideas than its predecessors at the forty-third and forty-fourth sessions of the General Assembly and this gave us considerable encouragement. We are grateful to the sponsors of that draft resolution for the careful consideration which they gave to our proposals and their co-operative spirit. We particularly thank the delegation of Yugoslavia for its efforts.

Unfortunately, the gap between our positions proved in the end too large to bridge in the time available and it has been necessary to put both draft resolutions to the vote. Whilst regretting this, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35 express the hope that, at the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly, it will indeed prove possible to draft a single text on the bilateral nuclear arms negotiations.

Mr. AMIGUES (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation ia pleased to inform the Committee that, following intensive consultations with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53, entitled "Tenth anniversary of the United Rations Institute for Disarmament Research", we produced draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1, which is before the Committee for a decision.

The main changes in the revised draft relate to operative paragraph 7, concerning the study which the General Assembly would ask the United Rations Institute for Dfsarmament Research (UNIDIR) to prepare, and also to paragraph 4, on the way in which the study would be financed, The solution found inthe revised

(Mr. Amiques, France)

draft has been the subject of consultations with all delegations involved and has been accepted by them.

As the Committee is aware. UNIDIR has, since its founding, had satisfactory support from the United Nations and a proper balance has been maintained between financing the Institute through voluntary contributions and through grants from the regular budget. The latter is necessary to ensure the independence of the Institute and is also in keeping with its statute, as noted in the draft resolution.

In asking UNIDIR to study the economic aspect of disarmament - which would be financed equally from the regular budget and from voluntary contributions - the General Assembly would be acting in accordance with the spirit of UNIDIR. Studies carried out by UNIDIR complement the studies carried out the Department for Disarmament Affairs, and by reason of their exploratory character they relate mainly to new issues.

My delegation would like to emphasize that the States sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1 would be pleased if the draft resolution could gain consensus and general support for UNIDIR. We trust that Member States will confirm their support by agreeing to a consensus on the draft resolution and also by making voluntary contributions permitting the partial financing of the study in question.

Mr. SUTRESNA (Indonesia): In my capacity as current Chairman of the Disarmament Commission, I should like to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.12/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission".

As representatives may note, operative paraq 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the draft resolution reflect the outcome of the 1990 substantive session of the Commission held in Way 1990, the results of which have been widely commended.

In paragraph 8, the General Assembly would endorse the set of measures of the reform programme adopted by the Disarmsment Commission, Paragraph 10 relates to the question of substantive agenda items for the 1991 session. As members of the

(Mr. Sutresna, Indonesia)

Committee may recall, the Commission had conducted extensive consultations over the past few months on that issue with delegations and held six open-ended meetings with a view to reaching agreement on a set of agenda items for the 1991 session of the Commission.

At the consultation meeting of the Commission, held on 15 November, consensus was reached on a set of agenda items for the 1991 session, which are as follows:

"(1) Objective information on military matters;

"(2) Process of nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons;

"(3) Regional approach to disarmament within the context of global security:

"(4) The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields.'*

The agreed agenda items are now reflected in paragraph 10 of revised draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.12/Rev.1. In this connection, I should like to express my gratitude to all delegations for their co-operation and for the spirit of compromise which enabled the Commission to reach consensus, on a set of agenda items for its 1991 session.

On behalf of the sponsors and of the Disarmament Commission, I request that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.12/Rev.1 be adopted by consensus.

Mr. KOTEVSKI (Yugoslavia): We regret that, despite intensive negotiations, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35 are not in a position to accept the proposed compromise and agree on a single text on bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations.

By merging the two drafts the non-aligned countries, on whose behalf I am speaking, wont quite far in an effort to meet the concerns of other States. We even ● ☒□❒♏○♋♏♎ a readiness to introduce some mow important changes ir draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5, in the hope that the changes that are taking place in international relations and the positive international climate would enable us, this year, to agree on a single text on such an important issue.

Unfortunately, despite all efforts - and I should like to express our thank8 and appreciation to all participants in the negotiations, particularly the delegation of the United Kingdom - the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.5 and A/C. 1/45/L.35 were not able to reach agreement. Therefore, as happened last year, my delegation will be obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35.

Finally, I wish to repeat something that I said when I was introducing draft rerolution A/C.1/45/L.5: that, in our view, the international community ought to have a joint position in respect of an issue a8 important a8 bilateral nuclsar-arm8 negotiations. We sincerely hop. - as, we are pleased to have heard, do the sponsors of draft rerolution A/C.1/45/L.35 - that next year we shall be in a position to have such a text.

The CHAIRMAN: A8 no representative want8 to speak in explanation of vote, or otherwise, in respect of draft resolutions in cluster 5, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5, entitled "General and complete disarmament" and ha8 the subtitle "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations".

(The Chairman)

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November 1990.

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

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5 are as follows: Yugoslavia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-aligned Countires, and Panama.

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 Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, 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, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5 was adopted by 109 votes to none, with 20 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35, entitled "General and complete disarmament" and has the subtitle "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations".

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 16 November 1990.

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

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35 are as follows: Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

---

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet 'Socialist Republic; Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Viet Nam

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tansania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35 was adopted by 70 votes to none, with abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on the representative of Hungary, who wishes to explain his vote.

Mr. GAJDA (Hungary): The Hungarian delegation had sincerely hoped that separate votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.5 and A/C.1/45/L.35 would not take place and that this explanation would not be required. As a sponsor of one of these two draft resolutions on the same subject, my delegation believes that bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations are so important that only one draft resolution should have been submitted, and consequently, put to the vote in the General Assembly. That would have been more to the point.

We are aware of the efforts made to that effect by various delegations and therefore regret even more that again this year full success could not be achieved.

We voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5 in spite of its shortcomings. This affirmative vote, however, is due much more to the subject-matter - that is, the negotiations and their progress - than to the wording of the draft resolution, We can only urge the authors of both drafts to take a few more steps next year in order to succeed in finding common ground for a single draft resolution on biiateral nuclear-arms negotiations.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.39 A and B and A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1, listed in cluster 7.

I shall call on those representatives wishing to make statements other than in explanation of their positions on draft resolutions in cluster 7.

Mr. KAPAMBWE (Zambia): Since this is the first time that my delegation has spoken, allow me to join all those who have spoken before me in congratulating you, Sir, and your colleagues in the Bureau on being elected to your respective positions. My delegation wishes to place on record its great satisfaction at the way you have conducted the work of the Committee so far. We are confident that the rest of your tenure will be just as distinguished.

(Mr. Kaaambwe, Zambia)

We are meeting today to take action on a draft resolution that is of great importance to my country, Zambia, and the countries in the region of southern Africa, and, indeed, to all the countries on the continent of Africa. I am here referring to the two parts of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/45/L.39, entitled, respectively, "Implementation of the Declaration" on the denuclearization of Africa, and "Nuclear capability of South Africa", which were introduced by the representative of Sierra Leone on 6 November 1990 on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States.

I have always known the African delegations to be active participants in the work of the Committee. This year has been no different. Even on those agenda items that relate to regions other than their own, African delegations have participated with equal zeal, often helping to promote understanding where misunderstanding threatens to pit countries of other regions against one another.

While the African countries have always been guided by the principle that all the issues discussed in the Committee are of concern to all mankind, they have always been willing to respect and support the regional initiatives of other countries. It is against this background that my delegation harbours the hope that the two parts of the draft resolution I referred to earlier will receive wide support among the members of the Committee.

It is with some sadness and concern that my delegation has noticed a trend in this Committee and in other committees towards restoring South Africa's bona fides by dropping any criticism of apartheid in our resolutions. It is not lack of seriousness on our part to insist on retaining our criticism of apartheid. Indeed we would very much wish to see our draft resolutions adopted by consensus. But consensus should not be an end in itself.

(Mr. Kapambwe, Zambia)

Unless there is some information which we are not aware of, apartheid is still the official policy of the Government of South Africa. True, a number of measures have been taken by the South African Government - and we welcome that. However, these measures have only corrected aberrations which were created by the South African Government itself and which ought never to have been created in the first instance.

Our criticism of South Africa has never been intended to be permanent. We are prepared to welcome South Africa to the community of nations the moment it abolishes anartheid and reaches a negotiated settlement with its majority population on the running of the country. This moment has however not arrived and it would be premature for the United Nations to relax its pressure on the South African régime at this critical hour. It is important to ask the questions: Why do we wish to drop criticism of apartheid now? Has the South African Government indicated that it will abolish apartheid when the United Nations relaxes the pressure? What exactly are we going to achieve by so doing?

If we have to err, let us do so on the side of caution. The experience that our countries in southern Africa have had in dealing with successive South African régimes has left us with some scepticism about the seriousness with which these régimes take their own public pronouncements.

It is not easy for us in the region to feel sufficiently assured by the few measures taken by the South African Government when 1.5 million of our people have died in less than a decade from causes related to South Africa's aggression and acts of destabilisation, when our economies have lost $62 billion over the same period owing to the same causes.

Mr. DZVAIRO (Zimbabwe): The delegation of Zimbabwe has taken note of ths Secretary-General's report an South Africa's nuclear capability. We are also aware

(Mr. Dzvairo, Zimbabwe)

of current developments on the South African political landscape and hope that these may result in the birth of a truly democratic and non-racial South Africa.

The implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearisation of Africa remains a cherished goal for Zimbabwe. There is no doubt that the greatest obstacle to that implementation remains the nuclear capability of South Africa and the continuing threat to regional and international peace and security that it poses. We are greatly 'toncerned that the nuclear capability of South Africa, with all it represents, has been nurtured and developed with the assistance of the very countries whose stated aim is to promote peaceful coexistence and mutual security not only in the southern African region but also in the world. Such assistance is glaringly contradictory.

We are aware of the denials of the South African Government that its nuclear programme has any sinister intent. We are also aware of its recent halfhearted offer to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty. It is our belief that if South Africa was sincere in its intentions, it would not seek to make its accession to the non-proliferation Treaty conditional on the accession of any other country in the region, in view of the fact that none of the other countries in the region have even the most rudimentary of nuclear programmes. Further, none of them has ever been as aggressive and destabilising as South Africa in respect of its neighbours.

Zimbabwe's accession to the non-proliferation Treaty will be a sovereign act. It will not be based on the actions or lack of actions of any other State in the region or elsewhere,

Finally, we in the southern African region remain aware of the grave threat that the South African régime poses not only to ourselves, its immediate neighbours, but to all who believe in peace. While apartheid makes this threat even graver, given that apartheid leaders are on record as saying that in defence

(Mr. Dzvairo, Zimbabwe)

of their system no rules will apply, the nuclear capability of South Africa will continue to be of concern to us in our quest for the denuclearization of Africa. Our delegation therefore urges all members to support both part A and part B of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39.

Mrs. MULAMULA (United Republic of Tanzania): My delegation wishes to associate itself fully with the statements of the representatives of Zambia and Zimbabwe. In addition, we wish to emphasize again that we find it ironic that the racist regime suggests in document A/C.1/45/9 that there should be an equal commitment by the other States of the southern African region to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Our commitment has been expressed since 1964, with the adoption of the Declaration on the Deauclearixation of Africa, with regard to whose implementation a draft resolution, A/C.1/45/L.39 A, is before the Committee. That Declaration has been frustrated by the very racist régime that is talking of an equal commitment.

Mr. AZIKIWE (Nigeria): I should like to make a brief comment on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B, on the nuclear capability of South Africa.

My delegation wishes to concentrate its intervention on the Secretary-General's report (A/45/571) of 29 October this year on South Africa's nuclear-tipped ballistic missile capability, submitted in accordance with paragraph 5 of resolution 44/113 B of 15 December 1989.

First, my delegation wishes to thank the Secretary-General for his prompt action on the request made on this issue last year. We also commend the experts for their excellent job. With the able assistance of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, they produced the report within the record time of five months.

In my delegation's view, the report is well balanced, within the scope of the resources available for its production and the opportunities to investigate a development that has been shrouded in utter secrecy by the principal culprit. It is balanced in the sense that it did not reach conclusions on the basis of evidence that could not be verified. However, there is strong evidence that South Africa's nuclear capability has only been further confirmed by the acquisition of a long-range rocket and its test-firing some 1,400 kilometres into the South Atlantic

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

on 5 July 1989. If South Africa has no sinister intentions in its ballistic missile programme, why did it wait to announce this until it was confronted with that evidence?

With regard to collaboration, my delegation is worried by the similarity between the Israeli site used to launch the Shavit space vehicle and South Africa's Overberg test site. In this regard, my delegation therefore wishes to stress the implications for the continent of Africa of South Africa's acquisition of a long-range missile.

First, acquisition of the missile is a threat to regional peace and security. Secondly, the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction at this time, when the world is being made to believe that the political atmosphere in South Africa is improving, will only make the purported intention to eliminate apartheid through current reforms look cosmetic. Thirdly, South Africa's continual abuse of, and flagrant disregard for the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa can only worsen even further the already charged atmosphere in the region. The continued violation of the principles underlying the General Assembly Declaration of the Zone of Peace and Co-operation of the South Atlantic will surely endanger international peace and security. Indeed, the sea lanes of the South Atlantic and the desire'of the African and Latin American States to safeguard peaceful maritime activities and freedom of navigation on the high seas will be jeopardised.

In the light of the imminent danger posed by South Africa's current participation in an arms race, at a time when most regions of the world are de-escalating the arms race, my delegation must strongly condemn South Africa's nuclear-weapons programme and its delivery system. We wish to call for further investigation of South Africa's acquisition of these weapons of mass destruction. Further investigation should attempt to conduct intelligence activities with regard to the parties involved, especially the collaborators.

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

Finally, my delegation wishes to remind these collaborators that they will be individually and collectively held responsible for facilitating the acquisition of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems by the crisis-prone and bankrupt régime in South Africa. My Government will make its views on this question known in greater detail at the appropriate time.

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

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel): All who have commented have agreed that there can be no progress in any disarmament process if there is not at least a minimum basis of confidence between the various parties. This draft resolution - A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1 - in spite of some cosmetic changes, does not contribute anything at all as a confidence-building measure; quite the opposite. It has become a pernicious ritual, which should be discontinued if Israel is to have any faith in the workings of the United Nations. It is completely at variance with the basic tenor and the recommendations put before the First Committee by the Secretary-General in his thoughtful study on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East (A/45/435).

Three developments relevant to the background of the situation in the Middle East have become apparent recently. First, the crisis in the Gulf has emphasiaed the seriousness of the Iraqi threats to use weapons of mass destruction against Israel; secondly, there have been ample published indications about Iraq's intention to acquire nuclear weapons and its actions in that regard despite its obligations as a signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT); and thirdly, the Secretary-General, in his study on a nuclear-weapon-free zone, which is before this Committee, stressed the need for such a zone in the Middle East. According to this report, a nuclear-weapon-free zone can be even more effective than the NPT under the conditions prevailing in the Middle East.

We are convinced that a nuclear-weapon-free zone is the only possible practical solution. This was evident in our statement on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.1 at the 30th meeting, on 7 November this year, and in our joining of the consensus on that draft resolution earlier in this session, Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1 is unfortunately the complete anti-thesis of draft resolution

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

A/C.1/45/L.1 and cannot contribute anything to the attainment of peace and disarmament in the Middle East.

I have some brief comments to make on some of the operative paragraphs,

Operative paragraph 1 refers to the refusal to renounce any possession of nuclear weapons. No State has ever made a blanket statement of this kind - not even signatories to the non-proliferation Treaty, which can opt out of the Treaty.

Operative paragraph' 2 refers to nuclear co-operation between Israel and South Africa. As we have stated on many occasions, there is no nuclear co-operation between Israel and South Africa.

Operative paragraph 4 demands that Israel place all its facilities under safeguards. Israel has repeatedly stated and explained its non-proliferation policy: it is by way of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, based on precedence and on recommendations of the Palme Commission. Once we have such a zone, full-scope safeguards will of course be part of it, made credible by mutual reassurances. There is no basis for singling Israel out among all the other States that have not signed the NPT or accepted full-scope safeguards, for example, Pakistan and India. With regard to attacking or threatening to attack nuclear facilities, we made it very clear, as recently as yesterday, that the policy of the Israeli Government was that *'nuclear facilities dedicated to peaceful ends should be inviolable** and that it would not "attack or threaten to attack any peaceful nuclear facilities". (A/C.1/45/PV.37, p. 13)

In operative paragraph 7 the Secretary-General is called upon to continue to report to the General Assembly and in paragraph 8 there is a decision to include the item in the provisional agenda of the next session, even if there is nothing to report. This is only to make sure that the First Committee does not forget to discuss Israel in perpetuity.

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

The absurdity of this request is evident from the report of the Secretary-General in document A/45/574, where the only subject was the resolution adopted by the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency in September of this year, which in content was almost identical with the Organisation's resolution of last year.

The First Committee has to decide whether the majority of its members wish to espouse the single-minded and unwarranted harassment of Israel in the face of the situation in the Middle East now manifest to everyone and the unbridled and unconditional threats against the very existence of Israel on the part of Iraq, Syria, Libya and Iran.

In his study on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle Bast the Secretary-General states:

"... Israeli opinion must gain confidence that its neighbours have no intention of using their superior manpower, wealth and other resources to destroy Israel ..." (A/45/435, para. 152)

If Israel is to be reassured that a measure of equitableness reigns in the international community, the First Committee is invited to stop the victimisation of Israel and to vote against the draft resolution in its entirety.

Mr. STAYEOV (Bulgaria): The Bulgarian delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament".

Bulgaria has been striving consistently over the years for the implementation of the principle of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as one of the main pillars of world security. In conformity with this stand, we are resolutely against an increase in the number of new States with nuclear weapon capabilities in any region of the world, including the Middle East.

(Mr. Stavkov, Bulaaria)

At the same time, we are alarmed over the growing possibility of nuclear-weapon capabilities being acquired by States that have not so far been addressed in the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations bodies. In the light of this fact, we find it difficult to accept some of the language contained in the draft resolution in question, since my delegation believes it runs counter to the spirit of accommodation now prevailing in the world Organisation, which seeks points of mutual interest, inter alia, in security matters.

It is our assessment that in the present situation of unrest and deep crisis in the Middle East region, including the use of military force, the draft resolution would not serve the cause of understanding and durable peace. Accordingly, the Bulgarian delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A, entitled **Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa".

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sierra Leone, on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, at the 27th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1990. The programme budget implications of this draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/45/L.58.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A is Sierra Leone, on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States.

The CHAIRMAN: We put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A. A recorded vote has been requested, including a separate recorded vote on the eighth paragraph of the preamble,

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, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, 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, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaailand, 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: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Greece. Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Turkey

The eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A was retained by 109 votes to 3, with 17 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentine, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, 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, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates. United Republic of Tanzania. Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A as a whole was adopted by 124 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a vote on part B of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sierra Leone, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, at the 27th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1990. There is an oral statement in connection with this draft resolution,

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

---

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

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): f d r a f t resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 is Sierra Leone, on behalf of the State8 Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States.

I wish to make the following statement on behalf of the Secretary-General in respect of part B of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa".

"By the terms of operative paragraph 11, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide all necessary assistance that the Organisation of African Unity may seek regarding the modalities and elements for the preparation and implementation of the relevant convention or treaty on the denuclearisation of Africa. In carrying out this task, the Secretary-General would provide all assistance practicable within existing resources, and therefore there would be no additional programme-budget implications for the biennium 1990 to 1991.

**By the terms of operative paragraph 15, the General Assembly would also request the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its forty-sixth session on the military assistance that apartheid South Africa is receiving from Israel and any other sources in advanced missile technology as well as the supporting technical facilities. In carrying out this task, the Secretary-General would report on any further relevant developments that may occur before the forty-sixth session beyond those already described in the Secretary-General's report contained in document A/45/571. It is at present difficult to assess the work-load that might be involved, but it is anticipated that there would be no additional programme-budget implications for the biennium 1990 to 1991,"

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo. Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, 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, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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: France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland. Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands. New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B was adopted by 98 votes to 4, with 27 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament". The draft resolution war introduced by the representative of Lebanon at an earlier meeting of the First Committee on behalf of the Arab States.

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.45/Rev.1 are the following: Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait. Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tansania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Singapore. Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1 was adopted by 84 votes to 2, with 38 abstentions.*

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

Mr. BERGH JOHANSEN (Norway): I have asked to speak to explain the vote of the five Nordic countries. Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden and my own country, Norway, on the two draft resolutions contained in document A/C.1/45/L.39, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearisation of Africa".

The position of the Nordic countries on the question of apartheid is clear and well known. Apartheid remains a flagrant violation of fundamental human rights and freedoms, as laid down in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in international law. To all of us, apartheid implies an intolerable violation of human dignity.

The Nordic countries share the concern voiced in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 that South Africa might acquire nuclear weapons. Such a development would be a major set-back to international efforts at non-proliferation. The Nordic countries have therefore persistently and in various contexts called upon the south African Government to adhere forthwith to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), most recently before this year's Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty. Adherence by South Africa would contribute to regional stability and have significant benefits for the

---

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

(Mr. Bergh Johansen, Norway)

non-proliferation régime on a global level as well. South Africa's declared intention to adhere to the NPT should materialise as soon as possible. In this context the Nordic countries welcome the recent adherence of Mozambique to the NPT. We call on other front-line States to do the same as soon as possible.

For the aforementioned reasons, our delegations voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A. We were, however, compelled to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B because of problems with a number of aspects of the text before us.

The world has lately witnessed important improvements in the international political climate. This applies to various regions, including southern Africa, as exemplified by Namibia's accession to independence and by significant developments within South Africa itself. Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B does not take account of these developments and is becoming increasingly outdated.

We would also have found it natural if draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B had drawn upon the report of the Secretary-General on South Africa's nuclear-tipped ballistic missile capability (A/45/571) as well as the consensus report of the Disarmament Commission on its 1990 session.

As in previous years, the Nordic countries strongly deplore the continued arbitrary and inappropriate singling out of individual countries or groups of countries. This clearly detracts from the main objective of strengthening international support for the Declaration on the Denuclearisation of Africa. It also makes it more difficult to reach an international consensus in dealing with the question of South Africa.

In addition, we must in general reserve our position with regard to formulations which fail to take into account the proper division of competence between the Security Council and the General Assembly, as laid down in the

(Mr. Bergh Johansen, Norway)

Charter. Furthermore, the Assembly should address itself to Governments and not to private citizens and enterprises.

The Nordic countries sincerely hope that in the future the Committee will be presented with texts that make it possible to deal with this important issue in a more credible manner.

Mr. JANDL (Austria) (interpretation from French): Austria abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B, on the nuclear capability of South Africa,

The Austrian delegation shares the concern expressed with regard to international peace and security and the dangerous situation that could be brought about by nuclear proliferation, particularly in the region in question. Austria is against nuclear proliferation at the global and regional levels.

This being said, my delegation is, nevertheless, of the view that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B no longer reflects the realities of the region in question in that the situation has changed very much in the course of the last year. In addition, Austria cannot agree with the idea of naming a country or group of countries in this way in a General Assembly resolution. Taking into account these reservations, my delegation was obliged to abstain.

Mr. COLLINS (Ireland): I wish to explain why Ireland felt obliged to abstain this year, for the first time ever, on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B, on the nuclear capability of South Africa. Ireland has consistently supported the fundamental principle of the denuclearisation of Africa. We have indicated our continuing support for that principle by voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A, on the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearizatioa of Africa. We recognize that the two texts include many of the same elements and sentiments. However, draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A expresses them in a manner which we can support.

In relation to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B, on South Africa's nuclear capability, Ireland shares the concern expressed in the draft resolution on South Africa's unsafeguarded nuclear facilities. We attach the greatest importance to the maintenance of an effective international nuclear non-proliferation régime through accession to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and through the application of International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards on as universal a basis as possible.

That said, we have reservations on a number of elements in the draft resolution, more specifically:

First, we have reservations about the selective focus in a text on this issue on matters which, while not immediately germane to the text, are of such importance to the international community as a whole that they deserve to receive - and are receiving - comprehensive treatment elsewhere in the United Nations. Thus, Ireland's principled and consistent opposition to, and abhorrence of, apartheid are well known. We have also welcomed the progress which has been made through dialogue in South Africa in the past year, as well as in its relations with neighbouring countries. We readily acknowledge, however, that such progress, which constitutes only a beginning, has not been matched by concrete positive

(Mr. Collins. Ireland)

developments in placing South Africa's nuclear facilities under the system of international safeguards.

Secondly, we have reservations about the singling out of certain countries or groups of countries. We fear that such action might adversely affect the achievement of the important objective of strengthening international support for the Declaration on the Denuclearisation of Africa.

Ireland considers that the issue of the nuclear capability of South Africa is one of utmost concern to the international community and is, moreover, an issue on which consensus is desirable and could be achieved. In that context, we would draw attention to the fact that a major achievement of the 1990 session of the Disarmament Commission was the adoption, by consensus, of conclusions and recommendations on the nuclear capability of South Africa. The attainment of consensus on &aft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B would have been facilitated if it more closely reflected the recommendations agreed by the Disarmament Commission. My delegation hopes that this will be the case when the resolution is next presented, thus enabling us to register a positive vote on this important issue.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): The Netherlands voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A, concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearisation of Africa, though we cannot subscribe to the purport of its eighth preambular paragraph. On the other hand, our delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B, concerning the nuclear capability of South Africa. The Netherlands has some doubt that the line of action set forth in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B would be to the advantage of our ultimate goal which is to induce South Africa to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B does not take into account some positive developments such as the recent statements by Minister "Pik" Botha in which the

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

South African Government announced its preparedness to. start negotiations with the International Atomic Energy Agency on a full-scope safeguards agreement. The closure of the enrichment facility in Valindaba is another indication of South African intentions to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty.

Accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) by South Africa, together with the other States of the region, would be a significant contribution to the process of the denuclearisation of Africa, a concept my Government fully supports. In this context the Netherlands welcomes the decision of Mosambique to join the non-proliferation Treaty.

Those considerations are not fully covered in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B, which, inter alia, in addition to other objections of a more political nature, as well as the lack of reference to the encouraging political developments in South Africa, prompted us to abstain on this draft resolution.

Mr. ARBELL (Israel): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/45/39 B, my delegation was unfortunately unable to vote for the draft resolution because of the unfair naming of Israel in the preambular part.

We have on many occasions, both in this Organisation and in other forums, made known our abhorrence and total condemnation of Boár-, and we have curtailed our relations with South Africa. As far as alleged nuclear collaboration is concerned, my Government has often categorically rejected that allegation.

In 1989, the then Minister of Defence, Mr. Yitshak Rabin, stated, in an interview on Israel Radio:

"When it comes to the nuclear field, we have no relations whatsoever with South Africa, and therefore all the stories about any relationship between our two countries on this issue are totally unbased and without any justification."

Mr. ADANK (New Zealand): After careful consideration, New Zealand abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa". However, there should be no doubt in anyone's mind that New Zealand continues to reject totally South Africa's policy of apartheid. New Zealand also remains deeply concerned regarding reports of the acquisition by States of nuclear weapons capabilities and technologies. For this reason, New Zealand has urged all States which have not yet done so, including South Africa, to adhere to the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty and to accept International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards at their nuclear facilities.

New Zealand voted in favour of draft resolution L.39 A. However, with regard to draft resolution L.39 B, New Zealand believes it is important to distinguish concerns about apartheid on the one hand and nuclear proliferation on the other. In the latter respect, we are pleased to note the balanced report on South Africa's nuclear-tipped missile capability recently prepared by the Secretary-General with the assistance of three qualified experts, and would have liked to have seen greater recognition of its findings in the text of the present draft resolution. In particular we believe it is important, as the Secretary-General notes, to take into account development under way in South Africa, which could be having an important effect on that country's nuclear and military policies.

We hope that such developments will be taken into account when this draft resolution is next brought before the Committee.

Mis SOLESBY (United Kingdom): I should like to explain the United Ringdom's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.39 A and B, which have just been adopted.

The United Kingdom fully supports South Africa's neighbours in their efforts to guarantee and safeguard their territorial integrity and national sovereignty. It is in the interest of all, especially that of the population of South Africa and its neighbours, that there should be no nuclear weapons in the region. We note the statement by the South African Government on 17 September that South Africa is prepared to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in the context of an equal commitment by other States in the region. We welcome the South African Government's stated willingness to commence talks with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) on concluding a comprehensive safsguards agreement on its nuclear facilities.

In the interest of regional and world security, there is an urgent need for South Africa to accede to the Treaty and to place all nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. We hops that South Africa will take these steps at a very early date.

As we have stated on many occasions, the United Kingdom does not collaborate in any way with South Africa in the development of its civil nuclear power programme. Together with the other Member States of the European Community we have prohibited all nuclear collaboration with South Africa in the nuclear sector. There is absolutely no question of our providing the South African Government with assistance in the development of a nuclear weapons capability, That would be a gross violation of our obligations under the non-proliferation Treaty.

As a founder member of the missile technology control régime, the United Kingdom is concerned about recent reports that South Africa and Israel may be collaborating on missile development. We are therefore in sympathy with important

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

aspects of the two resolutions. However, there are passages we find less acceptable. All States have the right to apply and develop programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, a right that is internationally recognized and set out in a number of international instruments. We also note that these resolutions contain judgements which are either insufficiently substantiated or are more properly matters for the Security Council.'

In addition to these points, which we have made repeatedly over the years, we note the financial implications of operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A.

For all these reasons, we abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A and voted against draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B.

Mr. BRECKON (United States of America): The United States would like to make a comment with regard to its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

The United States noted with satisfaction the consensus reached in the Disarmament Commission last spring on the text regarding the nuclear capabilities of South Africa. That same spirit prevailed in the Declaration adopted at the sixteenth special session of the General Assembly, on Apartheid, in December 1989, and in its resumed session last September. Accordingly, the United States is disappointed with the tone of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39. This draft resolution, which did not achieve consensus, undermines the steady progress us have been making. We believe that when the international community speaks with one voice it better emphasises its abhorrence of apartheid and gives impetus to the ongoing negotiations towards a non-racial democracy.

Mr. SADER (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to explain our affirmative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B, on the nuclear capability of South Africa.

Despite the recent favourable developments'in southern Africa, my delegation agrees with the central idea in the draft, that is, as indicated in the report of Working Group I of the Disarmament Commission, that the introduction of nuclear weapons on the African continent by South Africa would militate against the intention to keep that continent out of the arms race. Moreover, until there are assurances to the contrary, it constitutes a potential threat to its neighbours, given the peculiar characteristics of apartheid.

Nevertheless, we should have liked to have seen the content of the Secretary-General's report better reflected in this text. In particular, my delegation would like to express its reservations regarding the fourteenth and sixteenth paragraphs of the preamble and operative paragraph 4. In fact, we cannot fail to note that those paragraphs would, in our view, constitute a return to the practice of singling out countries or groups of countries in language that would not be conducive to the achievement of a constructive dialogue.

Mr. GAJDA (Hungary): This year the Hungarian delegation abstained on the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A and on the whole of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B in order to express our dissatisfaction with a particular routine in the Committee, and also to indicate our dislike of certain honoured patterns and practices.

My delegation believes that the United Nation8 General Assembly as a whole and the First Committee in particular should not continue year after year citing unverified reports and unverifiable allegations. We believe that an end should be put to the inappropriate practice of singling out individual countries,

(Mr. Gadja, Hungary)

particularly if the international community is really interested in bringing about positive developments in those countries or in their attitudes concerning the important subject under consideration.

We also believe that resolutions of the General Assembly must not ignore the significant evolution and the favourable trends which, after such a long time, are reported from the area.

With those considerations in mind, the Hungarian delegation could not continue to support the draft resolution.

In explanation of its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1, the Hungarian delegation wishes to state that its abstention in no way reflects Hungary's position concerning nuclear armanents or the proliferation of nuclear arms. My country's position is clear in this regard, and nobody can question its record. Hungary has always condemned any acts of proliferation and any attempts at acquiring nuclear weapon capabilities. We have done so and will continue to do so irrespective of the geographical location, political system or ideological creed of the country in question. However, the Hungarian delegation no longer supports any modalities which, in its considered view, cannot serve the proclaimed purposes.

Mr. NEGROTTO CAMBIASO (Italy): The Italian delegation, on behalf of the European Community and its member States, wishes to explain the vote of the Twelve on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1, on Israeli nuclear armament.

While acknowledging that some efforts have been made by the sponsors of the draft resolution to improve it, the Twelve have maintained their abstention on it as it still makes a number of assumptions that they do not necessarily share, inter alia in the sixth preambular paragraph, which recalls a resolution of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) against which the Twelve voted. Furthermore, other paragraphs of the draft resolution do not take into account some declarations of the Israeli Government recently reaffirmed in the First Committee.

The Twelve strongly support and are fully committed to the objective of nuclear non-proliferation. The Twelve recognise the indispensable role played by the IAEA and its safeguards in the development of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. They recognise that these safeguards are the corner-stone of an effective non-proliferation régime. For their part, the Twelve have accepted, in accordance with their respective individual status, the exercise of international controls on their nuclear installations and apply constraints to their export policies. The Twelve strongly support the application of safeguards on as universal a basis as possible. However, the Twelve cannot support calls on only one of the States that have net done so to place its facilities under IAEA safeguards.

Mrs. LETTS (Australia): Despite the considerable improvements the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1 have made to the text, my delegation still has a number of reservations on this draft resolution, just adopted, on Israeli nuclear armament.

But Australia's abstention should not be interpreted as less than full and strong support for calls on Israel to join the non-proliferation Treaty and to accept full-scope safeguards en all its nuclear activities. Australia has

(Mrs. Letts, Australia)

consistently enjoined Israel and other States not party to the non-proliferation Treaty, particularly those that operate unsafeguarded nuclear facilities, to take such action.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): In connection with draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.39 and A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1, which have just been adopted and on both of which Japan abstained, my delegation wishes to state the following for the record.

Japan, as a strong-supporter of the non-proliferation Treaty rdgime, is very much concerned over the persistent stories about possible Israeli and South African nuclear armament. Japan earnestly hopes that Israel, South Africa and other countries that are not parties to the non-proliferation Treaty will accede to the Treaty as soon as possible and further strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation régime, thus removing the concerns of the international community.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The Argentine delegation voted in favour of the eighth paragraph of the preamble to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A. It also voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1, despite our well-known position that no State has an obligation to submit its nuclear facilities to the IAEA safeguards. It did so because of the importance of the political objectives sought by these draft resolutions, which, by their very nature, far exceed essentially technical aspects,

Similarly, we believe it appropriate to emphasise that the reference to delivery vehicles contained in the operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1, in our view, deaerves more careful consideration. We suggest that it would be advisable in future to refrain from associating this question with the production of nuclear weapons.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.