

UNITED NATIONS
General Assembly

FORTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
33rd meeting
held on
Friday, 10 November 1989
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 33rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of and action on draft resolutions on disarmament items
(continued)
- Organization of work

This record is subject to correction.

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/44/PV.33
21 November 1989
ENGLISH

89-63207 4663V (E)

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

AGENDA ITEMS 49 TO 69 AND 151 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the Secretary of the Committee to make an announcement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the First Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/44/L.17/Rev.1: Côte d'Ivoire; A/C.1/44/L.25: Mauritius, Gambia and Uganda; A/C.1/44/L.34: Mongolia and Guatemala; A/C.1/44/L.52: Argentina; A/C.1/44/L.55: Romania; A/C.1/44/L.15/Rev.1: Thailand; A/C.1/44/L.47: Thailand; A/C.1/44/L.31/Rev.1: Romania; and A/C.1/44/L.36: Suriname.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As I informed you yesterday, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.17/Rev.1, which is included in cluster 3, and on draft resolutions A/C.1/44/L.12, A/C.1/44/L.14, A/C.1/44/L.24 and A/C.1/44/L.34 contained in cluster 5, draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.3 and A/C.1/44/L.39 in cluster 6, and A/C.1/44/L.5, A/C.1/44/L.9, A/C.1/44/L.21, A/C.1/44/L.42, A/C.1/44/L.48 and A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.1. in cluster 7.

Several delegations have requested that draft resolutions A/C.1/44/L.17/Rev.1 and A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.1 should not be voted on until this afternoon. I have also received requests that action on draft resolutions A/C.1/44/L.12, A/C.1/44/L.21 and A/C.1/44/L.24 should be deferred until next week. Those requests will be heeded. I should like to appeal to delegations to endeavour to abide by our programme of work so that we may be able to finish our work in accordance with the established timetable.

(The Chairman)

We shall now proceed to take action on those draft resolutions in cluster 5 that have not been deferred, namely draft resolutions A/C.1/44/L.14 and A/C.1/44/L.34.

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.14 is entitled "Nuclear disarmament". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of China at the 31st meeting of the First Committee on 6 November 1989. It is sponsored by the delegation of China. It has been requested that this resolution be adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.14 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.34, entitled "Cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament and prevention of nuclear war". It is sponsored by 17 delegations and was introduced by Argentina. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): This draft resolution is sponsored by the following countries: Argentina, Brazil, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, the German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Nigeria, Romania, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.34.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Denmark, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Norway

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.34 was adopted by 114 votes to 12, with 5 abstentions.*

* Subsequently, the delegations of Afghanistan, Benin, Kenya, Mauritania and Peru advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will now turn to the draft resolutions in cluster 6, draft resolutions A/C.1/44/L.3 and A/C.1/44/L.39. Does any delegation wish to make a statement with regard to either of those draft resolutions, other than in explanation of vote?

Mr. DIETZE (German Democratic Republic): Following consultations with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.3 and with other interested delegations, my delegation would like to propose an oral amendment to the draft resolution. Before the penultimate preambular paragraph, the following paragraph should be added:

"Noting that the Ninth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Belgrade from 4 to 7 September 1989 stressed the need for the conclusion of an international agreement prohibiting all use of nuclear weapons,".

With the inclusion of a footnote reference to the document of the non-aligned meeting, the text of the preambular paragraph of the draft resolution would follow the practice of earlier resolutions adopted under this item. It also broadens the references made in the draft resolution to the important subject of the non-use of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war.

We therefore submit draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.3, as orally amended, to the Committee for its consideration and approval.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will now proceed to a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.3, as orally amended. Does any delegation wish to make a statement in explanation of vote before the voting?

Mrs. URIBE de LOZANO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): As it did in the case of General Assembly resolution 43/78 B and other similar resolutions adopted in previous years, the delegation of Colombia will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.3, "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war".

(Mrs. Uribe de Lozano, Colombia)

We feel that the only reliable guarantee that nuclear weapons will not be used is the total elimination of such weapons. Declarations of the non-first-use of such weapons, as contained in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution before us, imply the existence of nuclear weapons and, in essence, they amount to a legitimization of such existence. The concept of non-first-use, when applied only to nuclear weapons, weakens the prohibition of the use of force contained in the United Nations Charter. It also obscures the need to avoid war of any kind.

Even were we to agree that nuclear war could be prevented through declarations alone, declarations on non-first-use would not affect present arsenals and the potential threat they pose, nor would they affect the possible use of conventional or chemical weapons, which, if used in an attack, could easily lead to the use of nuclear weapons.

With those considerations in mind, Colombia is a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.34, submitted by Argentina, which more properly expresses our position on the urgent subject of the prevention of nuclear war, the non-first use of nuclear weapons and the prohibition of nuclear weapons.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): If no other delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/44/L.3 or A/C.1/44/L.39, the Committee will now proceed to vote on those draft resolutions.

The Committee will vote first on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.3, as orally amended. The draft resolution is entitled "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war". It has six sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic at the 21st meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1989. The sponsors of the draft resolution are: Bulgaria, Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia and Romania.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Spain

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.3, as orally amended, was adopted by 106 votes to 16, with 8 abstentions.*

* Subsequently the delegations of Afghanistan, Kenya and Mauritania advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.39, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". The draft resolution has 12 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of India at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, held on 8 November 1989. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the First Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.39 is sponsored by the following delegations: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Romania, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.39.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Greece, Ireland, Israel, Japan

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.39 was adopted by 113 votes to 17, with 4 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call now on delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote.

Mr. NOREEN (Sweden): I wish to explain the vote of the Swedish delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.3, introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic, and draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.39, introduced by the representative of India.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.3, let me first of all reiterate that the Swedish Government views unilateral declarations by the nuclear-weapon States committing them not to be the first to use nuclear weapons as an important concept in the effort to reduce the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war. We hope that all nuclear-weapon States will find it possible to make such declarations. It is obvious that progress in conventional disarmament and in the establishment of non-offensive military structures on all sides would facilitate such commitments.

In the view of the Swedish Government a firm commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, made through an international instrument of legally-binding character, would be an important contribution to successful efforts to prevent nuclear war. That is one reason for the support my Government has given to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.3.

* Subsequently the delegations of Afghanistan, Kenya and Mauritania advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Noreen, Sweden)

However, such an international instrument should deal solely with the concept of non-first use of nuclear weapons and should not contain any further elements not directly related to it. In fact, the Swedish Government considers that the prohibition of the use or threat of use of force in international relations, laid down in Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations, is mandatory and sufficient. What is required is, rather, improved compliance by Member States with the existing prohibition and with the obligation, also laid down in the Charter, to settle their international disputes by peaceful means.

Sweden voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.39. We did so, as in previous years, since Sweden supports the concept of prohibiting, in an international legal instrument, the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. It seems that such a prohibition corresponds to an international norm saying that the use of nuclear weapons contravenes the laws of humanity and the dictates of public conscience. Many rules of international law and certain circumstances limit or prohibit the use of nuclear weapons. Sweden considers that time is ripe to investigate the possibility of comprehensively banning, in an appropriate legally-binding form, the use of nuclear weapons. Since the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons is not deducible from the Charter of the United Nations, Sweden has reservations concerning the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution and its interpretation of the United Nations Charter.

Dame Ann HERCUS (New Zealand): It was only after the most careful consideration, and with some regret, that New Zealand again decided to vote against the draft resolutions contained in document A/C.1/44/L.3, on the non-use of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war, and in document A/C.1/44/L.39, promoting a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

(Dame Ann Hercus, New Zealand)

The decision to cast a negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.3 was not taken easily. The abhorrence of New Zealanders for nuclear weapons is widespread and deep. It has found expression in New Zealand's nuclear-free legislation, which prohibits the entry of nuclear weapons into New Zealand under any circumstances whatsoever. The New Zealand Government has rejected the use of nuclear weapons even in our defence.

For that reason, a major thrust of my delegation's work at the United Nations is maximizing New Zealand's contribution to working for a world in which no country feels it must depend for its security on nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction.

Reluctantly, however, we have come to the view that in its present form this draft resolution does not make a real contribution to that process. We acknowledge that there have been improvements in some preambular paragraphs. These now reflect more clearly the state of the international environment.

But in our view the draft resolution remains flawed. The only certain guarantee against the use of nuclear weapons is through their total elimination. That day will come only when no State believes it has the need for nuclear weapons. There are developments which may lead the more optimistic among us to believe that the day may be nearer than we had dared hope. In that context, I would highlight the talks on conventional forces in Europe, where the conventional security issues that are so intimately linked to the nuclear equation are being addressed.

(Dame Ann Hercus, New Zealand)

None of us can stand aside from this process of making the world a safer place. The nuclear-weapon States have a special role, but none of us can afford to shirk our responsibilities. New Zealand has worked with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.3 towards a text that better reflects today's realities. Unfortunately, despite mutual good will, these efforts did not produce a draft resolution for which New Zealand could vote. We should like to continue this process of co-operation next year, with the objective of achieving a draft resolution that could be adopted by consensus.

We have also, with some reluctance, decided again this year to vote against the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/44/L.39. We have taken this decision because of our concerns about whether the convention promoted by that draft resolution could realistically be a practical disarmament measure. The convention as it stands is essentially declaratory and provides no mechanism for verification. However, we are pleased to note there have been a few useful improvements in the preambular paragraphs which address some of the concerns we expressed last year.

While New Zealand has difficulty in supporting the draft resolution in its current form, we share its wider objective of reducing the threat of nuclear war and preventing the use of nuclear weapons. New Zealand is totally opposed to nuclear weapons. As I have said, we have rejected them as a rational form of defence for our country. Opposition to nuclear weapons is a deeply held conviction in New Zealand. It is our view that while nuclear weapons continue to exist every effort should be made, and all avenues explored, to ensure that nuclear missiles remain in their silos. We doubt, however, whether the approach proposed in the draft resolution can make a substantive contribution to that end.

(Dame Ann Hercus, New Zealand)

As the draft resolution acknowledges, the only certain guarantee against the use of nuclear weapons is their total elimination. We have seen welcome steps in this process in both conventional and nuclear disarmament. In New Zealand's view, further major achievements in these areas will provide us with the secure knowledge that nuclear weapons will not be used.

Mr. HU Xiaodi (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation agrees with the gist of draft resolutions A/C.1/44/L.3 and A/C.1/44/L.39, and therefore we voted in favour of them.

However, we wish to emphasize that on the very day it acquired nuclear weapons, 16 October 1964, the Chinese Government solemnly announced to the whole world that China would never, under any circumstances, be the first to use nuclear weapons. We have consistently held that all nuclear-weapon States, particularly those possessing the largest nuclear arsenals, should also accept the obligation never to use nuclear weapons under any circumstances, and in particular not to use them against non-nuclear-weapon States or to use them in nuclear-weapon-free zones. On this basis, there should be concluded an international convention, to which all nuclear-weapon States should be parties, prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons. These considerations, and other approaches and measures to prevent nuclear war, have not been fully or comprehensively reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.3.

Moreover, the preamble to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.39 and the draft convention annexed to that draft resolution contain certain wording that we consider requires further consideration.

Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland): I wish to explain Finland's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.3, entitled "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war".

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

Nuclear war is nowhere professed to be an element of rational policy. The major nuclear Powers have jointly stated that a nuclear war cannot be won and should never be fought. Finland appreciates that statement. Nuclear weapons should never be used under any circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As no other delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote on the resolutions we have just adopted, I now propose that we proceed to take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 7. I shall first call on delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. AHMAD KAMAL (Pakistan): I wish to introduce a draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia (A/C.1/44/L.48), sponsored by Bangladesh and Pakistan.

The draft resolution has been motivated by our abiding commitment to the process of the universal elimination of nuclear weapons. It also reflects the realistic assessment that, pending the achievement of a nuclear-weapon-free world, it would be advantageous to keep as many regions of the world as possible free of nuclear weapons.

We have consistently supported and pursued the objectives of general and complete disarmament and have stressed the need for a comprehensive approach to nuclear disarmament. It remains our view that a comprehensive approach encompasses global, regional and bilateral measures for nuclear disarmament. We believe that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world represents an important collateral measure which would contribute significantly to a nuclear-free world. It is in this spirit that we have consistently supported all proposals for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

The concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones is not new. It has received consistent support from, and has been endorsed by, the international community.

(Mr. Ahmad Kamal, Pakistan)

The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament unanimously recognized the need for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world, with the ultimate objective of achieving a world entirely free of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Ahmad Kamal, Pakistan)

The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has also lent its support to the establishment of those nuclear-weapon-free zones. The Declaration adopted at the conclusion of the Ninth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries held at Belgrade, Yugoslavia, in September 1989, expressed support for the establishment and strengthening of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world, which could significantly contribute to the strengthening of international security.

We believe that the necessary conditions exist in South Asia to enable the countries of the region to move towards the objective of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. All countries of the region share the commitment to keep the area free of nuclear weapons. They have made unilateral declarations at the highest levels pledging not to acquire, develop or manufacture nuclear weapons. They have supported all international efforts for nuclear disarmament and for the complete elimination of these awesome weapons of mass destruction.

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.48, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, has been prepared along the same lines as resolution 43/66 adopted with the overwhelming support of Member States last year. We hope that the international community will once again lend its support to this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As there are no other delegations wishing to make statements on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 7, I now call upon those delegations that wish to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. SOOD (India): The delegation of India wishes to place on record its views with regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/44/L.48, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", introduced by Pakistan.

(Mr. Sood, India)

The position of India on this issue is based on certain principles which form part of our coherent and consistent disarmament policy. Those principles are also contained in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament held in 1978, which was adopted by consensus. We have maintained that nuclear disarmament is a global, and not a regional, issue. Accordingly, lasting world peace can only be built on the basis of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Within this process nuclear disarmament is accorded the highest priority and this has been accepted by the world community in the 1978 Final Document.

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones does not, in our view, accord with this global approach. In the action plan for ushering in a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world order presented last year at the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, we had highlighted the importance of a global approach. Zoning measures of the kind visualized by such draft resolutions will not lead us to our shared objective of a global nuclear-weapon-free zone.

We would do well to keep in mind the illusory nature of security provided by a nuclear-weapon-free zone when faced with the global reach of such weapons. This is amply borne out by studies on climatic and environmental consequences of the nuclear exchange. The large-scale climatic perturbations, the consequent effects on the interlinked biosystems that support life on this planet, and the resulting societal disruptions will make distinction between combatant and non-combatant totally superfluous. Not only do targeting strategies of the nuclear-weapon States cover the entire earth, but their ships and submarines loaded with sea-launched ballistic missiles and sea-launched cruise missiles roam unimpeded in all oceans of the world.

(Mr. Sood, India)

The primary reason behind this dichotomy is that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones does nothing to reduce the level of existing stockpiles in the arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States. On the contrary, it could be argued that such steps may even serve, indirectly, to legitimize the possession of nuclear weapons by a few States.

In today's interdependent world, inter-State relations have to be based on equality and non-discrimination. No State has the right to claim for itself the cachet of "responsible" while consigning others to the category of "irresponsible".

Nevertheless, we recognize that nuclear-weapon-free zones have been established in other parts of the world. We have not objected to these proposals, but have participated in the global consensus that they attract because, in the first place, they enjoy consensus among the States of the region concerned. These initiatives arise out of shared perceptions of the States of the region. They emerge from local initiatives and are freely arrived at among the States themselves. Prior consultations are carried out with a view to reaching consensus. At that stage, the United Nations plays the significant role of endorsing such agreements.

In addition, there exists the question of the practicality of such measures. The presence of nuclear weapons on the ground and in the waters surrounding South Asia raises basic questions in defining the viability of such a zone. Those problems demonstrate the difficulties of attempting artificial geographical delimitations of this kind.

The proposal by Pakistan does not carry the kind of qualifications that have enabled us to support other proposals that enjoy consensus with regard to establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones. As the Pakistani proposal is clearly not introduced in this forum with a view to achieving reasonable consensus, one can only conclude that the intent behind the draft resolution is not serious.

(Mr. Sood, India)

Resolutions such as those introduced in a ritual fashion and lacking substantive content run counter to the provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In 1974, we too had submitted a draft resolution on this subject. It was adopted by an overwhelming majority but did not enjoy consensus among the States of the region. Since then we have therefore directed our efforts to consensus-building and have not engaged in a ritual submission of draft resolutions.

A climate of trust and confidence must be created. This requires patience, perseverance and hard work - not rhetoric or ritual draft resolutions.

My delegation will vote against the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/44/L.48.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As no other delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the voting, we will now take action on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 7.

The Committee will proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/44/L.5, on implementation of General Assembly resolution 43/62 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco). The draft resolution has 18 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 26th meeting of the First Committee on 2 November 1989.

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

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the First Committee): The list of sponsors for draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.5 is as follows: Mexico, the Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now put draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.5 to the vote.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Cuba, France

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.5 was adopted by 132 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.9, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 26th meeting of the First Committee, on 2 November 1989. I have received a request that this draft resolution be adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.9 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.42, entitled "South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty". This draft resolution has five sponsors, and was introduced by the representative of New Zealand at the 27th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1989. The sponsors are Australia, Fiji, New Zealand, Samoa and the Solomon Islands.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia,

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

Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, France, Papua New Guinea, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.42 was adopted by 132 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.48, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". This draft resolution has two sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Pakistan today. The other sponsor is Bangladesh.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands,

* Subsequently the delegations of Mauritania and the Solomon Islands advised the Secretariat they had intended in vote in favour.

New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Bhutan, India, Mauritius

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Iceland, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.48 was adopted by 102 votes to 3, with 30 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. KOP (Netherlands): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.5. The Netherlands has on many occasions emphasized the importance of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and its aim of creating a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America. The Kingdom of the Netherlands, being one of the four States with territories in Latin America, has therefore signed and ratified Additional Protocol I to the Treaty, thus bringing it into force for the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

* Subsequently the delegation of Mauritania informed the Secretariat it had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Kop, Netherlands)

Draft resolution L.5 urges a fourth eligible State to ratify Additional Protocol I, which would result in the Treaty's entry into force for the territories of that State in the zone of application of this Treaty. While we would, of course, welcome such a development, we note with regret that the Treaty itself has not entered into force for a number of States, either because it has not been signed, or has not been ratified, or for other reasons. The effectiveness of the Treaty would, in our view, be significantly enhanced if it covered all territories and maritime areas delimited in article IV of the Treaty. By focusing exclusively on ratification of Additional Protocol I and failing to call upon all sovereign States in the region to sign or ratify the Treaty in its entirety, the draft resolution remains rather one-sided.

We do hope that the Council of OPANAL will soon find ways and means to address the issue of accession to the Treaty by all States in the region.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): Our delegation has joined in support of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.5 as an indication of strong and unwavering United States support for the Treaty of Tlatelolco. At the same time, we wish to record, as we have done numerous times in the past, our disappointment that this draft resolution focuses only on Additional Protocol I of this Treaty and not on the issue of universal adherence to the Treaty by all eligible States.

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

In doing so, this draft resolution is patently one-sided. It singles out one State for criticism, whereas it should call on the other eligible States in the region to become parties. Such a discriminatory draft resolution, which attacks only a part of the problem, loses much of its potential force and is less likely to achieve its intended purpose.

As we have pointed out previously, only when the Treaty of Tlatelolco, together with its Protocols, is fully in force for all eligible States will it be able to make its full contribution to regional and international security. As we have done in previous years in respect of similar draft resolutions, we urge the sponsors of this draft resolution to alter their approach should they decide, in the future, to introduce a draft resolution on this Treaty. Next year we should find it very difficult to associate ourselves with a similar draft resolution unless its text were to reflect our stated concerns.

The United States delegation is also supporting draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.9 concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. With regard to preambular paragraph 5, which addresses the need for appropriate measures for the protection of nuclear facilities, the United States has not determined that additional measures are required. Moreover, nuclear facilities are already protected by the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the laws and customs relating to armed conflict, including those prohibiting attacks against facilities that are not legitimate military objectives, and attacks that would cause disproportionate civilian casualties.

The United States delegation, this year again, has joined those supporting the traditional draft resolution - this year, draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.48 - concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. My delegation is able to support the initiative because the proposal appears to be in harmony with the following criteria to which we subscribe: the initiative for the

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should arise from States in the region concerned; all States whose participation is deemed important should participate; there should be adequate verification provisions; the zone should not upset existing security arrangements, to the detriment of regional and international security; it should effectively prohibit the development or possession of nuclear explosive devices for any purpose; it should not restrain the exercise of rights, such as freedom of navigation; and it should not affect the right of States to make arrangements for such matters as port calls and transit privileges.

In accordance with operative paragraph 2 of this draft resolution, all States in the region would be urged to refrain from any action that was contrary to the objectives of the draft resolution. We hope that all States in the region will take particular note of this provision.

Finally, it is clear that there are other areas, such as areas within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization region, in which the conditions necessary for a nuclear-weapon-free zone would not be satisfied. Accordingly, my delegation wishes it to be noted that the reference, in preambular paragraph 3, to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other regions of the world does not constitute, for us, an endorsement of such zones on a universal basis.

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel): My delegation has once again joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.9 - introduced by Egypt - which calls for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. In paragraph 8, draft resolution 43/65, which was adopted last year, the General Assembly

"Requests the Secretary-General to undertake a study on effective and verifiable measures which would facilitate the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, taking into account the circumstances and characteristics of the Middle East, as well as the views and

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

the suggestions of the parties of the region, and to submit this study to the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session".

As this report is due next year, we felt that a short technical resolution taking note of the Secretary-General's report, A/44/430, would have been sufficient for the present. However, the draft resolution before us goes beyond that and includes specific modalities for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Therefore we must place on record our reservations with regard to these modalities.

Any accord for a nuclear-weapon-free zone must incorporate the following principles: an initiative emanating from the States of the zone in question; free and direct negotiations between those States; mutual and binding reassurances between those States as part of a treaty establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone. These are the essential conditions for a credible nuclear-weapon-free zone and for the establishment of unambiguous confidence in the earnestness of the intention of the negotiating and contracting parties. In the absence of these components, the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone would be a proposal devoid of substantive content.

Israel has repeatedly invited the States of the region to negotiate a nuclear-weapon-free zone for the Middle East. These invitations have yet to be accepted. Israel, however, continues to stand by them. These principles were elaborated in letters submitted by Israel to the Secretary-General on 13 June 1985 (A/40/383) on 6 May 1986 (A/41/465, sect. II), and on 19 May 1989 (A/44/430).

Mr. NOREEN (Sweden): I wish to explain the Swedish delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.48, concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Sweden has on several occasions expressed its positive attitude with regard to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Such zones could have confidence-building effects, as well as a positive influence on the political

(Mr. Noreen, Sweden)

climate and the security situation in the region. The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone requires the non-possession of nuclear weapons by States in the zone, as well as the absence and non-deployment of nuclear weapons in such States. Another central element is the commitment by the nuclear-weapon States not to use, or threaten to use, nuclear weapons against targets within the zones.

However, as to concrete proposals for such zones, one basic prerequisite for any initiative is acceptance by, and co-operation from, all States in the region. In line with this principle, Sweden had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.48 regarding the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, as States concerned voted against the draft resolution.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): I wish to take this opportunity to explain Japan's votes on some of the draft resolutions in cluster 7. Japan voted in favour of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/44/L.5, A/C.1/44/L.9, A/C.1/44/L.42, and A/C.1/44/L.48. It has always been the view of the Japanese Government that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific, in South Asia, in Africa, or, for that matter, in any other region would contribute to the objective of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, as well as to the peace and security of the region in question.

My delegation, however, wishes to reiterate its view that the establishment of such a zone would not contribute to the strengthening of security in the region in question unless certain conditions were met.

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

Let me enumerate some of the most basic conditions: First, the establishment of such a nuclear-weapon-free zone should be agreed upon at the initiative of the countries in the region and with the voluntary consent of all the countries concerned, including nuclear-weapon States as the case may be. Next, it should be established in such a way that it would strengthen the peace and security not only of the region but also of the world as a whole. Furthermore, adherence to the non-proliferation Treaty by all the countries of the region in question would be highly desirable in creating such a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Mr. RIVERO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): We wish to explain the Cuban delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.5, which was submitted by 18 Latin American countries and is entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 43/62 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)".

The Cuban delegation abstained in the voting on that draft resolution because the text contains a direct reference to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, to which my country has not acceded. As we have done on a number of other occasions, we recognize the praiseworthy initiative of Mexico and the other Latin American countries that led to the conclusion and existence of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and its Additional Protocols. However, at the present time the conditions do not exist that would permit Cuba's accession to that international Treaty because of the existence on our territory of a naval base that is contrary to the sovereign will of our Government and people and is maintained there by the United States, a neighbouring Power to the region. Another factor is the constant policy of hostility and aggression that has been imposed on my country for nearly 30 years by various United States Administrations.

(Mr. Rivero, Cuba)

My country therefore maintains its position of principle that it cannot renounce its right to possess whatever weapons it deems necessary for the defence of its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Mr. de LA BAUME (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation wishes to explain its votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/44/L.5 and A/C.1/44/L.42.

First, in connection with draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.5, my delegation was obliged to abstain in the voting. My delegation does not agree to being specifically singled out when other countries within the Treaty's zone of application have not yet signed or ratified the Treaty or have not yet invoked the clause that allows it to enter into force immediately prior to their being eligible to accede to the Treaty's Protocols.

In due course the French Government will take the appropriate decision in respect of ratification of Additional Protocol I in the light of the status of the ratifications of the Treaty itself.

Turning to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.42, the French delegation abstained in the voting on that draft resolution. In his statement at the fifteenth special session of the General Assembly, the Foreign Minister of France stated, in respect of denuclearized zones:

"My country has always favoured the establishment of such zones. Naturally, any such undertaking must flow from the unanimous decision of all the States concerned and must be subject to satisfactory control. Moreover, their creation must be militarily and geographically relevant.

"Clearly, therefore, where nuclear deterrence operates directly, it would be artificial and would add nothing to security to designate regions and

(Mr. de La Baume, France)

declare them denuclearized. It is in the name of these same principles that France has refused to ratify the Protocols of the Rarotonga Treaty instituting a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific." (A/S-15/PV.4, p. 43-45)

Mr. WAYHRABI (Indonesia): The Indonesian delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.48, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia".

Our position regarding the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is well known. We are working actively to promote the establishment of South-East Asia as a nuclear-weapon-free zone in accordance with the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. As can be seen from paragraphs 33 and 60 of that document, the General Assembly declared that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned constitutes an important disarmament measure. In paragraph 61 of the same document, the General Assembly further stated that the process of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world should be encouraged and that the States participating in such zones should undertake to comply fully with all the objectives, purposes and principles of the agreements or arrangements establishing the nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Noting the report of the Secretary-General in document A/44/363 and Corr.1, which reflects the fact that the countries in South Asia were still in the process of achieving agreement on the issue, my delegation considers that, pending the conclusion of such an agreement, it should abstain once again in the voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. AL MOSAWI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation would like to make a few comments on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.9, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

The Middle East has its own specific problems. First, Israel is the only party in the region that possesses nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Al Mosawi, Iraq)

Secondly, Israel is the only party in the region that has not signed the non-proliferation Treaty, apart from those that do not possess nuclear weapons.

Thirdly, the region's major nuclear plants capable of producing nuclear material that could be used in the manufacture of nuclear weapons are in Israel. Those plants are not subject to the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Fourthly, Israel is the only party in the region that has strategic links with another nuclear Power, in addition to its military co-operation with the racist régime of South Africa in the field of nuclear weapons.

Thus, if Israel were to begin nuclear disarmament and to sign the non-proliferation Treaty, and if it were to submit all its nuclear plants to IAEA safeguards, and if all parties in the region were to agree not to accept the emplacement on their territory of nuclear weapons of other States and not to join any military bloc -

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

Mr. ZIFPORI (Israel): In this diatribe against Israel - and we have heard many such diatribes in this Committee - the Iraqi representative is again misusing his right to explain his delegation's vote in order to attack Israel. That is not the purpose of an explanation of vote. It does not explain why it joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.9 or why it voted the way it did on any of the other draft resolutions in the cluster. I suggest that the Chairman ask the representative of Iraq to make an explanation of vote and not attack other Member States.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I request that the representative of Iraq concentrate his remarks on an explanation of vote.

Mr. AL MOSAWI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Thus, if Israel were to begin nuclear disarmament and sign the non-proliferation Treaty, and if it were to submit all its nuclear plants to IAEA safeguards, and if all parties in the region were to agree not to accept the emplacement on their territory of nuclear weapons of other States and not to join any military bloc or alliance of which a nuclear Power is a member, those would be basic conditions for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East region.

It was asserted a few minutes ago that negotiations should precede Israel's accession to the non-proliferation Treaty, but we believe that would be putting the cart before the horse and would be intended to circumvent disarmament measures and to avoid participating in such measures.

I have explained my country's vote on the draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. As is my right, I have explained our understanding of the draft resolution and how it could be implemented, and I see no justification for the remarks made by another delegation.

Mr. POLHO (Finland): I wish to explain the vote of Finland on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.48, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". Finland voted in favour of the draft resolution because it is the general policy of Finland to support efforts to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones. At the same time, we consider that initiatives to establish such zones should come from States within the region concerned, and that the process of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone should enjoy the support of all States concerned.

Mr. GEVERS (Netherlands): My delegation went along with the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.9 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East notwithstanding the fact that not all conditions necessary for the

(Mr. Gevers, Netherlands)

establishment of such a zone, inter alia, the need for arrangements directly and freely arrived at by States in the region directly concerned, have been clearly brought into focus in the draft resolution.

We hope that prerequisite will be adequately reflected in the Secretary-General's study on the subject, which was commissioned for next year, and we are pleased that a Netherlands expert is participating in the consultancy group for the preparation of that study.

In that connection, the Netherlands welcomes the study by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) on different modalities for application of IAEA safeguards in the region, which was published last year as IAEA document GC/887. It is indeed clear that the application of IAEA safeguards is one of the effective verifiable measures that would facilitate the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and that could make a significant contribution to preventing the further proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Mr. JANDL (Austria): Austria abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.48 concerning a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. I should like to stress here that Austria welcomes and supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, since such zones can make a precious contribution to securing international peace and reducing international tensions, taking into consideration the interaction between regional and global disarmament efforts. However, Austria is of the opinion that first all States of a given region should agree to the idea of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in their region. In our view, only after all States of the region have done so will it be reasonable to call for the establishment of such a zone in a resolution of the General Assembly. As several States of the region have objected to the said draft resolution, Austria decided to abstain.

Mr. AL-SALLAL (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.9, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, the understanding of the Arab States which did not sponsor the draft resolution may be summarized as follows.

First, the preliminary steps necessary to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone, involving implementation of the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution, including declarations by States that they do not possess nuclear weapons, adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the placing of all their nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. All the parties concerned should declare their support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone and refrain from developing, producing or testing nuclear weapons or their explosive devices. They should declare solemnly that they will refrain from possessing nuclear weapons and from permitting the stationing of nuclear weapons on their territory by any third party.

Secondly, there should be no accession to any alliances or blocs which would lead to the introduction of nuclear weapons into the region.

Thirdly, the practical policies of the Zionist entity do not conform with the aforementioned stipulations. Therefore, it is the main obstacle to establishing the zone -

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel): I am sorry to interrupt, but would you please instruct the representative of Kuwait to call countries by their proper names? Israel is Israel. We are proud of being Zionist, but our name is not "Zionist entity". If the representative of Kuwait wants to refer to the State of Israel, let him do so.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I request the representative of Kuwait to confine himself to his explanation of vote.

Mr. AL-SALLAL (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): The practical policies of the Zionist entity are not in conformity with the aforementioned stipulations, and therefore it is the main obstacle to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Fourthly, we should consider and concentrate on the specific aspects of the region and the political situation there.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We have heard all the statements in explanation of vote.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Earlier this morning I announced that at this afternoon's meeting we would take up draft resolutions A/C.1/44/L.17/Rev.1 and A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.1. I have been informed that a new revised text - A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.2 - will be introduced. Therefore, it will not be possible to take action on that draft resolution.

I also understand that draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.24, in respect of action on which a postponement to next week had been requested, may be taken up this afternoon.

Therefore, this afternoon we shall take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/44/L.17/Rev.1 and A/C.1/44/L.24.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.