



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/46/PV.45
19 November 1991

ENGLISH

Forty-sixth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 45th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 13 November 1991, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia)

- Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations [114] (continued)
- Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas): Letter from Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland [39]
- Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency [14] (continued)
 - (a) Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Agency
 - (b) Draft resolution
 - (c) Amendment

/...

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

- Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments [18]
 - (h) Appointment of the members of the Consultative Committee of the United Nations Development Fund for Women
 - (i) Appointment of members of the Committee on Conferences: Note by the Secretary-General

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 114 (continued)

SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS (A/46/474/Add.4)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to draw the Assembly's attention to document A/46/474/Add.4, which contains a letter addressed to me by the Secretary-General informing me that, since the issuance of his communications dated 17 September, 8 and 10 October and 5 November 1991, the Dominican Republic has made the necessary payment to reduce its arrears below the amount specified in Article 19 of the Charter.

May I take it that the General Assembly duly takes note of this information?

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 39

QUESTION OF THE FALKLAND ISLANDS (MALVINAS): LETTER FROM ARGENTINA AND THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (A/46/596)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): In connection with this item, I should like to call the attention of the Assembly to document A/46/596 containing a joint statement issued in London and Buenos Aires on 25 September 1991 by the Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Argentine Republic.

Furthermore, and taking into account General Assembly decision 45/424 of 12 December 1990, I should like to inform representatives that, following consultations regarding agenda item 39 on the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), it is proposed that the General Assembly decide to postpone consideration of this item and to include it in the provisional agenda of its forty-seventh session.

(The President)

May I take it, therefore, that the Assembly, taking into account its decision 45/424, wishes to take note of document A/46/596, already referred to, and that it is also the wish of the Assembly to defer consideration of this item and to include it in the provisional agenda of the forty-seventh session?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): We have thus concluded consideration of agenda item 39.

AGENDA ITEM 14 (continued)

REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

- (a) NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL TRANSMITTING THE REPORT OF THE AGENCY (A/46/353)
- (b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/46/L.10 and Corr.1)
- (c) AMENDMENT (A/46/L.12)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): May I remind representatives that the debate on this item was concluded at the 34th plenary meeting, held on Tuesday, 22 October.

In connection with this item, the Assembly has before it a draft resolution issued as document A/46/L.10 and Corr.1 and an amendment submitted by the representative of Iraq in document A/46/L.12.

I call on the representative of Iraq, who wishes to introduce the amendment to draft resolution A/46/L.10.

Mr. MALIK (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): On behalf of the delegation of Iraq, I have the honour to introduce the amendment to draft resolution A/46/L.10 that has been circulated in document A/46/L.12. I should like to make it clear here that the proposed operative paragraph is an addition to the draft resolution contained in document A/46/L.10.

Before I proceed with my introduction, allow me to make the following remarks.

First, Iraq is very keenly interested in seeing that the work of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) or any other international agency of the United Nations system should not be politicized.

Secondly, the aim of some parties to politicize draft resolution A/46/L.10 is part of a series of efforts being made by them to show Iraq as contravening resolutions and conventions so that the inhuman blockade against the Iraqi people may continue. Members are undoubtedly familiar with the latest report, excerpts of which were published in The New York Times of 22 October 1991 concerning the death of Iraqi children under the age of five in Iraq and the destructive results of this inhuman blockade and the toll it has taken in Iraqi lives and the very structure of Iraqi society. I quote from this report as cited in The New York Times:

(spoke in English)

"The safe disposal of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, demanded by ... resolution [687 (1991)], is a particularly legitimate concern. But it ... unleashed the destructive power of another weapon of mass destruction - the effective withdrawal of food and other necessities from the Iraqi people'." (The New York Times, 22 October 1991, p. A6)

(Mr. Malik, Iraq)

(spoke in Arabic)

Thirdly, we in Iraq are against double standards in dealing with States. If there is a single agreed standard, let it be applied to all States without distinction, especially in this vitally important field. The United States and its Western allies have raised the roof over the mere fact that Iraq has a technological and scientific research programme. These States claim that they are applying the Charter and international law. Why then do they not confront Israel, which actually does possess, and I repeat, does possess nuclear warheads aimed at the heads of all Arabs.

Israel has more than 300 nuclear warheads aimed at the heads of your Arab friends. Should you not voice your deep concern over this dangerous aberration, which threatens dire consequences at any moment? I advise members to take a look at the article published in The New York Times on 20 October 1991 to see but a part of the reality to which we had drawn attention in June 1981. The statement made by the Foreign Minister of Iraq at that time in a meeting held by the Security Council will make it clear that Iraq had mentioned this information in detail concerning Israel's project for the production of nuclear weapons to use against your Arab friends. Is this not a cause for deep and profound concern?

This is all that we are requesting in the paragraph contained in the amendment in document A/46/L.12, that is, to mention two facts: namely, that the General Assembly notes with appreciation a resolution of the International Atomic Energy Agency on Israeli nuclear capabilities and the threat they pose to the States of the region, and that deep concern is felt by all of us as a result of Israel's non-compliance with the Security Council resolution unanimously adopted on 19 June 1981 clearly calling on Israel to accede to the

(Mr. Malik, Iraq)

Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. This is all that we want to say in this paragraph. It is only right, fair and just.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I call on the representative of Argentina, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. CHIARADIA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): As is customary, the members of the Bureau of the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) coordinate the submission of the draft resolution relating to that body's report to the General Assembly.

This year Argentina as Chairman and Australia and Bulgaria as Vice-Chairmen fulfilled this task. In carrying out this responsibility, we consulted with a large number of countries on how best to present the IAEA's report to the General Assembly at this session. During those consultations, we found that a large number of delegations felt that the wording of the draft resolution in document A/46/L.10 was suitable and satisfactory.

Consequently, reflecting the opinion of the members of the Bureau of the Board of Governors of IAEA and speaking on behalf of all the countries supporting the present text of draft resolution A/46/L.10 as a whole, we believe that amending that text would be inappropriate.

For those reasons, we propose, in conformity with rule 74 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure, that no action be taken on document A/46/L.12.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The representative of Argentina has moved, within the terms of rule 74 of the rules of procedure, that no action be taken on the amendment circulated in document A/46/L.12. Rule 74 reads as follows:

(The President)

"During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote ...".

I call on the representative of Iraq.

Mr. MALIK (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): The Iraqi delegation categorically rejects and firmly opposes the arbitrary proposal made by the representative of Argentina. The procedure adopted by the sponsors of draft resolution A/46/L.10 is not evidence of courage but of failure. It is obvious that they have resorted to this procedural ploy out of fear that the Iraqi amendment in document A/46/L.12 may be adopted.

The procedure is utterly undemocratic, although some of the sponsors raise the slogans of democracy and claim to defend it. Once again, the General Assembly can see very clearly how double standards are used in dealing with States and facts alike. This is yet another demonstration of the policy of muzzling certain parties and of dealing in a discriminatory and arbitrary manner with a fact that is known to all: that the international community condemns such a policy. This policy is intended to prevent members from making proposals and discussing them.

Where is the justice that has been lauded by these States? Where are the principles of the Charter, which protect everyone in this Hall? Where is the fairness of which some are so fond of paying lip service to?

The delegation of Iraq has submitted the amendment to draft resolution A/46/L.10 contained in A/46/L.12. As I said in my earlier statement, the amendment contains two facts which are known to all and which are acknowledged by the international community. In doing that, Iraq, like all other Member States, has exercised its right to voice a legitimate concern. And we are sure that many free States of the world share that concern.

But, like many others, we have noted that over the past two weeks the United States of America has brought pressure to bear on all Member States with a view to blocking the adoption of our amendment. It was ironical indeed that, whenever we contacted our Assembly colleagues to discuss the matter

(Mr. Malik, Iraq)

with them, we were told that the United States too had contacted them. No one said he had been contacted by Israel. The spoilt child of the United States did not even bother to contact anyone, since big brother did the job on its behalf.

The delegation of Iraq, in putting these facts before the Assembly, calls upon all States to support the cause of justice and thwart the proposed adjournment of the debate on amendment A/46/L.12. We call on members to vote against that proposal. History will record who upheld the principles of the Charter and who did otherwise.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I shall now put to the vote the motion submitted by the representative of Argentina that no action be taken on the amendment circulated in document A/46/L.12. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zimbabwe

Against: Algeria, Bahrain, Burkina Faso, China, Comoros, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nigeria, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Uganda, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen

Abstaining: Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Haiti, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Myanmar, Namibia, Oman, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia

The motion was adopted by 88 votes to 25, with 26 abstentions.*

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/46/L.10 and Corr.1.

I shall call on representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the voting. May I remind delegations that in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401 explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

* Subsequently the delegations of Hungary and Mauritius advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegations of Indonesia, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United Arab Emirates had intended to vote against; the delegation of Niger had intended to abstain.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): Yemen values very highly the efforts of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in carrying out its tasks in the Middle East region and in other parts of the world. Consistently, year after year, Yemen has supported the resolutions relating to the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

However, in the light of what has just taken place with regard to the procedural motion submitted to the Assembly, we must say that what has taken place betrays clearly a double standard in dealing with the Middle East region.

The justification given to us a few moments ago with regard to that procedural motion was that the draft resolution is an integrated whole and that anything else will damage the draft resolution.

May I refer to the last preambular paragraph which makes mention of certain resolutions adopted by the Agency concerning the Israeli nuclear capabilities and the Israeli nuclear threat. In the same paragraph, there is reference to another resolution on the application of the IAEA safeguards in the Middle East.

The annals of the United Nations are replete with the breaches by Israel of United Nations resolutions and Israel's non-compliance with the repeated calls to it by this international forum to accede to the safeguards regime of the IAEA. As a member of the Security Council, we note the draft resolution's reference to Security Council resolutions and find it strange indeed that reference to Security Council resolutions relating to Israel would damage the draft resolution. In view of this double standard, we no longer know which of the Security Council resolutions we should select and which we should reject. Is the Security Council made up of several parts? This is a question before the international community.

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Yemen)

Our concern and fear is that the procedural motion would mean, inter alia, giving Israel carte blanche to persist in its rejection of the international community's pleas and calls that it should accede to the safeguards regime of the IAEA.

In view of the reports which are no longer covered by secrecy and which have become common knowledge, we must draw attention to the fact that in the Middle East region Israel, in particular, possesses nuclear capabilities and nuclear weapons.

In view of all this, my delegation finds that it cannot support the draft resolution this year and, therefore, will abstain when it is put to the vote.

Mr. KORUTURK (Turkey): Turkey is against the proliferation of nuclear weapons. That is why we join in the consensus which exists in the General Assembly on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. This position of my country was confirmed yesterday in the First Committee during the adoption, without a vote, of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.35/Rev.1. Therefore, we have no objection to the substance of the amendment in document A/46/L.12.

Nevertheless, because we believe that the draft resolution in document A/46/L.10 on the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency is not the appropriate framework for addressing this issue, we voted in favour of the procedural motion for no action on this amendment.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The General Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/46/L.10/Corr.1. A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/46/L.10/Corr.1.

Is there any objection to that request?

(The President)

Since there is no objection, I shall therefore put operative paragraph 4 to the vote first.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

Against: Cuba, Iraq

Abstaining: Benin, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ghana, Haiti, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Malaysia, Mexico, Myanmar, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda

Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/46/L.10/Corr.1 was adopted by 122 votes to 2, with 11 abstentions.*

* Subsequently the delegations of Hungary, Indonesia, Latvia and Liberia advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I now put to the vote draft resolution A/46/L.10/Corr.1, as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brasil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Algeria, Cuba, Ghana, Haiti, Iraq, Jordan, Malaysia, Sudan, Yemen

Draft resolution A/46/L.10/Corr.1, as a whole, was adopted by 141 votes to none, with 9 abstentions (resolution 46/16).*

* Subsequently the delegations of Hungary, Indonesia, Latvia and Nicaragua advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes. May I remind delegations that, in accordance with decision 34/401, explanations of vote or position are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

MR. MONTAÑO (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Mexico voted in favour of draft resolution A/46/L.10 because, as in past years, we are convinced of the importance of the work being carried out by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), as described in the report (A/46/353) before the General Assembly.

My delegation would have preferred to have the draft resolution remain within the bounds of the texts which have in the past won the unanimous support of the General Assembly. We are sure that a text in keeping with resolution 45/7, which was adopted last year, would have maintained the agreement among all delegations on the mandate and work of IAEA. In our opinion, the inclusion of operative paragraph 4 in the text put to the General Assembly this year brings in elements on which it could be difficult to achieve a consensus.

The delegation of Mexico has reservations about this paragraph, as it believes that it introduces political considerations into the work of a body which is eminently technical. Similarly, we were opposed to including additional elements in the draft resolution with political objectives, as these would have been likely to undermine the purpose of the resolution we have just adopted.

Also, it is clear that, regardless of the importance that the Agency's participation has had in the implementation of Security Council resolutions

(Mr. Montaña, Mexico)

687 (1991) and 707 (1991), the Agency has carried out other activities over the past few months which can not and should not be sidelined. One cannot award the IAEA safeguards activities a privileged place in a resolution submitted to the General Assembly except at the expense of the importance attached to other activities, such as, for example, the Agency's technical cooperation. It is contrary to the provisions of resolution GC(XXXV)/RES/569 of the 35th General Conference of IAEA, which affirmed that in order for its objectives to be achieved, a suitable balance should be struck between the Agency's principal activities.

Furthermore, it is clear that the activities of IAEA which relate to Iraq derive from specific Security Council mandates and, therefore, are exceptional in nature. The Agency must hold to its unaltered and unalterable character as a technical body by avoiding politicization and not extrapolating extraordinary cases into guidelines for the future.

Mr. TRINH XUAN LANG (Viet Nam): The delegation of Viet Nam has asked to speak in order to explain, briefly, the positions that it adopted in the voting process related to the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

On many other occasions at this rostrum or in IAEA forums, Viet Nam has expressed its high appreciation of, and support for, the important work of IAEA. As indicated in the annual report of IAEA for 1990 (A/46/353) and in the statement by Dr. Hans Blix, Director General of IAEA, the Agency has undertaken an immense amount of work and has taken on some tasks that are unprecedented in their scope and complexity.

(Mr. Trinh Xuan Lang, Viet Nam)

The work of IAEA is commendable, and Viet Nam is pleased to join other countries in endorsing the report of the Agency submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-sixth session, as reflected in the resolution just adopted.

The position that the delegation of Viet Nam adopted on the procedural vote relating to the amendment contained in document A/46/L.12 is fully in line with the objectives of the Agency, particularly that of promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Furthermore, that position is based on Security Council resolution 487 (1981) of 19 June 1981, numerous resolutions of the General Assembly, and on resolution GC(XXXV)/RES/570 of IAEA.

Mr. ANOONOR (Ghana): The draft resolution contained in document A/46/L.10, together with the amendment proposed in document A/46/L.12, sought to contribute to the achievement of an objective we all desire, namely, the eventual establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. In the relevant resolution adopted last year - resolution 45/52 - the General Assembly urged that steps should be taken towards the establishment of such a zone and called upon all Middle East States that had not done so to submit to International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards.

Ghana strongly identified itself with forces that condemned Iraqi aggression against, and occupation of, Kuwait. It was absolutely unacceptable and morally wrong for Iraq to invade and occupy Kuwait. It is a matter of regret that our appeals for a peaceful solution of the underlying conflict did not reach receptive ears.

Ghana has also supported subsequent resolutions of the Organization, including resolution 687 (1991), adopted by the Security Council in order to

(Mr. Awoonor, Ghana)

permit an inventory of Iraq's chemical weapons, biological weapons and nuclear facilities, materials and stockpiles. Had the draft resolution contained in document A/46/L.10 come under an agenda item dealing directly with the Gulf crisis, and had it therefore made any reference to Iraq in that context, Ghana would have positively voted for it without hesitation, but the resolution comes under agenda item 14, which deals with the report of IAEA.

(Mr. Awoonor, Ghana)

The report deals with a number of issues, including resolution GC(XXXIV)/RES/526 of the IAEA General Conference, in which the Director General is requested

"to deploy further efforts in continuing the consultation with the States concerned in the Middle East area with a view to applying Agency safeguards to all nuclear installations in the area".

(IAEA Annual Report for 1990 (GC(XXXV)/953), p. 6)

Ghana therefore expected the Assembly to adopt a resolution that could add to the worthy efforts that have been launched in Madrid and would promote lasting peace in the Middle East, with particular reference to assignments given to IAEA. Regrettably, the resolution does not take into account these laudable goals and rather tends to be discriminatory in intent, but the United Nations cannot be a body that will lend itself to any effort which is not seen to be even-handed or fair. It is for these reasons that my delegation abstained in all phases of the decision-making on this resolution.

Mr. RIVERO ROSARIO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Cuba would like to place on record its reservation with regard to operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/46/L.10, on the report of IAEA. That reservation was the reason for our abstention.

In the first place, I should like to mention the importance my country attaches to this body, which helps provide useful cooperation in our present programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy with a view to the economic, social and scientific development of Cuba.

Since my delegation did not take part in the debate, may we briefly thank the Director General of IAEA for the report he has submitted, which provides

(Mr. Rivero Rosario, Cuba)

some information on Cuba's cooperation with IAEA, to which I have just referred.

In past years, the General Assembly resolution on the report of IAEA has been more or less procedural in nature, taking note of the report as a whole without giving special importance to any particular activities and avoiding controversial language that might prevent it from enjoying greater support from delegations. This is not surprising since the report deals with the work of a body that is so important to the international community that the adoption of its annual report to the General Assembly should command only the broadest possible support. Abandoning this beneficial approach could have a negative effect, and no one would want that. It might set a precedent which could undermine the achievement of consensus in other related areas.

My delegation is also concerned that in operative paragraph 4 one of the Agency's activities is singled out for praise, an activity that was carried out at the behest of another principal organ whose decisions are binding in nature, and do not require action by the General Assembly, the organ to which IAEA reports regularly within the context of the resolutions mentioned in the same paragraph and which keeps itself informed of the matter by virtue of those resolutions. Furthermore, as will be recalled, resolution 687 (1991) was not supported by all members of the Security Council, and my delegation, as a non-permanent member, voted against it for the reasons clearly explained on that occasion. We shall not repeat them here, but they had to do with its judgement that, through that resolution, the Security Council assumed powers which went beyond its terms of reference as laid down clearly in the United Nations Charter. This action, in our opinion, therefore violated the terms of the Charter. The reasons we expressed still have the same force and validity,

(Mr. Riva TORRERO, Cuba)

quite apart from any other considerations. For that reason it would be impossible for my delegation to support this paragraph of the resolution on the report of IAEA.

In addition, my delegation would like to state its view that the activities authorized by the Security Council on verification and inspection, including those related to the case of Iraq, should not become a precedent or be used as a pretext for strengthening some IAEA activities at the expense of the other tasks of extreme importance that are being carried out by the Agency for the benefit of the developing countries in the promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. And that includes technical assistance and cooperation.

The Cuban delegation is also concerned that by singling out in a General Assembly resolution this particular activity of IAEA that is being carried out in such exceptional circumstances, to which the Director General referred when he presented his report, we would unduly prejudge the activities that the organization should be carrying out in the future in the normal performance of its many functions, including activities to improve safeguards.

Although it is always right and necessary to refer to past experience in such delicate areas as the one considered here, which affects the interests of the entire international community, we should proceed with the utmost caution and with due respect for the sovereignty of States, without offering judgements but taking into account everyone's concerns. It would be harmful and against the general interest if this procedure were undermined or subverted.

Finally, my delegation would like to say that its position does not imply any commitment regarding those treaties or conventions mentioned in the draft

(Mr. Rivero Rosario, Cuba)

resolution that have not been signed by Cuba, specifically the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material - nor any commitment, as we have indicated before, with regard to implementation of Security Council resolution 687 (1991) or how that resolution might apply to other cases.

Mr. JACOB (Israel): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution just adopted, but if the text had been put to the vote paragraph by paragraph we would have voted against the last paragraph of the preamble.

Mr. SALAH (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/46/L.10 because we believe that there is a lack of balance between the concepts and issues in the preambular paragraphs and those which appear or those which do not appear in the operative paragraphs of the resolution.

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

Specifically speaking, while the last preambular paragraph refers to various instances relating to the nuclear capabilities of certain countries, such as the nuclear capabilities of South Africa and Israel's nuclear capabilities and threat, as well as the application or non-application of the Agency's safeguards in the Middle East, in the operative paragraphs, there is no mention at all of South Africa or Israel, or of the fact that Israel is not committed to implement the safeguards regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), particularly in the case of the Dimona reactor.

That is why we find that the draft resolution had strayed from equity and justice in its judgements. For all those reasons, and because we believe that the adoption of resolutions in the General Assembly should proceed in a democratic fashion, my delegation voted against the procedural motion submitted by Argentina.

I should like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation of the IAEA and its Director General for their work. I would also like to emphasize the importance of their work in encouraging the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and their taking due account of the need of developing countries, in particular, to obtain technical assistance from the Agency.

My delegation would like to reaffirm the right of States to possess the necessary technology to provide for their own development. I would also like to assert that States - particularly those in the Middle East - should accede to the non-proliferation Treaty and apply the safeguards of the IAEA on all their nuclear installations.

Mr. MUMBENGEWI (Zimbabwe): Zimbabwe has read with great care the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) contained in document A/46/353. We have also examined the resolution just adopted and its amendment in document A/46/L.12.

(Mr. Mumbengegwi, Zimbabwe)

As a member of the Security Council, Zimbabwe supported Security Council resolutions 687 (1991) and 707 (1991). Those resolutions entrusted the IAEA with certain tasks relating to the nuclear programme in Iraq. The Agency has discharged the tasks assigned to it by the Security Council.

It is therefore consistent that we should commend the Agency for carrying out those tasks. For that reason, we have supported the resolution just adopted without any amendments.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 14.

AGENDA ITEM 18

APPOINTMENTS TO FILL VACANCIES IN SUBSIDIARY ORGANS AND OTHER APPOINTMENTS

- (h) APPOINTMENT OF THE MEMBERS OF THE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR WOMEN
- (i) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCES: NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/46/109)

The PRESIDENT: Concerning sub-item (h) of agenda item 18, the terms of office of the present five members of the Consultative Committee appointed under General Assembly decisions 43/325 of 9 December 1988 and 45/318 of 12 December 1990 expire on 31 December 1991.

Following consultations, I have appointed Denmark and Uganda as members of the Consultative Committee for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1992.

May I take it that the General Assembly takes note of these appointments?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: Consultations for identifying candidates for appointment as members of the Committee are still in progress. Accordingly, I hereby renew my appeal to the regional groups to continue to extend their cooperation to me in this regard.

(The President)

We have concluded this stage of our consideration of agenda item 18 (h).

We turn now to sub-item (i) of agenda item 18, entitled "Appointment of members of the Committee on Conferences". As indicated in document A/46/109, the General Assembly, by its resolution 43/222 B of 21 December 1988, decided that the Committee on Conferences should be composed of 21 members to be appointed by the President of the Assembly, after consultations with the chairmen of the regional groups, for a period of three years, on the basis of geographical distribution. The Assembly further decided that each year one third of the Committee's membership should retire and that retiring members would be eligible for reappointment.

Since the terms of office of Ghana, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Jamaica, Mozambique and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland expire on 31 December 1991, it is necessary for the President of the General Assembly to appoint, during the current session, seven members to fill the resulting vacancies. The members so appointed will serve for a period of three years beginning on 1 January 1992.

After consultations with the chairmen of the groups of Asian States, Eastern European States, Latin American and Caribbean States and Western European and Other States, I have appointed Honduras, Hungary, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Jamaica and Turkey to be members of the Committee on Conferences, with effect from 1 January 1992.

May I take it that the Assembly takes note of these appointments?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: Regarding the remaining two vacancies to be filled from the African States, I intend to hold further consultations with the

(The President)

chairman of the group in this respect. Therefore I propose that the Assembly should keep this sub-item on the agenda of the forty-sixth session. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees to that procedure.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We have concluded this stage of our consideration of agenda item 18 (i).

The meeting rose at 11.20 a.m.