



# General Assembly

Fiftieth session

## First Committee

**26**<sup>th</sup> Meeting

Friday, 17 November 1995, 3 p.m.

New York

*Official Records*

*Chairman:* Mr. Erdenuchuluun . . . . . (Mongolia)

*The meeting was called to order at 3.50 p.m.*

### Agenda items 57 to 81 (continued)

#### Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

**The Chairman:** At this meeting the Committee will continue to take decisions on draft resolutions which appear in the following clusters:

Cluster 1: draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1.

Cluster 3: Draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.29/Rev.2 and A/C.1/50/L.45.

Cluster 7: Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1. As far as draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.24 and A/C.1/50/L.31/Rev.1 are concerned, we are still awaiting word on the budget implications. If word is received in the course of the meeting we may still be able to act on those two draft resolutions and I will inform the Committee at an appropriate time.

Cluster 11: Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 is, I understand, still under discussion. Once again, if during the course of this meeting, the sponsors and the interested delegations inform me on the outcome of their consultations and if those consultations were conclusive we may also take up that draft resolution this afternoon.

I hope the delegation of Japan will bear with us, as we left draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2 pending when we adjourned this morning's meeting.

As we shall be taking up other draft resolutions this afternoon, I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than explanations of position or vote on draft resolutions in cluster 1.

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): I wish to address draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". As my delegation has said more than once in the past, this draft resolution is, in our view, counterproductive and inappropriate. It is counterproductive because it singles out for negative attention a State that is actively engaged in the Middle East peace process. It is inappropriate because it is redundant upon the draft resolution on a Middle East nuclear-weapon-free zone, which this Committee adopted by consensus just the other day. In short, this is a bad draft resolution, and the United States will vote against it, as it has against similar texts in the past.

This morning I heard that some in this body might wish to single out one or more of the draft resolution's paragraphs for separate votes. I would like to serve notice in advance that if any paragraph or paragraphs which the United States would otherwise support are singled out for separate action, the United States will abstain because those paragraphs are embedded in a draft resolution that we oppose fundamentally. If any new language is put in, regardless of how benign it is — even if it says, "God is good and the United Nations Charter is okay" — we will abstain on that too, for the reasons I have stated.

**Mr. Dorani** (Djibouti) (*interpretation from French*): It is difficult for me to decide whether my intervention is a statement or an explanation of vote, because it relates to two draft resolutions, one which we adopted yesterday — draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, on “Nuclear testing” — and another which is still under consideration by the Committee, namely, A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”. Perhaps what I am offering is simply food for thought.

I am eager to see the result of the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, and I am above all eager to note the votes of countries that in recent years have repeatedly used their statements on draft resolutions on nuclear testing to try to teach us moral lessons about the consequences of nuclear testing and the dangers of nuclear proliferation throughout the world. Before the vote, one of these countries even went so far as to hand out documents that were out of the ordinary in the normal discourse between States. And unfortunately, these documents challenged the sovereignty of States in taking a position on the draft resolution on nuclear testing. This was done in an attempt to convince us to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3.

For our part, we would say that if those countries are to be consistent in their actions, they should, logically, vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, on the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East. If they do not, I can only tell them, “You are sovereign States and, after all, I understand and respect the position you have taken.”

**The Chairman:** I call now on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or their position before the vote.

**Mr. Yativ** (Israel): I should like to explain Israel’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1. Ever since the Madrid Conference was launched, laying the ground for the ongoing peace process, Israel has hoped and expected that the impact of that historic process would leave its mark on the deliberations of this Committee. We had hoped that short-lived political considerations would give way to a genuine urge to encourage a process that could turn the entire region of the Middle East into a zone of peace. We had hoped that all those regional parties that are involved in the quest for peace in the region would manifest, in this Committee, the kind of attitude that would be conducive to removing this draft resolution from the agenda, thus enhancing the peace process.

To our dismay and to the dismay of other peacemakers, none of this has happened. Unfortunately, we have to engage today in an old ritual that was conceived years ago and retained over the years for political purposes. It has no other aim than to perpetuate, directly or indirectly, the arraignment of Israel in this Committee. An attempt was made to convince the members of this Committee that this draft resolution does not single out Israel. I regret to state that it does just that. A simple scrutiny will indicate that there is a deterioration in the language, both in letter and in spirit, thus maintaining an anachronistic phenomenon of the past.

In presenting this draft resolution, the representative of Egypt referred to “equality” as a key word for regional obligations to attain peace and security. Is it really conceivable that equality can serve as a yardstick when Israel is still faced with tremendous security problems. It must be recalled that a number of well-apportioned regional States still deny Israel’s legitimacy, let alone agree to negotiate peace or endorse the ongoing peace process. Therefore, in the absence of comprehensive peace, the right equation for security and peace is not “equality across the board”, but first meaningful political accommodation and then equal margins of security. Israel is determined to exhaust the ongoing peace process to achieve the coveted infrastructure for the enhancement of progress towards a comprehensive peace and security in the region.

In all candour, we fail to understand the motive for submitting this draft resolution. It is devoid of any substantive message that does not appear in other resolutions. Therefore, Israel will oppose this draft resolution because of its hostile nature and its overall adverse effect on peace in our region. It is time for this Committee to demonstrate its unqualified support for peace in the Middle East and thus reflect in its resolutions the new and hopeful reality evolving in our region. Hence, we strongly urge the members of this Committee to cast a negative vote on this draft resolution, that will naturally constitute a positive vote for peace.

**Mr. Benjamin** (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”, which we have before us today, Canada has decided to take into account all of the possible effects of this draft resolution, particularly — and this was emphasized by the assassination of Yitzhak Rabin two weeks ago — the effects on the efforts now being undertaken to promote and to establish a lasting peace in the Middle East.

The draft resolution deals with one of the essential elements for establishing lasting peace in the Middle East: the question of nuclear proliferation.

*(Spoke in English)*

In many areas of regional tension, in order to deal with the very real security concerns posed by weapons of mass destruction, we need to deal with the broader context — the root causes of tensions, problems and conflicts. We need to build confidence, promote understanding and reconciliation as the basis for true security.

Canada believes that all countries should sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We were pleased to see that the United Arab Emirates recently added its name to the global list of NPT adherents. We congratulate the United Arab Emirates on this step. The NPT is a vitally important foundation for peace and security. Canada also believes that all non-nuclear-weapon States should place their nuclear facilities under full-scope safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency. This would be an important contribution to building confidence at the regional and global level.

The draft resolution before us draws attention to the need to work to ensure the adherents of all States of the Middle East to these instruments. This is a worthy aim — one we fully share. However, notwithstanding the positive elements contained in this draft resolution, we continue to have concerns about other parts of the text. In particular, the singling out of a State is not seen by us as a helpful way of dealing with the problem. Direct engagement between and among concerned parties is the most effective way of developing and implementing lasting solutions. As a country committed to contributing positively to the Middle East peace process, we are very aware of the deep commitment and real effort being made to reach understanding and build new relationships. We believe that the encouraging progress being made in the peace process should be reflected in our consideration of Middle East issues within this Committee.

*(Spoke in French)*

Canada would like all parties directly concerned to continue to work together in all available forums to achieve this common goal, the establishment of lasting peace in the Middle East. We believe that this is the ultimate goal to be achieved and for that reason Canada has decided to abstain on this draft resolution.

**Mr. Sukayri (Jordan):** I have asked to speak in order to explain Jordan's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1 entitled, "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution because it believes that it is balanced and fair. It is balanced in the sense that it refers to all relevant General Assembly as well as International Atomic Energy Agency resolutions and, more important, it recalls the resolutions adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, particularly where they emphasized the importance of the universality of the Treaty. It is also balanced in the sense that it refers in a favourable way to the positive developments in the Middle East peace process and appropriately establishes a clear linkage between confidence-building measures among the States in the region and the consolidation of the nuclear non-proliferation regime.

On the other hand, the draft resolution as it stands is fair in the sense that it calls upon all States of the region without exception or discrimination that have not yet done so to accede to the NPT and to place all their nuclear facilities under full-scope safeguards of the IAEA. Further, it is fair in both welcoming the recent accession to the Treaty by the United Arab Emirates, and calling upon Israel and all other States that are not yet party to the Treaty, to refrain from developing, producing, testing or otherwise acquiring nuclear weapons and also to renounce possession of such weapons. The only reason for mentioning Israel in operative paragraph 2 is simply because Israel, as is well known, is the only State in the region with significant unsafeguarded nuclear capabilities.

My country, Jordan, has, as is known, signed and ratified a peace Treaty with Israel and we are committed, as we believe Israel is, to implement in good faith all of the provisions of that Treaty. That being confirmed, and if it is true that peace and security cannot be maintained in the region unless confidence prevails among all its States, it is our deep conviction that such steps as adherence by all States in the Middle East to the NPT, along with all the fulfilment of requirements of adherence, such as the renunciation of nuclear weapons and the placement of all nuclear facilities under comprehensive IAEA safeguards, will undoubtedly contribute to confidence-building and pave the way for a comprehensive and durable peace in the region.

**The Chairman:** In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, I call on the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs.

**Mr. Davinic** (Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs): In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons", I would like to address the Committee in my former capacity as Secretary-General of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

I have checked the documentation of the NPT Conference to determine the cause of discrepancies with respect to the word "goal" in the various languages in the document entitled "Decision on Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament". It appears that the plural form of this word appears in the English language only. In all other languages the singular form of the word is used.

Upon further examination of the relevant notes, I have determined that, while there was some discussion of this question in the negotiations between the States parties focusing on the substantive consequences of having one or two goals, the final agreement was to have the word in question in the singular.

I have furthermore determined that the plural was introduced in the English text of the final document inadvertently and under the time pressure of producing the documents in the late hours for final approval by the Conference.

It is my understanding that a corrigendum has already been prepared. Had it not been for the busy period of the General Assembly, this document would have been issued already, together with the remaining documentation of the Conference that is still outstanding. I will see to it that this is done as expeditiously as possible so that the English text may be brought into line with all the other languages.

I hope that this explanation will help the Committee proceed with its work without further delay. I would also like to state that if there is any responsibility on the part of the Secretariat in this matter, I will fully assume this responsibility myself.

**The Chairman:** I think that explains the situation that arose this morning.

**Mr. de Icaza** (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am grateful to the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs for his explanation of that mysterious "s" in the English version of the text adopted at the NPT Review

Conference. I would, however, be grateful for a clarification of whether the text on which we are about to vote will contain the word "goal" or the word "goals".

**The Chairman:** In the light of the explanation of the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, it is my understanding that the word will appear in the singular: "goal".

I believe that we can now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2. A recorded vote has been requested. Separate recorded votes have moreover been requested on the fifth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a vote on the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Japan at the Committee's 15th meeting, held on Tuesday, 7 November 1995. It is sponsored by Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malta, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Spain, Sweden and Venezuela.

The Committee will now vote on the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco,

Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

Afghanistan, Brazil, Cuba, Egypt, Ghana, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kenya, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe

*The fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2 was retained by 135 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.*

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a recorded vote on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya,

Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

India, Israel

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Brazil, Cuba, Myanmar, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan

*Operative paragraph 1 was retained by 146 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions.*

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2 as a whole.

*A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2 as a whole.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic,

Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Brazil, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ghana, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Myanmar, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan

*Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, as a whole, was adopted by 144 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.*

*[Subsequently, the delegation of the Gambia advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]*

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya on a point of order.

**Mr. Mubarak** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): This is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to say that my delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2. Shall we speak now or would you rather we waited until after the vote on the second draft resolution?

**The Chairman:** May I remind delegations that explanations of vote are given on clusters rather than on each and every draft resolution. All delegations wishing to explain their votes after the voting will be given an opportunity to do so after all draft resolutions in the cluster have been voted on.

A separate recorded vote on the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1 has been requested.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to act on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Egypt, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States for the month of November 1995, at the 16th meeting of the Committee on 8 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Afghanistan, Egypt — in its capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States for the month of November 1995 — and Malaysia.

*A separate recorded vote was taken on the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia,

Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen

*Against:*

Guatemala, India, Israel

*Abstaining:*

Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Georgia, Guyana, Jamaica, Kenya, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Rwanda, Singapore, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Zambia,

*The sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1 was retained by 109 votes to 3, with 27 abstentions.*

*[Subsequently, the delegation of Thailand informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]*

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1 as a whole.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Chad, China, Colombia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Fiji, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, New Zealand, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen

*Against:*

Guatemala, Israel, Lesotho, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina,

Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Monaco, Mongolia, Myanmar, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Zambia

*Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 51 votes to 4, with 88 abstentions.*

*[Subsequently, the delegations of the Gambia and Guatemala informed the Secretariat that they had intended to abstain.]*

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will commence voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1, entitled "1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka at the 25th meeting of the Committee, today, 17 November 1995. It is co-sponsored by Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and South Africa.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon,

Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

Cuba, India, Israel

*Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1 was adopted by 155 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

*[Subsequently, the delegation of the Gambia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]*

**The Chairman:** I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes. There are 14 speakers so far.

**Mr. Yativ** (Israel): I should like to explain Israel's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1. Israel is not a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and is not bound by the decisions and resolution of the Extension Conference. Israel did not call for a recorded vote on this draft resolution because it considered it to be a procedural one, merely stating facts. However, once a vote was called for, Israel had to abstain because it

cannot support any draft resolution that detracts from the sovereignty of the peace process. In this regard we must also emphasize that we do not accept operative paragraph 2 of this draft resolution.

**Mr. Moubarak** (Lebanon): My delegation wishes to explain its position concerning the draft resolution just adopted on the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

Last May during the Review and Extension Conference of the NPT we stressed our position and we hereby stress again that the NPT is a fundamental component of international peace and security as long as it is effectively universal.

At the time, the Conference did not seriously address the Israeli nuclear programme, which remains outside the circle of the NPT regime. Neither did it address Israel's refusal to adhere to the NPT and to submit its nuclear facilities to the full-scope safeguards regime, thereby constituting a grave threat to regional and international security and undermining the credibility and universality of the Treaty.

Maintaining the Israeli position as a *fait accompli* represents a grave imbalance that seriously threatens peace and stability in the region. Our insistence that Israel should adhere to the NPT is consistent with the principle of universality. The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East remains great, especially since Israel is the only country in the Middle East with significant unsafeguarded nuclear capabilities. That is why we of necessity call for all nuclear facilities in the region to be placed under the full-scope safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Our position on operative paragraph 2, relating to the resolution on the Middle East adopted on 11 May 1995 by the parties to the Treaty, was explained at length during the NPT Review and Extension Conference. Our position remains constant in this regard. No exception should be allowed. As long as Israel does not accede to the NPT and does not place its nuclear facilities under the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency, any measure concerning the NPT, particularly in the Middle East, would fall short of its objective.

This statement applies also to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons", which



in its fifth preambular paragraph mentions the indefinite extension of the NPT.

**Mr. Hallak** (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation wishes to put on record its position concerning the reference to the Review and Extension Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2.

We voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole in consonance with our position supporting nuclear disarmament with the ultimate goal of eliminating nuclear weapons. We abstained in the vote on the fifth preambular paragraph because at the NPT Conference we did not agree to the indefinite extension of the Treaty so long as Israel does not adhere to the Treaty and place its nuclear facilities under the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

My delegation voted for draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1, submitted by Bangladesh and Sri Lanka and entitled "1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons". My delegation is of the view that the indefinite extension of the Treaty has left some nuclear programmes and weapons outside the non-proliferation regime, and by this we mean the Middle East region, the security and stability of which is an integral part of international peace and security.

The Extension Conference provided a rare historic opportunity, which was not taken by Israel, to accede to the Treaty and to contribute with the States of the region to turning the Middle East into a nuclear-weapon-free zone and free of all weapons of mass destruction. Therefore we could not agree to the indefinite extension of the Treaty unless Israel would accede to it and agree to place its nuclear facilities under the IAEA safeguards and inspection system.

The Syrian Arab Republic was one of the first countries to accede to the Treaty. We abide by our obligations under the Treaty. We cannot accept having Israel outside the ambit of the Treaty, especially since everyone knows that it has a large arsenal of nuclear weapons and is still occupying significant parts of the territories of its neighbours, challenging resolutions of international legitimacy, and acting as if it were above international law.

The position of the Syrian Arab Republic emanates from its non-acceptance of the presence of nuclear weapons in Israel, which might endanger peace and security in the region and throughout the world. That situation should be rejected by the international community.

As to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, relating to the Middle East, we emphasize that even though Syria clearly adheres to the process of peace, and despite our bilateral talks and efforts with a view to reaching a just and durable peace in the region, we cannot agree with the decision taken in the Conference on Disarmament concerning the Middle East unless Israel agrees to place its nuclear facilities under the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in implementation of the numerous General Assembly resolutions adopted on this matter and in spite of Security Council resolution 487 (1981), in which the Council called upon Israel to place its nuclear facilities under the safeguards of the IAEA, a resolution which has thus far not been implemented.

*Mr. de Icaza (Mexico), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

**Mr. Starr** (Australia): Australia voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1. We did so because we believe it to be consistent with our support for the Middle East peace process, which has continued to make clear progress in the last year.

The draft resolution is also consistent with our support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and a zone free of weapons of mass destruction.

Most of all, the draft resolution is consistent with Australia's profound commitment to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), in the light of which we support the call made at the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the NPT to all non-parties to the NPT without exception to join the Treaty and accept full scope nuclear safeguards in their nuclear facilities.

Australia considers that the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation norms set out in the NPT are now reflective of customary international law, but universal and formal recognition of this fact is vital if we are to produce a world of greater security for us all, a world free of nuclear weapons within the reasonable time-frame Australia seeks.

**Mr. Martínez-Morcillo** (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union as well as of Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania and Slovakia.

Those States decided to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1 entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

We welcome the efforts made by the sponsors to achieve consensus and to improve the draft resolution over last year's in order to ensure that it reflects important events that have taken place in the field of nuclear non-proliferation.

The international community now has a non-proliferation Treaty of indefinite duration, one which is gradually achieving its goal of universality. The 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the States Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty also adopted a resolution on nuclear non-proliferation in the Middle East. For this reason, the European Union voted in favour of the sixth preambular paragraph. However, despite all these endeavours, the draft resolution continues to make a specific reference to Israel. As a result we were obliged to abstain in the vote inasmuch as the submission of a draft resolution that singles out Israel is not consistent with the spirit of the peace process now under way in the Middle East and fails properly to reflect the remarkable progress achieved in the region this year.

**Mr. Mubarak** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2 and A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1. However, we abstained in the vote on the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, according to which the General Assembly would welcome the decisions of the Review and Extension Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

We do not accept paragraph 3 (c) of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1. Had there been a separate vote on this paragraph we would have abstained because it refers to the same issue.

Inasmuch as the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is a party to the NPT, my delegation would like to reiterate its position concerning the extension of the NPT, namely that the NPT has been extended in an irregular way and through unjustified pressures from one country, which means that

the extension does not reflect the free will of some Member States and there is no agreement now between the Member States. This was evidenced by the fact that the Final Act was not approved at the end of the Conference.

My delegation's position was fully explained at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly after the Treaty was extended as well as in the First Committee. To save the Committee's time we are not going to explain it at length again.

Briefly, the extension of the NPT perpetuated the discrimination between nuclear-weapon-States which develop nuclear weapons qualitatively and those which are not entitled to possess such weapons or even the technology for peaceful purposes.

No binding assurances have been given concerning the non-use or non-threat-of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. The indefinite extension of the Treaty is meaningless unless all countries adhere to the Treaty and pledge to renounce the use of nuclear weapons and place their nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. Moreover, in our region, the Middle East, it is essential for Israel to accede to the NPT and place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards.

Renunciation of the possession of nuclear weapons is essential and a prerequisite for the extension of the NPT.

My delegation also voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, concerning the risk of Israeli nuclear armaments in the Middle East, and would like to explain its position. While we supported draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, my delegation has reservations concerning anything that gives the impression of acknowledging what is called "Israel" and we alert the international community to the seriousness of the large arsenals of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction possessed by Israel, which pose a serious threat to the States of the Middle East and to international peace and security.

We call upon the international community to urge Israel to accede to the NPT and impel it to do so and to place all its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards and to establish a timetable for destroying its arsenals of nuclear weapons. Then, and only then, can we talk seriously about peace and security in the Middle East.

**Mr. Boang** (Botswana): I wish to explain my delegation's position with regard to draft resolution

A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1 which has just been adopted. Botswana voted in favour of the draft resolution but we would like to reserve our position on operative paragraph 2, inasmuch as there is name-calling in that paragraph while all other States remain anonymous, even in operative paragraph 3.

**Mr. Hasan** (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I would like to explain my country's position regarding draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", which has just been adopted. At the outset, I must acknowledge the efforts made by the delegation of the sister State, Egypt, in the preparation of the draft resolution. My delegation supports the noble aims set forth therein. However, we feel that the wording of the draft resolution does not fully reflect the gravity of the matter, for the following reasons.

First, the draft resolution does not refer to the risks that the positioning by Israel of more than 200 nuclear warheads poses to regional and international peace and security.

Secondly, the draft resolution does not refer to the responsibility of the Security Council for eliminating the risks of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, especially the implementation of Security Council resolution 487 (1981), in which the Council called upon Israel to place its nuclear facilities under full-scope safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Israel is the only State that was called upon by the Security Council to do so. Hence, those who complain about the reference to Israel by name should ask the Security Council why it singled out Israel, among all States of the world, in the aforementioned Security Council resolution 487 (1981). Reference must also be made to paragraph 14 of Security Council resolution 687 (1991), the only paragraph in this resolution, on which no action has been taken because it has to do primarily with Israel's weapons, while the rest of the resolution deals with Iraq.

Thirdly, my delegation has reservations on the last paragraph of the preamble because we do not think that the current developments in the peace process in the Middle East will induce Israel to give up its nuclear weapons. In this regard, we feel that the experience of South Africa is a model worth noting. No substantive progress was made towards ridding the African continent of the risks of nuclear proliferation until South Africa renounced its nuclear weapons. Israel should follow this example if it is seeking a real peace in the Middle East.

**Mr. Esenli** (Turkey): I would like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1. My delegation is fully aware of the fact that nuclear proliferation in the Middle East would pose a serious threat to international peace and security. Therefore, we have been calling insistently on all the States in the region to adhere to the international instruments on the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, in particular to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We hold that practical steps in that direction would make an important contribution to confidence-building in the region. With this in mind, we share the main thrust of the draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". Therefore, we voted in favour of the sixth paragraph of the preamble. However, we abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, since we believe that referring to a particular country under such a general title is not compatible with the objective of the draft resolution. Had that not been the case, we would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1.

**Ms. Ghose** (India): My delegation would like to explain its votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1.

We had made a statement this morning. We would normally have voted against draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, for two reasons.

The draft resolution seeks to bring into a General Assembly resolution language and decisions from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), and as a speaker before me mentioned, it seeks to make this language and these decisions into customary international law. We will resist any move to translate inequality into law, particularly, if we have not been parties to the negotiation of that law. In addition, we find that while the title of this draft resolution concerns the "elimination of nuclear weapons", in fact the text seeks to deal only with the subject-matter that had been considered by the Review and Extension Conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). It does not in fact, in our view, deal with nuclear weapons. This constrained my delegation to call for a vote on the fifth paragraph of the preamble and on operative paragraph 1 even though this particular paragraph had been included in last year's text. This year, as I mentioned in my statement, the situation is different. None the less, since the draft resolution as a whole is aimed — although in a misguided way — towards nuclear disarmament and we support nuclear disarmament — we abstained on the draft resolution as a whole.

We have a similar problem with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19 and the use of language and decisions from NPT in this particular draft resolution. We were therefore constrained to vote against the sixth preambular paragraph. However, we abstained on the draft resolution as a whole even though we do not support any State being singled out in a resolution such as this.

My reason for abstaining on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.49 — and I quite willingly admit that it was my delegation that called for a vote on this draft resolution — is that we do not see it as purely procedural. The language of the draft resolution may be procedural; however, we feel that again the results and decisions of an intergovernmental conference outside the United Nations, being sought to be made legal tender within a General Assembly resolution, is a situation we cannot and do not accept.

**Mr. Fouathia** (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): The Algerian delegation wishes to explain its abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2. My delegation, which had supported General Assembly resolution 49/75 H at the last session, regrets however that it was unable to do so in the case of the draft before us this year in document A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, for the following reasons.

First, we believe that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2 duplicates and even contradicts, as we see it, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, of which my delegation was a co-sponsor. Furthermore, the title does not seem accurately to reflect the actual content of the draft resolution, some parts of which appear to us to contradict A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1. We would have preferred, however, some effort to have been made to try to merge these two draft resolutions, after having removed all the contradictory elements.

Secondly, some of the points that were incorporated in the draft resolution seem to us to be inconsistent with the view we hold on nuclear disarmament, which is identical to that held by the Non-Aligned Movement, a view reiterated at the eleventh summit conference, which was recently held at Cartagena de Indias, Colombia. That appeared to us to be fully in harmony with international circumstances that would promote nuclear disarmament.

Finally, unlike draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 the conceptual approach followed by draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2 does not conceive of nuclear disarmament as taking place through concrete measures in a precise context with certain priorities which would lead

eventually to the final elimination of nuclear weapons according to a well-established timetable.

For these reasons my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2. My delegation continues, nevertheless, to hope that during the next session efforts will be made by one and all to bring together views on this important matter so that a consensus can be reached.

**Mr. García** (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My country voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, entitled “The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”.

My country is a party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco and also to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. It supports the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone and, like other Member States of the Organization, it reaffirmed the need to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, as called for in a draft resolution which was adopted without a vote just a couple of days ago by the Committee.

My delegation is pleased to note the progress that is being made in the peace process in the Middle East. The remarkable efforts being made to achieve peace between Palestine and Israel, with the cooperation of many States both inside and outside the region, deserve our resolute and enthusiastic support. Day by day, with increased hope, we see that results are being achieved despite those that still try to stifle these efforts by violent means.

We believe that the elimination of nuclear weapons in the region is one thing that could help to strengthen the right of all States and all peoples of the Middle East region to live in peace.

**Mr. Kim Chang Guk** (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea): My delegation abstained this year on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2 as it did on a similar draft resolution last year. The original draft resolution was sponsored by Japan and we are very concerned that the draft resolution may mislead world public opinion because Japan’s actions with regard to nuclear issues contradict what is written in the draft resolution. Therefore my delegation cannot take the draft resolution at its face value, neglecting benignly what is behind it.

**Mr. Nasser** (Islamic Republic of Iran): The views of my delegation on the issue of nuclear disarmament are basically reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, which was adopted here yesterday.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, also on nuclear disarmament, attempts to present a very broad approach towards nuclear disarmament and disarmament in other fields of weapons of mass destruction, primarily in the context of the decision taken at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The draft resolution does not open any particular doors nor does it close any as it is devoid of specificity and does not identify any measures for reaching the objectives at which the draft resolution seems to aim. In that sense it could have had our moderate and general support, but the draft resolution in its present form still requires some improvements and the points of emphasis need to be adjusted.

One example in this connection appears in operative paragraph 3 where States are called upon to implement fully their commitments in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Whereas many States already have commitments in some areas of the elimination of weapons of mass destruction it is not appropriate to refer solely to the non-proliferation of these weapons and skip their elimination. That could lead to the interpretation that commitments to the elimination of weapons of mass destruction do not have the same significance as other commitments and that their fulfilment need not be called for.

As regards the fifth paragraph of the preamble, the reference to the decisions that were made at the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference is not an accurate reflection of the manner in which those decisions were made. For my delegation, therefore, the basic point of reference for the General Assembly on those decisions would be draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1, adopted a few minutes earlier.

Moreover, while we do welcome the decision on strengthening the review process for the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the decision on Principles and Objectives, we believe it is too early to welcome the decision to extend the Treaty indefinitely as we are still waiting to see how the various decisions and the resolution adopted at the Review and Extension Conference will be implemented and whether commitments agreed upon after intensive negotiations will indeed be fulfilled in good faith.

In this light, my delegation and several others were inclined to present formal amendments to the present text but after consultations with the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, and noting that this is an effort in good faith by Japan, and that incorporating our views in the draft

resolution would have created some practical difficulties for the co-sponsors at this stage, we decided not to submit amendments at this session and we abstained on the draft resolution and on the fifth preambular paragraph, on which there was a separate vote.

We would of course welcome and look forward to consultations with the co-sponsors at an earlier stage next year if they decide to submit a similar draft resolution on this issue.

My delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", as the Middle East continues to remain under Israel's nuclear threat. We wish to put on the record our reservation, however, on the seventh and last preambular paragraph, in which reference is made to the Middle East peace process, on the basis of principled positions on this matter.

**Mr. Alvarez** (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Uruguay abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1 because that text repeats the discriminatory practice of name-calling, which we thought had been done away in General Assembly resolutions. Uruguay has repeatedly stated that it regards as unacceptable the singling out of States in resolutions of a general nature, particularly those that refer to the situation in a specific region.

The peace process in the Middle East is of far-reaching importance to international peace and security. Uruguay has unreservedly supported this process. Language such as that contained in the draft resolution just adopted adds no positive elements but maintains a divisive tone that could be detrimental to such sensitive negotiations.

**Mr. Rivero Rosario** (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2. Just as it had last year with its participation in General Assembly resolution 49/75 H, my delegation has had difficulties in that it would have preferred the title of the draft resolution and the content to have been more objectively balanced. This year once again we have had the same difficulties inasmuch as the title reflects one idea while the content specifically relates to a set of ideas centred on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. My delegation is not a party to that Treaty and therefore it abstained.

That is also the reason why my delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1.

**Mr. Than** (Myanmar): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

Myanmar has been a consistent and ardent advocate of nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation and related nuclear arms limitation measures. However, my delegation is of the view that a country-specific draft resolution such as the present one is not helpful to efforts to achieve these goals. We are sympathetic to, and supportive of, the main thrust of the fifth preambular paragraph calling upon States that have not done so to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as soon as possible, and operative paragraph 3, according to which the General Assembly:

"Calls upon the States of the region that have not yet done so to place all unsafeguarded nuclear facilities under full-scope International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards ...".

We are also supportive of the main thrust of another draft resolution — A/C.1/50/L.10 — entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East" which, without being country-specific, encompasses positive elements similar to those mentioned above.

My delegation has reservations about operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, which singles out Israel. For this reason my delegation abstained in the vote on that draft resolution.

**Mr. Zaluar** (Brazil): The delegation of Brazil has asked to speak in order to explain our abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2. Last year

we also abstained in the voting on a similar resolution, General Assembly resolution 49/75 H, and expressed the wish that future drafts would take into account the important role of regional agreements, such as the Treaty of Tlatelolco and others, nuclear non-proliferation and support for nuclear disarmament. We regret that once again the sponsors could not accommodate our concerns. We hope that next year if the draft resolution is introduced again, adequate changes will be made which will allow us to vote in favour of the draft, the general objectives of which we fully share.

Also in connection with the draft resolutions in the cluster approved today, I must stress that Brazil's understanding of the process of the evolution of customary international law is different from that expressed by a representative who spoke earlier. My delegation fails to grasp the notion that a treaty which is not universally accepted can somehow be considered a part of customary international law.

**Mr. Abdulai** (Ghana): As the matters that I intended to raise have been clarified, it is unnecessary for me to intervene.

**Mr. Ngo Dinh Kha** (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): I wish to explain Viet Nam's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2 and A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1.

As members of the Committee know, Viet Nam has supported and will continue to support any efforts to achieve general and complete disarmament, particularly in the nuclear field. This is why we voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2. However, Viet Nam would still like the Committee to adopt a draft resolution of more specific and stronger content, in accordance with the aspirations of the non-nuclear-weapon States and more in keeping with the responsibilities of the nuclear-weapon States in respect of reductions in the stocks of such weapons and, ultimately, their complete elimination.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, Viet Nam's affirmative vote is fully in keeping with the desire to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

I wish to emphasize that these votes are entirely consistent with Viet Nam's position on the question of general and complete disarmament.

**Mr. Leung** (Fiji): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1 because we believe

that the elimination of nuclear weapons in the Middle East would produce an atmosphere conducive to success in the current peace process. As Fiji is a signatory to the Treaty of Rarotonga, its support for this draft resolution is also consistent with its view that the total elimination of nuclear weapons should be our ultimate goal. However, we should like to record our regret at the fact that a State has been singled out for mention in the text.

**The Acting Chairman** (*interpretation from Spanish*): We have now concluded our consideration of the draft resolutions in cluster 1 on nuclear weapons.

The Committee will now take action on the two draft resolutions in cluster 3 — A/C.1/50/L.29/Rev.2 and A/C.1/50/L.45.

I shall first call on those delegations that wish to make general statements — not explanations of vote.

**Mr. Akram** (Pakistan): I should like to refer to the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45, submitted by the Islamic Republic of Iran, India and Pakistan and contained in document A/C.1/50/L.56.

The sponsors of these amendments held consultations with the principal sponsor of the draft resolution. Although the amendments were viewed with understanding, we were told that the question of the transfer of related technology should be taken up next year. Secondly, it was clarified that the goal was indeed to place a moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines of all types. Thirdly, it was made clear that the concerns with regard to assistance in mine clearance could be reflected in other draft resolutions to be taken up by the General Assembly. We were also told that if the proposals contained in document A/C.1/50/L.56 were included in draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45, this might result in the loss of some of the sponsors of the latter.

Bearing these responses in mind, and in a spirit of compromise, the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.1/50/L.56 have agreed not to press them to a vote.

**The Acting Chairman** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Pakistan. The amendments contained in document A/C.1/50/L.56, relating to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45, have been withdrawn.

**Mr. Rodrigue** (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation wishes to indicate its wish to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/L.29/Rev.2, entitled

“Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them”.

The Haitian delegation would like to emphasize the importance that it attaches to the question of putting an end to the illicit circulation and collection of small arms, which constitute a very serious threat to the safety of civilian populations, as well as to the political stability of numerous countries.

The proliferation of these weapons, which are very easy to acquire, undoubtedly contributes to increasing banditry, violence and crime, thus disturbing peace in society and weakening national institutions, particularly in those countries serving their apprenticeship in democracy.

This applies to my country — Haiti — where, one year after the restoration of democracy, certain groups of individuals hostile to change and to the establishment of a state of law continue to sow death and insecurity. Very recently, a member of parliament was slaughtered in broad daylight, and another was very seriously wounded in the street.

At this time, when Haiti is preparing to organize the election of a new president in order to assure the continuance of the democratic process which began with the elections of 1990, such criminal acts are intended only to create a climate of insecurity and instability which would be likely to disturb the holding of these elections.

This shows very clearly that collection of the great number of weapons which are circulating in Haiti is a matter of absolute priority if we want democracy and the reconstruction of the country — to which the international community has pledged itself — to be effectively realized. This is why my Government has just adopted appropriate measures to collect all the weapons which are circulating in Haiti.

My Government wishes thereby to indicate its determination to dismantle this structure of violence and crime which went on during the three years of the *coup d'état* and thereafter. We hope that the international community, through the United Nations Mission in Haiti, can lend its help to ensure the success of this undertaking to totally and completely disarm the country, so earnestly desired by the Haitian people, the main victims of these weapons.

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): I, too, would like to say a few words about draft resolution

A/C.1/50/L.45, on the moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines. At the outset, allow me to express appreciation to the co-sponsors of the amendments outlined in A/C.1/50/L.56 for their decision to withdraw their proposed changes. I can confirm the essence of the report we just heard from the Ambassador of Pakistan concerning the dialogue that took place between the co-sponsors of A/C.1/50/L.45 and the co-sponsors of A/C.1/50/L.56. This spirit of cooperation has continuously proven so important to the work of the First Committee on its steps towards the removal of this scourge.

As can be expected, we are quite pleased that the draft resolution enjoys solid, widespread support from a diverse mix of United Nations Members. With a record of 103 co-sponsors, the draft resolution reflects the growing international commitment to address the humanitarian dimensions of this issue.

As in last year's resolution, the Assembly would call on States to work towards the eventual elimination of all anti-personnel land-mines, and to adopt, as a first step, moratoriums on their transfer and sale. According to the draft resolution, the General Assembly would welcome the progress made this past summer at the International Meeting on Mine Clearance, at which over 90 Governments were represented. It also highlights the need to strengthen the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects and Protocol II — on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby Traps and Other Devices — and discusses this issue without in any way prejudging the results of the Conference, which reconvenes in January.

Finally, by encouraging further international efforts to seek solutions to the problems caused by land-mines, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45 underscores the importance of international cooperation on this issue. The draft resolution is one of three that deal with this important matter. We are focusing here on export moratoriums. The General Assembly is dealing with de-mining and assisting affected countries; while regulation of the future use of land-mines is the subject of the Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons. These draft resolutions and these efforts should be seen together, and taken as three parts of a whole campaign.

It is true that my Government is responsible for having actually introduced this draft resolution, but it is also true that credit for it must be shared among the other 102 co-

sponsors, as well as with the many other delegations with which we worked.

We request that this draft resolution be adopted without a vote.

**The Acting Chairman** (*interpretation from Spanish*): Does any other delegation wish to make a general statement? If not, does any delegation wish to explain its position before action is taken on these resolutions? I see there are none. We shall therefore proceed to take action on these draft resolutions. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.29/Rev.2, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mali, at the Committee's 15th meeting on Tuesday, 7 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Belize, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Gabon, the Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Japan, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal and Togo.

**The Acting Chairman** (*interpretation from Spanish*): The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed their wish that it 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.1/50/L.29/Rev.2 was adopted.*

**The Acting Chairman** (*interpretation from Spanish*): We now move on to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution contained in A/C.1/50/L.45 entitled "Moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the United States of America at the 13th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Afghanistan, Angola, Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Colombia, the Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia,



Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Djibouti, Andorra, Fiji, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, the Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, the Federated States of Micronesia, Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Latvia, Liechtenstein, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, the Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen and Zambia.

**The Acting Chairman** (*interpretation from Spanish*):

The sponsors of this draft resolution have requested that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. ...

I call on the representative of the Gambia.

**Mr. Jallow** (Gambia): The Gambia would like its name to be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

**The Acting Chairman** (*interpretation from Spanish*):

It will be so recorded.

I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45 without a vote.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45 was adopted.*

**The Acting Chairman** (*interpretation from Spanish*):

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

**Ms. Ghose** (India): My delegation is extremely pleased to see that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45 has been adopted by consensus. However, I should like to add a particular comment at this point.

Last year India was a co-sponsor of a similar draft resolution on moratoriums and this year we had also wished to have been able to join the co-sponsors and perhaps have been included in this long list of co-sponsors of this important draft resolution. We were unable to do so and I should like to cite the reasons.

The first problem related to the fifteenth paragraph of the preamble. We had considerable difficulty with the concept that outside the negotiations to take place in Geneva on Protocol II, other measures will be under consideration simultaneously. We believe, as the draft resolution itself states, that the only authoritative international instrument governing the responsible use of anti-personnel land-mines would be Protocol II. In that light we would have preferred a slight modification to the fifth preambular paragraph.

Similarly, we had a slight problem with the implication in operative paragraph 5 that the implementation of the applicable rules of Protocol II would take place immediately. That particular concept is being negotiated in Geneva. We have nothing against it. After having heard the representative of the United States very carefully explain that this did not prejudice that, we are considerably reassured.

Those two comments do not diminish our support of the main thrust of this draft resolution. We totally support the moratoriums and the draft resolution as it stands.

**Mr. Yativ** (Israel): I wish to explain Israel's position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45. Israel shares the dismay at the ongoing tragedy engendered by the illegal and irresponsible planting of more than 100 million anti-personnel land-mines in more than 30 countries and is one State that has imposed a moratorium on the export, sales and transfers of anti-personnel mines.

We have also donated to the United Nations Voluntary Fund and have offered our extensive practical experience, know-how and assistance in training in de-mining techniques. Israel supports the requirement that all mines be detectable and that remotely delivered mines be equipped with self-destruct mechanisms, and it supports the requirement that the use of anti-personnel mines without self-destruct mechanisms be restricted to controlled areas in accordance with clear requirements to be set out in the provisions of the Protocol.

Israel favours the extension of the scope of Protocol II to non-international armed conflicts, as well as during peacetime, with the aim of protecting the civilian population both in times of war and in times of peace. We appreciate that in the realities of today extensive civilian casualties indeed occur during non-international conflicts in what is formally considered to be peacetime. Israel calls upon regional States to act likewise and declare a moratorium on anti-personnel land-mines.

**Sir Michael Weston** (United Kingdom): My delegation went along with the consensus on the draft resolution which the Committee has just adopted, the text of which was contained in document A/C.1/50/L.29/Rev.2, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them".

When we joined the consensus on a similar draft resolution last year we made it clear to the co-sponsors that we had two concerns which needed to be addressed in any future resolution. First, we expressed our belief that the implementation of the resolution, and in particular the advisory missions referred to in the draft resolution, should not place any additional burden on the United Nations regular budget and that the costs associated with these activities should be met from within existing resources. This view has been fully justified in the light of the subsequent further deterioration in the financial situation of the United Nations. Our concerns remain with regard to this year's draft resolution. The deliberations of the United Nations Disarmament Commission on international arms transfers next year should help to inform Member States where valuable resources could best be directed in this area.

Secondly, as we pointed out last year in respect of last year's resolution, the second preambular paragraph is inconsistent with the rest of the text. The focus of the draft resolution should be maintained clearly on the illicit traffic of small arms. Small arms can be essential weapons of self-defence for every nation and their possession *per se* does not necessarily impede development or increase insecurity. It is not "massive", but "excessive" quantities that can be destabilizing.

Illicit transfers, on the other hand, can pose a threat to the stability of a State or region. We are disappointed that our suggested amendment calling for the insertion of the word "illicit" before the word "circulation" in the second preambular paragraph was rejected by the co-sponsors. We urge the co-sponsors to look again at this important point. If any future draft resolution on this subject is to be adopted by consensus it will be necessary to amend the language to take account of this point.

**Mr. Esenli** (Turkey): I should like to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45. We fully share the view that the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel land-mines causes great humanitarian and economic problems. We strongly support the goal of ending the human tragedy that they cause. Therefore we attach great importance to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45 which the Committee has adopted by consensus.

However we are not in full agreement with the wording of operative paragraph 6. We understand the definition of "eventual elimination" in that paragraph as a political goal that we must strive to attain in the future. With that understanding in mind we joined in the consensus. Had operative paragraph 6 been put to a separate vote we would have abstained.

**Mr. Liu Jieyi** (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45, on the moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines. I should like to explain the Chinese position as follows.

China is a State party to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. We have always complied with the provisions specified in the Convention. China is of the view that with regard to the prohibition or restrictions on the use of anti-personnel land-mines, on the one hand it is of course necessary to avoid the infliction of harm on innocent civilians by land-mines. On the other hand, consideration should be given to the fact that land-mines are passive explosive devices and are legitimate means of self-defence for many countries.

China supports the joint efforts made by the international community to seek feasible and effective means to solve land-mine problems in a balanced way. In this spirit China participated actively in the Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons held in Vienna last September.

China joined in the consensus on the relevant resolutions on the moratorium on land-mines at the forty-eighth and forty-ninth sessions of the General Assembly. China has always taken a very cautious and responsible attitude towards the export of weapons, including land-mines. As a matter of fact, ever since the relevant resolution was adopted at the forty-eighth session China has not exported any anti-personnel land-mines. At the same time, China is of the view that land-mines constitute legitimate self-defence for many countries. Whether a prohibition on the export of all anti-personnel land-mines would serve the legitimate right to self-defence of all these countries, especially the developing countries, is a matter that would need to be studied.

**Mr. Onanga-Anyanga** (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation wishes to become a co-sponsor of

draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45. It welcomes the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.29/Rev.2.

However, my delegation wishes to express its regret that one of the pertinent provisions in the initial draft of this draft resolution has been deleted because of the financial implications that it entailed. This has diminished the significance of this very important draft resolution.

**The Acting Chairman** (*interpretation from Spanish*): Does any other delegation wish to explain its position? If not, let us move on to cluster 7.

In cluster 7 the Committee will take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.24, A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.31/Rev.1.

I now have pleasure in calling on Ambassador Erdenechuluun of Mongolia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1.

**Mr. Erdenechuluun** (Mongolia), Chairman of the Disarmament Commission: In my capacity as Chairman of the United Nations Disarmament Commission for its 1995 session and on behalf of the co-sponsors who are traditionally members of the expanded Bureau of the Commission, I have the pleasure of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission".

The draft resolution has been prepared in a manner similar to that of previous resolutions regarding the Disarmament Commission with only certain appropriate technical changes in the text as circumstances warrant. This draft is the result of open-ended informal consultations among members of the Disarmament Commission. Nevertheless, I wish to point out in particular operative paragraphs 8 and 12.

Operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolutions reads:

"Recommends that, pursuant to the adopted three-item phased approach, the Disarmament Commission, at its 1995 organizational session, adopt the following items for consideration at its 1996 substantive session:

"(a) International arms transfers, with particular reference to resolution 46/36 H of 6 December 1991;

"(b) [to be added]

"(c) [to be added]".

In this regard, it should be noted that, as explained in the footnote, two new items would be decided at the 1995 organizational session and would subsequently be added to the agenda of the Disarmament Commission at its 1996 substantive session. In order to determine the subject-matter of these two new items, open-ended informal consultations have been held in the course of the past few weeks among members of the Commission. At this stage I am happy to note that consultations on the issue have been very positive and cooperative among delegations in searching for the appropriate subjects of these two new items. More consultations will be held at a later time with a view to reaching a consensus among members of the Commission. I am confident that with the spirit of cooperation and compromise we will be able to harmonize views of delegations at the organizational session of the Disarmament Commission scheduled for 11 December this year.

Operative paragraph 12 of the revised draft resolution reads:

"Further requests the Secretary-General to prepare a compilation, in the format of a note by the Secretary-General, of all texts of principles, guidelines or recommendations on subject items that have been unanimously adopted by the Disarmament Commission since its inception in 1978".

The programme budget implications prepared by the Budget Division will be presented by the Secretary of the Committee.

Furthermore, in order to accommodate the concerns of certain delegations, the phrase "in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations" has been deleted from operative paragraph 12 of the original draft resolution, A/C.1/50/L.28. I hope that with this slight revision and after hearing the explanation of the resources required for the compilation, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1 entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission" will again enjoy a consensus vote as in previous years. Thank you for your attention to this introductory statement.

**The Acting Chairman** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on representatives wishing to make general statements on the draft resolutions in cluster 7.

I see there are none.

Does any delegation wish to make a statement in explanation of vote before decisions are taken on the draft

resolutions before the Committee? I call on the representative of the United Kingdom.

**Sir Michael Weston** (United Kingdom): I wish to explain the position of the United Kingdom and the United States of America on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1, on the report of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

Our delegations intend to support the draft resolution as a whole but to abstain on operative paragraph 12. We very much regret having to do this, but we were unable to persuade all the co-sponsors to omit this paragraph.

In operative paragraph 12 the Secretary-General is requested to prepare a compilation of texts of principles, guidelines or recommendations that have been unanimously adopted by the Disarmament Commission since its inception in 1978. Our delegations question whether the production of such a compilation, at a time when the United Nations is seriously handicapped by financial problems, is a sensible use of the scarce resources of the United Nations.

Even if the programme budget implications show that it can be produced within existing resources, that does not mean it is necessary to produce it in the first place, or that it is needed. All United Nations expenditure obviously has a financial cost but it also has an opportunity cost. Money spent on one thing is unavailable to spend on something else which might be more useful. In our delegations' view that is certainly the case here.

There is no General Assembly resolution that specifically forbids such a compilation. However, there have been a number of resolutions in recent years, for example resolutions 33/56 and 38/32, which call for restraint in the duplication or reproduction of existing texts and suggest other ways of meeting the need for delegations to be aware of relevant documents. One way would be to provide a list of the documents concerned.

*The Chairman returned to the Chair.*

Operative paragraph 12 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1 is contrary to the spirit of these resolutions if not the letter. Our delegations believe that the action proposed in this paragraph represents an unwelcome reversion to former bad practice, long since abandoned. This would be particularly deplorable at a time of financial crisis. It would also set a bad precedent for the First Committee, other subsidiary organs of the General Assembly, and other

United Nations bodies. That is why we shall abstain on operative paragraph 12.

We would urge any other delegation concerned about the need for the United Nations to streamline its operations and avoid unnecessary expenditure, to join us.

**The Chairman:** Does any other delegation wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting? There seems to be none.

The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolutions in cluster 7. First, the Committee will take up draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.24. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.24 was introduced by the representative of Peru at the 16th meeting on 8 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Japan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, South Africa (on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the African Group of States), Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

**The Chairman:** The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.24 have expressed their wish that it 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.1/50/L.24 was adopted.*

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1.

A separate, recorded vote on operative paragraph 12 has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1, beginning with a recorded vote on operative paragraph 12.

Before doing so, however, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, I shall

read out a statement of the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1.

“By operative paragraph 12 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1, the General Assembly *inter alia*

‘Further requests the Secretary-General to prepare a compilation, in the format of a note by the Secretary-General, of all texts of principles, guidelines or recommendations on subject items that have been unanimously adopted by the Disarmament Commission since its inception in 1978’.

“In that connection, the activity called for in operative paragraph 12 of the draft resolution is programmed in the proposed programme budget for the 1996-1997 biennium under Section 2 C.4, Disarmament. It appears under the heading ‘Parliamentary services’, within subprogramme 1, ‘Deliberation and negotiation’ of Programme 7, ‘Disarmament’ of the medium-term plan for the period 1992-1997 as revised, and hence would be carried out within resources approved under Section 2 for the biennium 1996-1997. It should be noted that all texts of principles, guidelines or recommendations, as referred to in operative paragraph 12 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1, have already been translated into all official languages of the United Nations as contained in the reports of the Disarmament Commission. Therefore, the workload involved will be minimal, requiring referencing, a limited amount of translation and editing, text-processing and reproduction. It is therefore proposed to absorb the additional requirements that would arise within resources to be made available under Section 2 C.4, Disarmament, and Section 2 6.E Conference Services, of the programme budget for the biennium 1996-1997.”

The Committee will now proceed to take a separate, recorded vote on operative paragraph 12 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1, entitled “Report of the Disarmament Commission”. This draft resolution was introduced at this meeting of the Committee. It is sponsored by Belarus, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, Germany, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mongolia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Poland, South Africa, Sweden and Uruguay.

*A recorded vote was taken on operative paragraph 12 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Operative paragraph 12 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1 was retained by 147 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

**The Chairman:** The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed their 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.1/50/L.28/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted.*

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.31/Rev.1. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will commence its voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.31/Rev.1, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific", which was introduced by the representative of Mongolia at the 14th meeting of the Committee on Tuesday, 7 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Peru, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Viet Nam.

**The Chairman:** The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed their wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

I call on the representative of China on a point of order.

**Mr. Liu Jieyi** (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): This morning I informed the Secretariat that the Chinese delegation requested a separate recorded vote on operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. The Chinese delegation will explain its position after the vote.

**The Chairman:** A separate recorded vote on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.31/Rev.1 has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): I will check with my colleagues, who apparently did not receive this request. But there might have been a communications breakdown and if that is so we do apologize.

*A separate, recorded vote on operative paragraph 4 was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria,

Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakistan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India

*Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.31/Rev.1 was retained by 143 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

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

*Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.31/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Benin informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chairman:** I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote or position.

**Mr. Martínez-Morcillo** (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am speaking to express the position of the European Union on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.24, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa and United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean", which has just been adopted without a vote. I also speak on behalf of the following countries: Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania and Slovakia.

Our countries continue to believe that the regional disarmament efforts continue to be important. Consequently we regret to note that the United Nations Regional Centres in Lomé and Lima have been unable since last year to carry out substantive activities because of a lack of resources, which should have come from voluntary contributions.

Unfortunately, this is the continuation of a pattern we have seen for a number of years. The draft resolution does not reflect these facts nor does it take into account the Secretary-General's report this year, which makes it clear that the closure of the Centres may be dictated by a lack of resources.

As we see it, it would not be responsible for the First Committee to ignore the grave financial circumstances facing the United Nations, which the Secretary-General has rightly drawn to our attention. We do not feel that we can turn our backs on reality any longer. If, despite our renewed efforts every year, it is not possible to secure financing through voluntary contributions, which will make it possible for the Centres to carry out substantive work, then we share the Secretary-General's view that the Centres will have to be closed and the activities carried out from United Nations Headquarters. The approach to a draft resolution next year should be reconsidered, therefore, in the light of these circumstances.

I should like to add that in accordance with the same principles our delegations have joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.31/Rev.1, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific". This Centre attracts levels of voluntary resources that are sufficient to enable it to carry

out valuable work. I request that the text of this explanation of vote be annexed to next year's report of the Secretary-General on these Centres.

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): The United States fully supports the position taken by the European Union on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.24. For the record, the United States would like to be associated with the statements just made by the representative of Spain on behalf of the European Union, including his request that the statement be annexed to next year's report of the Secretary-General on the activities of the regional centres.

**Mr. Liu Jieyi** (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): First, I wish to reiterate that the Chinese Government supports the work of the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific and commends the Centre for its efforts in recent years to enhance mutual understanding between countries of the region and to enhance regional disarmament and security in arms control through the organization of regional meetings.

The Chinese Government wishes to thank in particular our friendly neighbour, Nepal, for the important role it has played as host nation to the Regional Centre. On the basis of this position, the Chinese delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.31/Rev.1.

Concerning operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.31/Rev.1, the Chinese delegation is of the view that other than the site of the Centre, Kathmandu, there is no need to make separate reference to any other city as that would mean giving one city special treatment that is not given to others. Therefore the Chinese delegation abstained in the vote on this paragraph.

We would also like to point out that on the basis of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly the activities of the Centre, the items for discussion at meetings, and so on, should be established jointly by the countries of the region in full consultation and should reflect in a balanced way the concerns of all countries. It is not appropriate for individual countries that provide funding to take over everything.

**Mr. Moradi** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should like to make a brief statement on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.31/Rev.1, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific". The Islamic Republic of Iran in principle supports the Centre, its goals and activities. However, we think that in future Asian countries should have more say in the activities

of this Centre, the topics of seminars, agendas of seminars and other related activities and we hope that in future the Centre will pay more attention to all the subregions of Asia, in particular the Middle East region, which is an integral part of Asia and where there is a need for the promotion of disarmament and security issues.

**Ms. Ghose** (India): My delegation abstained on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.31/Rev.1, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific", not because we have any problems with the activities of the Centre *per se*, but we do not think that the Centre should embark on activities unless all countries of the region are agreed on those activities. We would have preferred all countries of the region to have agreed on the text of this particular paragraph, in which case clearly we would have had no problem with it.

**The Chairman:** Does any other delegation wish to speak at this time? There seems to be none.

May we then move on to cluster 11. Concerning cluster 11 I informed the Committee that consultations were continuing on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7. The situation at present is that action on the draft resolution cannot be taken this afternoon but will have to be deferred until Monday. However, I shall now call on the representative of Egypt, who wishes to speak to this particular draft resolution.

**Mr. Abdelaziz** (Egypt): I am speaking with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 in cluster 11. An amendment in document A/C.1/50/L.58/Rev.1 has been proposed to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7. It addresses an important principle of the United Nations Charter and it is the wish of several delegations that the inalienable right of self-determination should be recognized in this draft resolution.

It has been learned that some delegations would like a reference to this inalienable right included in a different manner. Therefore, in an effort to reach agreement on the draft resolution and before consideration of and action on A/C.1/50/L.58/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.7, my delegation wishes to introduce an amendment in the form of a paragraph that we propose would replace the current third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 which takes into consideration the views of both the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 and those of A/C.1/50/L.58/Rev.1.

This draft amendment, the wording of which comes from the generally agreed paragraph 83 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, reads as follows:

"Taking into account the need of States to protect their security, bearing in mind the inherent right of self-defence embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and without prejudice to the principle of equal rights and self-determination of people in accordance with the Charter".

This paragraph, as I have just said, comes from paragraph 83 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

**The Chairman:** I thank the representative of Egypt for his introduction of an oral amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7.

I now call on the representative of Pakistan.

**Mr. Akram** (Pakistan): We have had long and constructive consultations with the principal sponsor and some other delegations with regard to the amendment that had been proposed by Pakistan and the Syrian Arab Republic in document A/C.1/50/L.58/Rev.1 to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7.

We are most grateful to our distinguished colleague from Egypt for the efforts that he has made and for proposing a change in the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7. If this revised third preambular paragraph can be incorporated into draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 my delegation is prepared to withdraw the amendment in A/C.1/50/L.58/Rev.1.

Before yielding the floor, and to avoid the kind of controversy that was raised this morning about the letter "s", may I draw attention to the fact that the formulation in paragraph 83 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament which was referred to in the text read out by our colleague from Egypt refers to the

"principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples" — with an "s", and that is also in the Charter.

**The Chairman:** I should like to remind representatives that we are already over time. Please be very brief.



**Sir Michael Weston** (United Kingdom): We do indeed seem to be plagued by the letter “s” today, those that should be there and those that should not. I was going to ask the representative of Egypt whether he was departing from the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament and the Charter having the word “people” in the singular. I am still not clear.

The representative of Egypt read out the word “people”. We are now told that he should have read out the word “peoples”. Which should it be?

**The Chairman:** Probably whatever is written in the document should be there — the word “peoples” and not the word “people”.

I call now on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The countries of the Non-Aligned Movement will be thrilled to learn that there will be a meeting of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement in this room immediately following the adjournment of the First Committee. In addition, a meeting of countries of the Non-Aligned Movement will also take place on Monday at 9 a.m. in Conference Room D.

**The Chairman:** The next meeting of the Committee will take place on Monday morning at 10 a.m.

*The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.*