UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
35th meeting
held on
Monday, 13 November 1989
at 10.00 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 35th MEETING

Chairman : Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) (Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

Distr. GENERAL
A/C. 1/44/PV. 35
17 November 1989
ENGLISH

89-63219 4706V (E)

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Fahmy (Egypt), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.,

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 49 TO 69 AND 151 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following States have become co-eponeors of the following draft resol. utionst A/C. 1/44/L. 1: Oman; A/C. 1/44/L. 25: Afghanistan) A/C. 1/44/L. 39: Ethiopia) and A/C.1/44/L.56: the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The CHAIRMAN: Today the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 27 in cluster 1; draft resolution8 A/C.1/44/L. 23/Rev.1 and A/C.1/44/L. 49 in cluster 4; A/C.1/44/L.12 and A/C.1/44/L. 31/Rev.1 in cluster 5; A/C.1/44/L.1 and A/C.1/44/L.57 in cluster 9 md A/C.1/44/L.13/Rev.1 in cluster 10.

As no delegation has asked to speak before the voting, we shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.27, in cluster 1. It is entitled Regional disarmament andhas 26 sponsors. The text was introduced by the representative of Belgium.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 27 has the following sponsorst Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechos Lovak ia, Denmark, France, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Irelmd, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Zaire.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of the draft reeolution have expreaeed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 27 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishinq to explain their position after the decision juat taken on draft reeolution A/C.1/44/L.27 in cluster 1.

Mr. AHMAD KAMAL (Pakistan): The eeventh paragraph of the preamble to draft reeolution A/C.1/44/L.27 reads:

> Further stressinq that disarmament efforts in a reqion cannot be isolated either from the disarmament efforts in other regions or from global disarmament efforts hoth in the nuclear and conventional fields .

In our view, regional disarmament can and doew assist in achievinq the objectives of global disarmament in both the nuclear and the conventional field. However, it is ohviouely possible for the States of a region to agree amonq themselves on disarmament measures, irrespective of simultaneous or eaual progress in glohal disarmament. Despite the wording of the seventh preamhular paragraph, my deleqation voted in favour of the draft reaalution, as we assume that the paragraph in question essentially relates to the situation in Europe.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): I wish to explain Japan s position on draft reeolution A/C.1/44/L.27, in cluster 1, which has just been adopted by consensus.

The draft resolution concerns regional diearmament. Japan fully shares the view expressed in the draft resolution, but wishes to reiterate t.he importance of the perceptions expressed in the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs, which point out that in the promotion of reqional diearmament the specific conditions characteristic of each reqion have to be taken into account and that it is for the

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

countriaa of a region to take appropriate initiatives in common. In East Asia, for instance, there still remain a number of issues and sources of tension, such as territorial issues md regional conflicts. Therefore, in the first place, steady efforts must be made to solve those problems and conflicts one by one in order to eliminate mutual distrust and to bring about conditions conducive to confidence- and security-building among nations. It is from this viewpoint that Japan has been making, and will continue to make, its utmost efforts for the promotion of peace and security in the region in which Japan finds itself.

Mr. MASHHADI (Islamic Republic of Iran) : My delegation suppor ta dra ft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 27, Regional disarmament", believing that it contributes to building confidence and co-operation among members of a region. We support the seventh preambular paragraph, to the effect that disarmament efforts in a region cannot be fsola ted either from the disarmament efforts in other regions or from global disarmament efforts in both the nuclear and the conventional fields.

In the meantime, there are prerequioi tes and conditions for such regional disarmament. First, the nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States should not seek to abuse this process by increasing their unlawful military presence in a region. In other words, there should be a security guarantee by big Powers to the countries of a region. Secondly, the regional disarmament agreement should be respected by outside Powers, particularly members of the Security Council. Thirdly , they should not fan regional conflicts by unjustly and in a discriminatory way taking sides with certain countries of the region, since in that event the downtrodden States will be left with no choice but more resort to arms.

The CHAIRMAN : Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 4 I shall call on those delega tfons wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. AHMAD KAMAL (Pakistan): I wish to introduce draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 49, Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The draft resolution is sponsored by Bangladesh, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madayasaar, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Pakistan.

The draft resolution was motivated by our abiding conunitment to the process of the universal elimination of nuclear weapons. Naturally, the most effective assurances against their use or the threat of their use continues to be their complete elimination. However, until that objective is achieved the non-nuclear-weapon States must be provided with credible and legally binding guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Such assurances ara necessary to enhance the sense of security of non-nuclear-weapon States.

We are disappointed that there has been no progress towards negotiating an internationally binding agreement on the subject. We believe that the General Assembly should call upon the Conference on Disarmament to intensify its efforts to reach an agreement on the issue.

The non-nuclear-weapon States have reiterated time and again that the unilateral declarations made by some nuclear-weapon States on the subject are not adequate to meet their concerns, both because those declarations are not legally binding and because they contain escape clauses. Therefore, those declarations do not allay the apprehensions of non-nuclear-weapon States. To be effective they must be legally binding and without conditions.

The draft resolution is along the lines of last year s text. Last year s draft resolution had the privilege of receiving the support of nearly all the members of the Committee, with 133 votes for, none against and only 4 abstentions,

and in the General Assembly there were 152 votes for, none against and only 3 abstentions. I hope that the draft resolution will enjoy the support of the whole membership of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN; Since no delegation wishes to make a statement other than in explanation of vote, I shall now call on thoee delegations wishing to explain their vote before the vote,

Ms. MASON (Canada): I wish to speak about agenda items 56 and 57. As we all know, for some time now two draft resolutions have traditionally been introduced, at successive sessions, of the General Assembly, on the subject of negative security assurances. While Canada has had difficulties with both such texts in the past, we were able to support one of them: that which last year was adopted a8 resolution 43/69. This year, we are very pleased to be able to support both the texts: that submitted by Bulgaria and Nigeria as draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.23/Rev.1, and draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.49, sponsored by Iran, Madaqascar and Pakistan.

While Canada is a full participant in the discussions on this item at the Conference on Disarmament, we none the less have reservations about the practicality and likely effectiveneau of an international convention as referred to in the final preambular paraqraph and operative paraqraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.49, as a way of solving the problem of negative security aasurancee. Certainly, we would not favour any attempts to amend existing treaties along such lines.

In that light, we in fact favour the approach to the particular matter of a convention that is found in draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.23/Rev.1, where in the recommendation to the Conference on Disarmament there is explicit reference to its qivinq consideration to any other proposal6 designed to secure the same objective.

The two texts on this item put forward this year hoth show a good deal of constructive compromise, such that both are likely to attract broad support. Canada believes that next year it should he possible for the two groups of sponsors to find sufficient common ground to enable them to agree on a text to put before the General Aasemhly at its forty-fifth session.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.23/Rev.1, entitled Conclusion of effective international

(The Chairman)

arrangements on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons . The draft resolution is aponsored by the delegations of Bulgaria and Niger ia and was introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, held on 7 November 1989. A recorded vote has been requested.

In favour : Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovak ia, Democra tic Kampuchea, Democra tic Yemen, Djibouti , Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji , Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Irelmd, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar , Malawi, Malaya ia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab F&public, Thailmd, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Repul lic of Tanzan ia, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against : Turkey

Abstaining: Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Ur uquay

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.23/Rev.1 was adopted by 113 votes to 1, with 20 abs ten t ions. *

* Subsequently the delegations of Barbados and Costa Rica advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour , the delegation of Turkey had intended to abstain.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 49. The draft resolution has five sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at this morning 's meeting of the First Commi ttee . I call upon the Secretary of the Commi ttee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the First Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 49 is sponsored by the delegations of Bangladesh, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour; Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi , Byelor uss ian Soviet Soc ial ist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liber ia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Mymmar, Nepal, Nether lands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, 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

Abstaining, Brazil, India, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 49 was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 3 abstentions. *

* Subsequently the delegations of Barbados and Costa Rica advised th e Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

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

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): We are happy to note that there seem to be less fundamental differences than before between the two draft resolutions submitted by Pakistan and Bulgaria respectively. It appears therefore that there is a slowly emerging trend towards agreement on the principle of a common formula which should combine the various unilateral declarations made by the five nuclear-weapon-States since 1978.

Indeed, the principal difference between those unilateral declarations seems to be in the conditions for assuring non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

The Conference on Disarmament should further elaborate on these matters during the course of its 1990 session. Eventually, an agreement on a common formula could be embodied in, for example, a mandatory resolution of the Security Council. We are, however, convinced that it is inappropriate to embody such agreements in an international convention. We would not want to create a kind of competition with the non-preliferation Treaty. Progress in the Conference on Disarmament seems all the more necessary in view of the fourth review conference of the non-proliferation Treaty, to be held in 1990.

In line with our well-known position cn non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, my delegation voted in favour of the Pakistani draft resolution, A/C.1/44/L.49. Although we abstained on the draft resolution submitted by Bulguria and Nigeria, A/C.1/44/L.23/Rev.1, because it still hinges, to some extent, on the controversial concept of an international convention, we do appreciate the intention of the drafters also to accept other means of realizing negative security assurances, for instance through a Security Council resolution.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

We hope that the positive trend outlined in the draft resolution of Bulgaria and Nigeria can be sustained, thus making it possible at the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly to put forward just one draft resolution instead of the present two. Such a combined draft resolution might in that case even obtain consensus, and the General Assembly could reduce the pertinent agenda items to a single item.

Mr. REESE (Australia): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/44/L.23/Rev.1 and L.49, which deal with the question of the conclusion of effective international arrangements on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

Australia supports such negative security assurances and participates actively in the negotiations under way on this question in the Conference on Disarmament.

We are also aware of their significance in the context of the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty. The Treaty of Raratonga, which recently received the overwhelming support of Metier States, contains such assurances. We are speaking today not only to emphasize our support for those assurances, but also to remark on the similarity between draft resolutions L.23/Rev.1 and L.49. We believe it is important that the international community speak with one voice on this issue, and we express our hope that, at the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly, these draft resolutions can be merged.

Mr. FYFE (New Zealand): New Zealand has #is year voted in favour of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/L.23/Rev.1 and A/C.1/44/L.49 on the conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Fyfe, New Zealand)

The first of these draft reaolutiona, A/C. 1/44/L. 23/Rev. 1, aponrored by Bulgaria and Niger ia, is markedly different from that of previous years. New Zealand consulted closely with Bulgaria on the drafting of this draft resolution, which we nw consider addreaaea the subject of negative security assurances in a balanced and realistic way. Bulgaria is to be commended *for* its flexibility in seeking to achieve a text which nw bridges the different strategic perception8 of the different alliances and also reflects recent positive developments in the international security situation.

This draft resolution, like that contained in document A/C.1/44/L.49, provides, we think, a sound basis for continued debate cn this subject in the Conference on Disarmament. Particularly important, is the fact that neither draft resolution pre judges the work of the Ad Hoc Commit tee on Negative Securi t.y Assurances. As the 1989 report of that Committee makes clear, all delegations want to continue the search for a common approach to the negative security assur ances issue.

(Mr. Fyfe, New Zealand)

The exact form of that approach is a subject on which we look forward to constructive debate next year.

If my delegation has any concerns about thoae draft reaolutinns, it is simply that, in the form in which they have just been adopted, they duplicate each other. A careful examination of the text reveals that, in terms of substance, they are virtually the same. A number of paragraphs are, in fact, identical. We would accordingly urge the sponsors of those two draft resolution8 to examine the merits of drafting a single text next year. Such a move would be consis ten t with the objective we all share of rationalizing the work of the Committee. It would also give us an opportunity to speak with one voice on that importmt subject.

New Zealand looks forward next year to working with the sponsors of draft reaolutiona A/C.1/44/L.23/Rev.1 md A/C.1/44/L.49 in an endeavour to produce a single, widely acceptable text, which we would be pleased to co-aponsor.

Mr. HOULLEZ (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I would like to explain ny delegation s votca on draft resolutions A/C.1/44/L.23/Rev.1 and A/C.1/44/L.49.

Our attitude has not changed with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.49, which is conaietent with previous texts. As to draft reaolu tion A/C.1/44/L.23/Rev.1, sponsored by Bulgaria and Nigeria, we are aware of the considerable and praiseworthy efforts made to produce a more realistic text. Those efforts to take into account the desires of other delegations were made not only as regards General Assembly reeolu tion 43/68, but also since the first vers ion of A/C.1/44/L.23/Rev.1 was submitted. The text is therefore much improved, and that explains my delegation s ability to change its negative vote on last year s resolution 43/68 to an abstention this year.

(Mr. Houllez, Belgium)

We appreciate the concern shown in the preamble to safeguard the non-proliferation régime. We are also happy to see the implicit recognition of the intensive efforts of the Conference on Disarmament to find a solution. But there is still some vagueness about the ways and means of reaching that objective, and we therefore regret that, despite a closing of the gap, the two delegations were not able to submit one single draft resolution.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): On behalf of my delegation, I would like to explain my country's position on the two draft resolutions submitted to the First Committee on the conclusion of effective international arrangementa on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States againet the use or threat. of use of nuclear weapons.

On draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.23/Rev.1, sponsored by Bulgaria and Nigeria, my delegation abatained, although it had voted against the draft resolution submitted by Bulgaria on the same topic at the previoua session. France notes with satisfaction that some dubioue ideas, which had prompted our negative vote, have disappeared from the new text by Bulgaria and Niger ia.

Hwever, we were not able to vote in favour for the follwing reaaons. First, the preamble to the draft resolu tion takes note of the unilateral declarations by nuclear-weapon States, but the operative part does not say that the search for a common appr oach to an in terna tional instrument must take into account those un ilateral declarations. For my delegation that is an essential point.

Secondly, if current negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament have still not been able to lead to agreement after more than 10 years, it is not because of the lack of "willingness" or flexibility on the part of the nuclear-weapon States, but rather because the question is so complex. One must consider the security requirements of both nuclear- and non-nucl ear-w eapon Sta tes.

(Mr. Morel, France)

As to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.49, submitted by the Islamic Republic of I ran, Madagascar and Pakistan, my delegation voted in favour, as it did laat year on the analogoue resolution submitted by Pakiatan - resolution 43/69. However, we would like to stresa that we do not fully concur with some elements. In particular, if the preamble mentions the principle of non-uae of force or threat of force enahrined in the Charter of the United Nations, it fails to recall the right to legitimate collective or individual self-defence against armed aggression, which is also enshrined in the Charter. It is precisely that right to legitimate self-defence that is at the basis of the unilateral declaration by France on the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States.

The CHAIRMAN, I nw call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft reeolutiona in cluster 5.

Mr. KOTEVSKI (Yugoslavia) : On behalf of the member s of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C. 1/44/L. 31/Rev.1, enti tled Bilateral nuclear-arms negotia tions".

It is natural that we all attach extreme importance to the issues dealt with by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics inasmuch as they have a direct bearing on all of us. There is every reason to aay that thoee issues attract universal attention and are of concern to the world Organization as a whole.

At their recent summit Conference, the non-aligned countries expressed their views on the current relations between the two major Powers, particularly in the Declaration and tne Document on International Security and Disarmament adopted in Belgrade last September. Their key positions are consequently reflected in the revised draft resolution submitted to the First Committee.

(Mr. Kotevmki, Yusomlavia)

There is no doubt that there ham been significant progress in the Soviet-United States negotiations on disarmament. We welcome it and encourage those States to continue their efforts with determination, for the benefit of all countries. We note with satisfaction the positive developments in the field of disarmament brought about by the implementation of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate Range and Shorter-Range Missiles and recent important agreements between the two sides. While calling upon the two Governments to exert every effort to achieve the goal they have met themmelvem of an agreement on a 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive arms, we also underline the importance of achieving agreement in other areas, in particular on the issue of a oompreheneiva nuclear-test ban md outer space issues.

It is also significant to stress that the non-aligned countries attach special importance to the link between the bilateral md multilateral negotiations. We feel that those negotiationa should facilitate and complement each other. In cur view, that derives from the fact that disarmament would by itm very nature be unattainable unless all countries joined in its implementation,

The Committee will note that we have submitted draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.31/Rev.1 in an attempt to merge the two draft resolutions on the aame issue. On behalf of the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, my delegation held a series of consultations with the delegation of the United Kingdom with the aim of achieving a consensus. We value md appreciate the co-operative and constructive attitude of the United Kingdom delegation.

Unfortunately , mom? major issues to which we attach particular importance could not be successfully reaolved. Nevertheless, we hope that it will be possible to achieve consensus at the next session of the General Assembly. Certainly , it

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

will very much depend on developments and results in the field of disarmament. For the time being, however, we are not in a position to support the draft resolution on the same issue contained in document A/C.1/44/L.12.

The overall thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.31/Rev.1 is intended to bolster the ongoing process. It is therefore our hope that it will be seen in that light.

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

Mr. GRANGER (United States of America): The United States delegation has asked to speak in explanation of its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.31/Rev.1, "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations". We appreciate the tone of this draft resolution, which we find less argumentative than its predecessors in previous years, and more consistent with the current atmosphere of co-operation, which all others should join in promoting. In particular, we welcome the general expression of support for the bilateral negotiations as indicated in operative paragraph 1. We hope the aponeors of this draft reaolution will act in that spirit in the future as well.

At the name time, we regret that this draft resolution still auffere from some fundamental flaws which prevent the United States from aupporting it. For example, we believe that the United States and Soviet nuclear apace talks should be carried out on the basis agreed by the parties, and that it is not appropriate *for* others to attempt to amend that basis.

The call for an urgent agreement on a comprehensive nuclear-teat ban is also inconsistent with the approach underlying the bilateral negotiations on nuclear testing issues.

Further, the language of the draft resolution does not place the threat of nuclear war in the proper context a it creates the impression that only nuclear war is a threat, whereas we believe the objective should be to reduce the threat of any war.

We are grateful to the delegations of the United Kingdom and Yugoslavia for their efforts to merge their respective draft resolutions on this topic. We had hoped that those efforts could succeed in developing a single draft resolution free

(Mr. Granger, United States)

of extraneous issues and unclear language and balanced in its overall tone, and we regret that this has not proved possible.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Once again, the First Committee has before it two draft resolutions cn the subject of bilateral negotiations on nuclear weapons. The Mexican delegation participated in the drafting of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.31/Rev.1, introduced just now by the representative of Yugoslavia. The approach it takes differs substantially from the one taken by the sponsors of the other draft resolution; therefore my delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.12.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a vote cn draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.12, entitled Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiationa . The draft resolution has 17 co-sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 29th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1989.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.12.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the First Committee): The oo-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 12 are : Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Fr ance, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Nether lwds, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L.12. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour; Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lao People s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam

Against: None

Abstaining; Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.12 was adopted by 71 votes to none, with 64 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.31/Rev.1, entitled Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations . This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia - on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations which are memhers of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries - at the 35th meeting of the First Committee, on 13 November 1989.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee for an announcement.

---

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

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee); I should like to point out that the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.31/Rev.1 are Yugoslavia and Romania.

The CHAIRMAN; We shall now proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.31/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour; Afghanistan, 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, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, ho People s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, 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 : None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.31/Rev.1 was adopted by 119 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their vote,

Mr. HU Xiaodi (China) (interpretation from Chinese) a The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.12, entitled Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations , because we agree with its main thruet. I should like to point out that the basic principles on verification adopted unanimously at the United Nations Disarmament Commission last year and approved by the General Assembly spelled out clearly that

> The form and modali ties of the verification to be provided for in any specific agreement depend upon and should be determined by the purposes, scope and nature of the agreement . . . Determinations about the adequacy, effectiveness end acceptability of specific methods and arrangements intended to verify compliance with the provisions of an arms limitation and disarmament agreement can only be made within the context of that agreement. (A/S-15/3, para. 60)

Thus we feel that the question of taking the verification procedures in a certain agreement as an example does not arise.

Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) : I speak to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.12 in explanation of our vote.

The Bangladesh delegation believes the aims of the draft resolution to be truly laudable. Never theless, in our opin ion, it could be improved by the accommodation of more widely held concerns. It is our hope that this will be done. Indeed, we share the aspiration for a consensus draft resolution on the i tern in the future.

However, at this time, on the draft as it is, Bangladesh was constrained to abstain.

Mr. KENYON (United Kingdom): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.31/Rev.1.

Together with some other speakers this morning, my delegation believes that bilateral nuclear arms negotiations are an important topic, of such importance that it is highly desirable that this Committee adopt a single draft resolution by consensus on the subject. It was for this reason that we worked with the delegation of Yugoslavia to try to arrive at a single text which could have been put forward for that purpose. We should like to thank the delegation of Yugoslavia for their efforts during those negotiations.

It was therefore with particular regret that we found, after the negotiations had been broken off, that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.31 had found it necessary to introduce a revised text, the new language of which they must have known would make it even less acceptable to my delegation than the original text. I speak, for instance, of the fifth preambular paragraph in which reference is made to "discarding the balance of fear". We reject that concept. As far as the United Kingdom and its allies are concerned, no one need fear us unless they intend to attack us. We threaten no one and we cannot subscribe to this language. It was for that reason, among others, that we abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.31/Rev.1.

Mr. TUN (Myanmar): My delegation would like to make the following explanation of vote on the draft resolutions regarding bilateral nuclear arms negotiations, contained in documents A/C.1/44/L.12 and A/C.1/44/L.31/Rev.1.

My delegation has been heartened by the positive developments this year in the bilateral nuclear arms negotiations. We have also been encouraged by the progress outlined in the joint statements of the Soviet Union and the United States, issued following their meetings in Washington and Wyoming in September 1989.

(Mr. Tun, Myanmar)

My drlegation voted in favour of both draft rerolutionr. The affirmative voter *reflect* our satisfaction with the important progreee achieved in the recent past ad our deep ad continuing commitment to aohieving nuclear disarmament.

bre I should like to reiterate my delegation s long-standing position, that disarmament negotiations, both nuclear and conven tional , mus t be carried out with the contribution *of* all States and that bilateral and multilateral negotiations need not be mutually exclusive: they must complement each other, md progreee in one field should facilitate rather than impede progress in the other.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will proceed to take action cn draft resolutions contained in cluster 9.

I shall call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote before the voting.

Mrs. DA SILVA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish) : In past years, Venezuela has abstained in *the* vote *cm the draft* resolution on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons, contained this year in document A/C.1/44/L.1, since we have substantive difficulties with it. Although we are aware *of* the dangers of armed attacks against nuclear facilities, it seems to us exceeaive to taay that such attacks should be considered tantamount to the use of radiological weapons, In some cases the effects can be comparable, but in other cases they cannot be considered equivalent.

We also see a discrepancy between the preamble and the operative part *of* the draft resolution. *In* the third preambular paragraph it says that :

> attacks against nuclear facilities . . . could be tantamount to the uae of radiological weapons .

(Mrs. da Silva, Venezuela)

In paragraph 1 the word "tantamount" is used. The Spanish version of this draft resolution uses the word "equivalentes" - equivalent, We do not believe that a possibility am be turned into an assertion.

In aonneation with paragraph 2, we believe that the queetion of the preparation of a internaticmal instrument to prohibit armed attacks against nuclear facilities is not a problem of disarmament per de, but rather a problem that involves the conduct of States in war , in other words it is a problem involving the law of war. As we have indioated in the past, this should be the subject of a diploma tic conferenoa.

That. is why my delegation feels obliged to abstain in the voting.

The same is true of draft: reeolution A/C.1/44/L.57, which is also a part of this cluster of draft reoolutione.

The CHAIRMAN, As no other delegation wishes to explain its vote before the voting, the Committee will now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L, 1, anti tled Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radioloq ical weapons". The draft resolution has five sponsors. It waa introduced by the representative of Iraq at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November 1989.

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

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) : Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.1 has the following co-sponsors: Iraq, Jordan, the Libyan Arab Jamahir iya, Oman and Yemen.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 1 to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour : Afghan is tan, Albania, Alger ia, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahra in, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Contra1 African Republic!, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovak la, Democra tic Kampuchea, Democra tic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democra tic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau , Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People 's Democra tic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liber ia, Libyan Arab Jamahir iya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malays ia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongol ia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar , Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Niger ia, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraquny, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Roman ia, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Somal ia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Soc ial ist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslav ia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern I relend, Uruguay, Venezu ela

Draft resol ution A/C. 1/44/L. 1 was adopted bv 104 to 2 votes, with 28 abs ten t ions.

The CHA IRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.57, entitled Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and uae of radiological weapons . This draft resolution has six sponsors. It was introduced by the representative of Peru at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November 1989. The aponeors are Austria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Hungary, the Netherlands, Peru, Sweden and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.57 was adopted.

The CHA IRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States) : The United States has asked to speak to explain its negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.1, entitled

Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons ".

The draft resolution seeks to define any attack on any type of nuclear facility as tantamount to the use of radiological warfare, a judgement that we do not share. Moreover, the United States has not concluded that military attacks on nuclear facilities should be subjected to additional legal measures. In our view,

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

resolution A/C.1/44/L.1 prejudges the outcome of discussions on this issue in the Conference on Disarmament.

Moreover, the text of this draft resolution is technically inaccurate in its argument. Operative paragraph 1 indicates that an armed attack against a nuclear facility would necessarily lead to the release of dangerous radioactive forces. This is simply not so.

Mr. MASHHADI (Islamic Republic of Iran): The Islamic Republic of Iran voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.1. In explanation of its vote, I should Like to call attention to operative paragraph 1, to the effect that armed attacks of any kind against nuclear facilities are tantamount to the use of radiological weapons. This prohibition of attack must be absolute: no justification on the grounds that this facility was active or that facility was not safequarded ta warranted, since any minor miscalculation or politically motivated apologetic explanation in military attacks on nuclear installations may cause the release into the environment of huge amounts of dangerous radioactive material. This action then, according to the sixth paragraph of the preamble, constitutes an unprecedented danger to international peace and security.

It is unfortunate that our nuclear facilities in the Iranian sovereign city of Bushehr, which was built for solely peaceful purposes, wore the tarqet of repeated Iraqi air military attacks under certain unjustifiable pretexts, which are contrary to the condemnation, *in* operative paragraph 1, of armed attacks of any kind. Following each of these attacks on Bushehr nuclear installations, the Islamic Republic of Iran filed formal protests, which are documented in the United Nations and in the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 10. I call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions,

Mr. MI Xiaodi (China) : At tho 31s t meeting, on 8 November, the Chinese delegation introduced draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.13, on conventional disarmament. In that statement I emphasized that in recent years the Chinese delegation has successively submitted dra ft. resolutions on conven tional disarmament with the sole objective of further promoting progress in the important field of conventional disarmament. As compared with resolu tion 43/75 F, which was adopted by consensus last year, the new text does not involve any substantive changes, Moreover:, the Chinese delegation has always conducted close consultations in a co-operative and constructive spirit. We did our best to incorporate reasonable suggestions into the text, wherever possible, so that. the new text could batter reflect the latest developments and he more comprehensive and balanced in substance.

In that spirit, the Chinese delegation submitted a revised text, document A/C.1/44/L.13/Rev.1. In this new text, the only changes are in operative paragraph 4, which has a new formulation:

"4. Urges the countries with the largest military arsenals, which bear a special responsibility in pursuing the process of conventional armaments reductions, and the States members of the two major military alliances to continue their intensive negotiations on conventional armaments, through appropriate forums, with a view to reaching early agreement on the establishment of a stable and secure balance of conventional armaments and forces at lower levels under effective international control in their respective regions, par tlcularly in Europe, which h as the largest concentration of arms and forces in the world;".

(Mr. Hu Xiaodi, China)

I should like to emphasize that in the above-mentioned paragraph 4 only drafting changes were made to certain forms of words, without compromising the main thrust of the draft resolution and the aubatance of that paragraph. It can be seen that the only changes were those made to the sentence on new talks on conventional disarmament in Europe so that the wording would reflect the formulation already agreed to by all sides participating in those negotiations. Of cour se, even with regard to such non-subs tan tive changes we have tried our beat to conduct negotiations with others. We point out with appreciation that all sides have demonstrated a spirit of understanding and co-operation.

The Chinese delegation bel ieves that draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 13/Rev.1, wh i ch we submi t ted, reflects the common aspirations md demands of the international community with regard to the important question of conventional disarmament. There fore, we hope that this draft resolution will commmd the continued support of all delegations and will he adopted by consensus as similar draft resolutions have been in other years.

TheIRMAN I The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 10, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.13/Rev.1, entitled Conventional disarmament . This draft resolution was sponsored and introduced by the representa tive of China at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November 1989. The sponsor of the draft resolution has expressed the wish that the draft resolu tion be adopted by the Committee without a vote . May I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly?

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.13/Rev.1 was adopted.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: At our next meeting, to be convened tomorrow morning, we shall deal with the following draft resolutions\ in cluster 7: draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 53/Rev. 2; in cluster 11: draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 37; in cluster 12: draft resolutiona A/C.1/44/L.15/Rev.1 md A/C.1/44/L.58/Rev. 2; md in cluster 16; draft resolutions A/C. 1/44/L. 2/Rev.1, A/C.1/44/L.18 and A/C.1/44/L.22/Rev.1.

I would appeal to delegations to endeavour to conclude their consultations, making full use of the afternoon we have available to us today.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.