



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 26th MEETING

Chairman; Mr. ROCHE (Canada)

CONTENTS

- CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT **RESOLUTIONS** ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS
(continued)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2 540, 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 fascicle for each Committee.

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 51 TO 59, 139, 141 AND 145 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

Ms. THEORIN (Sweden): I have asked to speak today in order to introduce, on behalf of the delegations of Argentina, Australia, Austria, the German Democratic Republic, India, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Venezuela and Sweden, draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.46, entitled "Comprehensive United Nations study on nuclear weapons".

Nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of **civilization**. That affirmation, made by the General Assembly at its first special session devoted to disarmament, 10 years ago, is as true today as it was then.

Existing arsenals of nuclear weapons alone are more than sufficient to destroy all life on Earth. That affirmation too is as valid today as it was 10 years ago.

The first special session on disarmament, moreover, established that among disarmament measures effective measures of nuclear disarmament have the highest priority. That order of priority remains as valid today as it was 10 years ago.

Three years ago the leaders of the two major nuclear Powers concluded that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. They agreed on the objective of ultimately eliminating all nuclear weapons.

This year we witnessed the beginning of the historic elimination of the super-Powers' land-based intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. The two super-Powers are engaged in negotiating substantial reductions in strategic nuclear weapons. But there are still no negotiations on ending nuclear testing, which is of pivotal importance for nuclear disarmament. Consequently, the nuclear-arms race continues. **The** nuclear threat remains.

With the exception of the phased removal of a few per cent of the tens of thousands of nuclear weapons, no **effective** measures of nuclear disarmament have been implemented.

(Ma. Theor in, Sweden)

Ten years ago, at its thirty-third session, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to carry out a comprehensive study on nuclear weapons. That study was submitted to the General Assembly in 1980. The study was a landmark in broadening the international community's understanding of this complex matter. In its essentials it retains its validity, but significant developments have taken place in the past decade.

The time has come for the United Nations to take stock of available knowledge and recent developments pertinent to nuclear weapons, and to evaluate their political, legal and security implications. Possible future disarmament and confidence-building and security-building measures related to these weapons are also to be identified.

The international community is entitled to authoritative and up-to-date knowledge about nuclear-weapons technology, the deployment of those weapons as well as doctrines concerning their use. As nuclear weapons threaten all countries, these matters concern all countries. Not least in view of the upcoming Fourth Review Conference of the non-proliferation Treaty, it is indispensable that all States have access to solid and up-to-date knowledge of nuclear weapons.

There are new scientific findings with regard to the effects of the use of nuclear weapons. The physical, environmental, medical and other effects of nuclear testing need to be evaluated. The risks of accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear arms merit renewed attention. So do initiatives designed to reduce and eliminate the nuclear threat.

Recent agreements, current negotiations and other arrangements with the purpose of reducing nuclear arsenals need to be re-evaluated. The question of verification of compliance with nuclear-arms-limitation agreements warrants international examination.

(Ms. Theorin, Sweden)

In addition, the efforts to achieve a comprehensive tort-ban and further strengthen the non-proliferation régime, as well as other measures to halt and prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, in all their aspects, deserve an up-to-date assessment.

In draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.46 the Secretary-General is requested to carry out, with the assistance of qualified governmental experts and taking into account recent relevant studies, a comprehensive update of the study on nuclear weapons providing factual and up-to-date information on such matters. The study should be completed well in advance of the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly. It should be as comprehensive as possible. It should be based on open material and such further information as Member States may wish to make available for the purposes of the study. As the nuclear-weapon States have a special responsibility for nuclear disarmament, I hope that all nuclear-weapon States will co-operate in that undertaking. Such a study will contribute to deepening the world community's awareness of the nuclear-arms race and to mobilising public opinion for nuclear disarmament.

The 1980 report of the Secretary-General provided a common frame of reference and an authoritative information base on nuclear weapons for the 1980s. Today, on the threshold of the 1990s, the time has come to prepare a corresponding standard reference work to serve as a guide for nuclear-disarmament efforts in the 1990s. The draft resolution I have the honour to introduce aims at establishing the mandate for elaborating such a standard reference work for the 1990s.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the representative of Sri Lanka, Ambassador Daya Perera, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, who will introduce the report of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. PERERA (Sri Lanka) , Chairman, Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean: Today, I have the honour to submit to the members of the First Committee the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and the draft resolution which the Ad Hoc Committee recommends to the General Assembly. The report is contained in document A/43/29.

I cannot help but notice a distinct tone of optimism in the report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly at its forty-third session, as well as in the statements of representatives who spoke during the general debate. As the Secretary-General and many delegations have observed, long-standing regional conflicts are now being resolved. As Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, I am particularly happy to see the resolution of the situation in Afghanistan and of the conflict between Iraq and Iran. Furthermore, various diplomatic moves concerning the situation in Kampuchea appear more promising than ever. I must hasten to note here that the resolution of those conflicts in the Indian Ocean area are also a reflection of the improvement in international relations, particularly among the major Powers. Such positive movements towards peace in the Indian Ocean region and its adjacent areas will surely help consolidate the political will of the members of the Ad Hoc Committee to make speedy progress in fulfilling the mandate entrusted to them and to complete the remaining Preparatory work in order to make it possible for the Conference on the Indian Ocean to be convened at the earliest possible time.

If I may dwell further on my impression of the General Assembly this year, it seems to me that more Governments than ever before have given clear priority to the improvement of the lives of their people, That may be a reflection of an enlightened recognition among world leaders that the capacity to provide socio-economic opportunity to their own people as well as to the world is an important factor in international relations. The reliance on military might as

(Mr. Perera, Chairman, Ad Hoc
Committee on the Indian Ocean)

the **single** dominant element of national power **seems to** be **losing** relevance in **today's relations** among nationr. The **aountrier** in the Indian Ocean **region** are no exception. They have long pursued the development *of* their national **economies** and improvement in the **rstandard of** living of their peoples. The ultimate **purpose** of **our efforts** to turn the Indian Ocean into a **eone of peace** **is** to create a peaceful environment for the natione in the region **and**, through **this**, to **foster the enhancement of** the quality of the liver of the **peoples** in the **region**.

Pursuant to **General Assembly** rerolution **42/43**, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Oaean held two **sessions** during 1988. The **first session**, in April, was devoted to the preparation *of* the **report** of the Ad Hoc Committee to the **General Assembly** at its fifteenth **special session**, the third **special session** devoted to diarmament, **That report**, adopted by **consensus**, covered the work of the Ad Hoc Committee during the **period 1982 to 1987**, At the **second session**, the Ad Hoc Committee continued **its** preparatory work for the convening of the **Conference** and made **some important progress** in its **substantive** work.

The Ad Hoc Committee **received** a liat of **20 eubetantive issues** and principlea relating to the **establishment of a zone of peace** prepared by the Working Group. Those **issues** and **principles** are contained in document **A/AC.159/L.85**. The Ad Hoc Committee **agreed** that they **constituted a good basis** for further elaboration, **Those** issues and principles will **lead towards a realistic** and acceptable **definition of** the concept of the **zone of peace** **as** applicable to the Indian Ocean, **In** the draft resolution the Ad Hoc Committee recommenda to the General Asembly **that it note** that important **achievement** and that **it urge** the Ad Hoc Committee to **intensify its discussion** on substantive **issues** and **pr inciples**.

The Ad Hoc Committee **also decided to update the views of** Committee **members** on the **major** topics relating to the ertabliehment of the Indian Ocean **as a tone of**

(Mr. Perera, Chairman, Ad Hoc
Committee on the Indian Ocean)

peace. Those topics were listed in the Ad Hoc Committee's report to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session, In 1983 the views of members of the Ad Hoc Committee were issued in document A/AC.159/L.55 and Add.105. Owing to the recent developments in the Indian Ocean region, the Ad Hoc Committee felt that updating the views at this time would facilitate its future work,

In the draft resolution recommended, it should be noted that the General Assembly requests the Ad Hoc Committee to hold two preparatory sessions during the first half of 1989, the first with a duration of one week and the second with a duration of two weeks. I should like to draw attention to the fact that the Ad Hoc Committee stood by its commitment to the scheduled year of 1990 for convening the Conference at Colombo. That reflects the Ad Hoc Committee's undiminished determination to convene the Conference at the earliest possible date. At the same time, paragraph 8 of the draft resolution states that the Ad Hoc Committee, at its preparatory sessions in 1989, will continue to keep under review the need to organise its work more effectively in order to enable it to fulfil its mandate.

I should also like to draw attention to paragraph 9, by which the General Assembly would decide that the Ad Hoc Committee should commemorate the tenth anniversary of the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, which took place in July 1979, during its preparatory sessions in 1989.

(Mr. Perera, Chairman, Ad Hoc
Committee on the Indian Ocean)

I should be failing in my duty if I did not advert to the invaluable contribution made by Mr. Sohrab Kheradi, the Senior Adviser, the Secretary, Mr. Shuniohiro Yorhida and the other members of his staff. The Ad Hoc Committee is indeed grateful to them.

The draft resolution was adopted by the Ad Hoc Committee by consensus. I ask the First Committee too to adopt it by consensus and recommend it to the plenary Assembly,

Mr. LUNDBO (Norway): I take pleasure in introducing document A/C.1/43/L. 39 which is a draft resolution concerning the holding in 1989 of the Third Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Employment of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and the Subsoil Thereof.

The sea-bed Treaty, which entered into force on 18 May 1972, has as its main provision the prohibition of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof. The objective of the forthcoming Conference is to review the operation of the Treaty with a view to ensuring that the purposes of the preamble and the provisions of the Treaty are being realised. Such a review should take into account any relevant technological development.

The Second Review Conference, which was held in Geneva during the period 12-23 September 1983, decided in its Final Declaration with respect to Article VII of the Treaty that a Third Review Conference should be held in Geneva at the request of a majority of the States Parties not earlier than 1988 and, in any case, not later than 1990.

Norway, whose representative had the honour to preside over the Second Review Conference, proposed this summer to the Depositary Powers that the Third Review

(Mr. Lundho, Norway)

Conference should be held in 1989. This proposal took into account the fact that the Fourth Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons will take place in 1990, with the support of the Depositary Powers of the Treaty (the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States), Norway held consultations with a number of countries, and at an informal meeting of the States Parties on 27 October it was confirmed that the Third Review Conference should be held in 1989. At that meeting it was further decided that the Preparatory Committee should be open to all States Parties and that the Committee should have one session in Geneva during the week of 24-28 April 1989. The Preparatory Committee should of course decide when in 1989 the Review Conference should take place.

Against this background, Norway has taken the initiative of presenting draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.39, which is co-sponsored by a total of 44 States Parties from all regions of the world, including the three Depositary Powers.

The draft resolution has five preambular and three operative paragraphs. In the preambular part reference is made inter alia to resolution 2660 (XXV) of 7 December 1970, in which the General Assembly commended the Treaty. The first operative paragraph concerns the establishment of the Preparatory Committee prior to the holding of the Third Review Conference in 1989. The second operative paragraph concerns the usual assistance to be provided by the Secretary-General. A hope for the widest possible adherence to the Treaty is expressed in the third operative paragraph. In this connection, I should like to draw your attention to the fact that the Treaty as of today has 50 States Parties, whereas 73 countries had become Parties to the Treaty at the time of the Second Review Conference in 1983. The States Parties include three nuclear-weapon States and some of the most significant maritime Powers in the world. The gradual increase in the number of

(Mr. Lundbo, Norway)

States Parties reflects the importance of the sea-bed Treaty, which has prevented a dangerous arms race in nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof .

Finally, I should like to express the hope that draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.39 will be adopted without a vote by this Committee and by the General Assembly.

Mr. MacKINNON (Canada) : The subject of verification has been a major focus of efforts by Canada and other countries in the United Nations for a number of years. Since 1985 there have been three consensus General Assembly resolutions on the subject. A working group also held discussions on verification at the 1987 and 1988 sessions of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

There now exists an international consensus that adequate and appropriate verification provisions form an essential element in all arms control and disarmament agreements. This was evident at the 1988 session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission which successfully concluded its consideration of "verification in all its aspects" in May of this year. This consensus was also clear at the third special session. It is highly significant that, while the special session did not reach agreement on a concluding document, there was general agreement respecting verification.

There is also a growing awareness within the international community of the significance of the role that multilateral verification is likely to play in arms control and disarmament. This, too, was evident at the United Nations Disarmament Commission in 1988 and the third special session. The form in which this role will unfold remains unclear, however.

There is an important practical role for the United Nations in arms control and disarmament verification. Canada's intensive work on various aspects of verification has convinced us of the technical complexity and political delicacy of

(Mr. MacKinnon, Canada)

the issues involved. Special care is needed in identifying a useful role for the United Nations in verification, one that is capable of generating and maintaining broad international political support in the long term. In this connection, we are thinking in particular of a role for the United Nations in the verification of multilateral agreements, but of course the United Nations could also have a role in the verification of bilateral or regional agreements if the parties thereto so desire.

Any role for the United Nations must develop in a step-by-step fashion, based on what is realistically feasible in today's political and financial environment. An attempt to go too far, too quickly, could put the development of any meaningful role for the United Nations at risk and seriously damage the credibility of the Organization. Canada has worked hard to avoid politicizing the subject of Verification in the United Nations and to achieve practical and significant progress on this question. We appreciate the support that we have received in the past from other countries in this endeavour and look to a continuation of that support in the future.

(Mr. MacKinnon, Canada)

The next logical stage in this step-by-step process is to undertake a group-of-experts study on the role of the United Nations in verification. At the third special session, after considerable negotiation, general agreement was reached on a recommendation to the Secretary-General to conduct such a study with the participation of a group of qualified governmental experts and to submit it to the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session. There was also agreement at the third special session on the text of the mandate for the proposed study. This mandate calls for an in-depth study that would, first, identify and review existing activities of the United Nations in the field of verification of arms limitation and disarmament; secondly, assess the need for improvement at existing activities, as well as explore and identify possible additional activities, taking into account organization, technical, operational, legal and other aspects; and, thirdly, provide specific recommendations for future action by the United Nations in this context.

Canada strongly supports this mandate as a sound basis for advancing the consideration of verification within the United Nations and the role of the Organization in this field. This mandate does not presuppose any particular role for the United Nations but, rather, will ensure that the merits and implications of all proposals in this context are considered.

We are now at an important crossroads with regard to the discussion of verification in the United Nations. There are two possible routes ahead of us. Following one, we can seek to maintain the consensus that, so far, has characterized the General Assembly's resolutions and the Disarmament Commission's accomplishments. This road involves building upon the text that the Assembly, at its third special session, worked out on the subject of verification, particularly with respect to the mandate for a United Nations study. In this way we can continue to move this issue forward within the United Nations in a constructive, step-by-step manner.

(Mr. MacKinnon, Canada)

The other route involves introducing elements that are clearly consensus-breaking. This, we believe, should be avoided as there exists a real opportunity, which we should seize, to work towards a useful and constructive conclusion, one that can be supported over the long term by all members of the United Nations.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 1, which I have the honour to submit on behalf of Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Columbia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Spain, Uruguay and Zaire, is a sincere attempt to accomplish this.

It has three basic components. First, it follows, with minor changes, the language from previous resolutions on verification, particularly with respect to paragraphs in the preamble. It is worth recalling that the preamble of these previous resolutions reflects language from the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament.

Secondly, the draft resolution notes with satisfaction this year's report of the United Nations Disarmament Commission on verification and endorses the 16 principles on verification agreed to at the Commission's 1968 session. This reflects language that appeared in the Chairman's draft concluding document for the third special session.

Thirdly, the draft resolution requests the Secretary-General to undertake a group-of-experts study on the role of the United Nations in verification. The language of this request again reflects that which appeared in the Chairman's draft concluding document for the third special session.

Canada and the other sponsors urge support for this resolution on verification as leading to the next logical and practical step in the United Nations

(Mr. MacKinnon, Canada)

confirmation of this vitally important subject. We feel that this resolution sets realistic goals for moving the issue forward constructively while maintaining international consensus.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) : Mr. Chairman, may I take this opportunity to express the satisfaction of my delegation at the fact that you are presiding at this Committee. It is at a pivotal point in the nuclear-arms race, and some progress has been made towards the elimination of nuclear weapons. The two major world Powers have consented to reduce their nuclear arsenals and cease underground nuclear tests. The Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Medium-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles is to be hailed as a major advance towards world peace.

Another hopeful move this year is the resolution adopted at the Toronto summit meeting declaring that the next political objective must be a significant reduction in the strategic nuclear weapons of the United States and the Soviet Union,

These developments are rich in promise that political thinking is beginning to adjust itself to a changed world in the nuclear time. Momentum seems to be pushing the pendulum in the direction of hope,

However, negotiations on plans for disarmament, necessary as they are, are not in themselves enough to achieve disarmament, for disarmament in a world of anarchy is utopian. The forces of our times call for a new world order. We shall have to bow to these forces. However perfect the disarmament plans that are produced may be, and whatever efforts may be made in promoting agreement on them, there can be little hope of fruitful results so long as we try to attain the unattainable, namely disarmament in a world where anarchy prevails. A degree of world law and order is a prerequisite for rendering disarmament negotiations fruitful. The events and trends of the past decades have expanded the concept of

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

international security. This could be achieved by the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security on the basis of the United Nations Charter, and its ability to function will be ensured by strict observance of the Charter's demands.

The Charter gives extensive powers to the Security Council, and wider use should be made of the United Nations military observers and United Nations peace-keeping forces. We are glad to see that the Soviet Union firmly upholds this concept.

Because of our concern over the continuing escalation of the arms race we introduced draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.13 on 31 October 1987, under agenda item 63, entitled "Review and implementation of the concluding document of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly".

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

In that resolution the Assembly called upon the Security Council to comply with Article 26 of the Charter and hold a series of meetings of the Council to consider the escalation of the arms race, with a view to bringing it to a halt.

Article 26 of the Charter provides that;

"... the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating ... plans to be submitted to the Members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments".

And even though Article 11 of the Charter, dealing with disarmament states:

"The General Assembly may consider the general principle of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the ... regulation of armaments",

Article 26 states that:

"... the Security Council shall" - and I underline the word "shall" - "be responsible... for the regulation of armaments".

Thus, the Security Council's responsibility for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments is thereby stressed.

As far as I am aware, the Security Council has ignored and bypassed the relevant resolution adopted by this Committee and the General Assembly, contrary to the provisions of the Charter and contrary to General Assembly resolution 39/63 K adopted on 12 December 1984. That resolution calls on the Security Council to comply with Article 26 and hold a series of meetings devoted to the consideration of the escalating arms race with a view to bringing it to a halt. Therefore, we wish, once again, to draw the attention of the Security Council to its responsibilities and to call it to account in accordance with the Charter and duly reintroduce this resolution for appropriate consideration and action,

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to thank Ambassador Rossides for once more bringing to this Committee the many years of accumulated wisdom that he has acquired,

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

The SECRETARY: I should like to inform the members of the Committee that the following countries have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C. 1/43/L.1: Zaire and Uruguay

A/C. 1/43/L.3: Ecuador

A/C.1/43/L.12: Romania and Uruguay

A/C.1/43/L.13: Ireland

A/C. 1/43/L.22: Paraguay

A/C. 1/43/L. 23: Ecuador

A/C. 1/43/L.27: Australia

A/C. 1/43/L. 29: Romania

A/C.1/43/L. 30: Romania and the German Democratic Republic

A/C. 1/43/L.33: Byelorussian SSR and Bulgaria

A/C. 1/43/L. 39: Ecuador and Malta

A/C.1/43/L.43: Bulgaria

A/C.1/43/L.45: Lao People's Democratic Republic

A/C. 1/43/L. 46: Argentina

A/C.1/43/L.48: Samoa and Papua New Guinea

A/C. 1/43/L.51: Barbados and Liberia

A/C. 1/43/L. 53: Uruguay

A/C. 1/43/L.62: Indonesia

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.