UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
31st meeting
held on
Wednesday, 8 November 1989
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 31st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela)

CONTENTS

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

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be seat under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned
within one week of the date of publication to the Chiefofthe 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.

67 P.

89-63195 4559V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C. 1/44/PV. 31
15 November 1989
ENGLISH

The mee ting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 TO 69 AND 151 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Mr. AL MOSAWI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic) a It is my honour to introduce draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L.1, which is sponsored by Jordan, the Libyan Arab Jamahir iya, the Arab Republic of Yemen and my country, Iraq. It is submitted under agenda i tern 63 (c), "Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons".

The international community's efforts to conclude an international treaty prohibi ting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons have been accompanied by increasing awareness that an attack upon nuclear facilities is tantamount to use of radiological weapons because of the resultant release of radioactive forces where harmful effects will not be confined to the target. site but will extend across the boundaries of the country under attack.

In its 1980 proposal to the Conference on Disarmament Sweden voiced this in terna t ional concern. It called for development of the 1977 Geneva Protocol. annexed to the 1949 Geneva Convention so as to prohibit attacks on nuclear facili tics because such attacks would release dangerous radiation.

This view was underscored by the group of experts appointed by the Secretary-General after the armed Israeli attack on the Tammuz nuclear reactor in 1981. Their report, contained in document A/38/337, emphasized that any deliberate attack, whether by conventional or nuclear weapons, against nuclear power stations and certain other nuclear facilities would cause the release of enormous quantities of radioactive materials, thus caus ing the radiological contamination of large areas.

The Chernobyl accident made it very clear that radioactive damage, whether due to technical accident or armed attack, is dangerous to human beings and the

(Mr. Al Mosawi, Iraq)

environment without limitation as to area or duration. Such dangers are not limited to one State or continent, and aubrequent generations may also suffer as a result.

These facts emphasize the need for an international convention for the protection of nuclear facilities against deliberate attack. The Conference on Dioarmament hae the fundamental task of working towards the conclusion of such a convention. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) also has a role to play since it is technically and scientifically qualified to prepare studies and provide the necessary expertiae. The Ail Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons of the Conference on Disarmament has already made an initial contribution by completing its study cn the prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities. Last July, Peru eubmitted to the Ad Hcc Committee a draft convention on the prohibition of attack8 on nuclear facilities! CD/929 is the relevant document. However, all of these efforts are inadequate given the extreme qravity and magnitude of this problem. That is why my delegation is again submitting thie draft resolution. It trusts that in so doing it will assist the international community and its organizations, particularly the Conference on Disarmament, in efforts to arrive at positive, concrete reeulte in order to prohibit attacks on nuclear facilities.

In its preamubular part the draft recalls resolutions of the General Assembly and the IAEA dealing with the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons, and inviting countries to conclude an international agreement prohibiting military attacks on nuclear facilities engaged in peaceful pursuits.

It also expresses grave concern that military attacks againrt nuclear facilities could be tantamount to the use of radiological weapons, even if such attacks are carried out using oonventional weapons.

(Mr. Al Mosawi, Iraq)

The Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear facilities, which were subject to IAEA safeguards, constitutes an unprecedented danger to international peace and security.

Coming to the operative part, the first paragraph reaffirms that armed attacks of any kind against nuclear facilities are tantamount to the use of radiological w eaponr .

The second requests the Conference on Disarmament to intensify further its efforts to reach an agreement prohibiting armed attacks against nuclear facilities.

The third requests the IAEA to provide the Conference on Diearmament with the technical studies that could facili ta te the conclusion of such an agreement.

The fourth and last paragraph requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session on the progress made in the implementation of this resolution.

We very much hope that this draft resolution will have the support of all members.

Mr. DIETZE (German Democratic Republic) : On behalf of the delegations of the Byelor uss Ian Soviet Soc ial ist Republic, Czechoslovak la, Poland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and my own delegation, I should like to introduce draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 45, entitled "Securi ty concepts md policies aimed exclusively at defence".

For quite a while now, there has been an intensive dialogue going on, both at the regional ad the global level, on non-offensive structures of &fence and security concepts. This is borne out in the document8 adopted at the summit Conference of the non-aligned countries held at Belgrade, the Indian action plan for a nuolemr-weapon-free and non-violent world order, the Brussels Qclaration of thr North Atlantic Treaty Organization ad also in the documents adopted by the War raw Treaty States at Bucharer t and Warsaw.

(Mr. Dietze, German Democratic Republic)

In plenary meetings at the current session of the General Assembly a number of Heads of State and foreign ministers have addreered the problem of security concepts and policies aimed at defence. That issue h as alro been thoroughly considered in the debate here in the First Committee. All of that reaffirms our view that the dialogue on defensive concepts should be given a strong impetus at this session of the General Assembly.

There is no doubt that peace can be lasting and stable only if the risks inherent in a system relying on deterrence are reduced and, I might add, eliminated once and for all. That, of course, is particularly true of Europe, the continent with the highest density of all kinds of destructive potential. If it is true that today in Europe neither a nuclear nor a conventional war can be fought because that would mean self-annihilation, then military concepte and the armed-forces structure8 of all sides must adequately reflect that.

Given the declara tionr by the Sta tes par ties to the War saw Treaty and the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization that neither side wants military confrontation and that both sides want to prevent war, those declara tions must be made the basis for discussion of the military concepts of the two alliances.

No lees important is that on the bas is of the manda te for the nego tia tionr at Vienna - namely, eliminating the capability of launching a surprise attack and initiating large-ecale offensive action - agreements be reached and then gradually implemented by measures to verify compliance by all eider.

Also in the global context , it will become necessary to abandon tradi tional security concepts, especially in light of the new quality of military technologies, From cur point of view that would require, in particular, a redefinition of the military factor in ensuring national security. The right to use military force in self-defence is recognized and reaffirmed in the *Charter* of

(Mr. Dietze, German Democratic Republic)

the United Nations, and military preparedness is no lees a basic feature of national policy than it ever was. However, the use of force to gain security at the expense of other States is now considered unacceptable. It is evident that a competitive, open-ended accumulation of weapons by nations aggravates pol itical conflict and increases the risk of war and can lead to lees, rather than to more, eecur ity. That has never been more true than in the nuclear age. War has ceased to be a means to attain poll tical ends, and even more so since , in the nuclear and apace age, a nuclear war cannot be won and therefore must never be fought. We bel ieve that the power of logic and realism in poll tics urges that military concepts be adjusted to those new requirements.

There fore, in its preambular part draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.45 points to the ongoing international dialogue on non-of Pensive eecur ity concepts, including the search for common denominators for the security requirements of different regions. The draft resolution also expresses the conviction of the General Assembly that security concepts and policies ehould be aimed at removing the danger of war and securing peace at progressively lower levels of armaments and armed forces.

Paragraph 1 of draft resolution L. 45 considers the development of an international dialogue on security concepts and policies aimed exclusively at defence to be of great importance for promoting the process of achieving disarmament and strengthening international security.

Paragraph 2 recommends that Sta tee should initiate or intensify the dialogue on security concepts and policies aimed at defence at the bilateral, regional or multilateral levels and keep the General Assembly informed about the progress achieved.

(Mr. Dietze, German Democratic Republic)

Finally, the draft resolution euggeets that the question of defensive security concepts be included in the provisional agenda of the forty-fifth eeeeion of the General Assembly.

The sponsors of draft resolution L. 45 would hops that it will be given broad support similar to that given the aforementioned Qaumente and declarations from South, East and West. We are prepared to enter into diecueeion in the next few days with other interested delega tione in a search for a text that could be acceptable to all.

I should like to use this opportunity to introduce to the First Committee a second draft resolution, A/C.1/44/L. 46, entitled "Science and technology for disarmament", on behalf of the delegations of the Dyelorueeian Soviet Socialist Republic, Mexico and the German Democratic Republic.

We are all aware of the sweeping changes in science and technology and the new challenges we have to face. At the same time we see that developments in science and technology open up unprecedented opportunities for successfully tackling the global problems facing mankind. Here we have a common chance to make science and technology a decisive factor in the promotion of peaceful co-operation and development, as well as the chance to promote further progreae in the disarmament process.

In that context we have in mind, for example, the control of the implementa tion of disarmament agreements, as well as the verification of compl iance with obligatione undertaken by the parties to treaties. That presupposes state-of-the-art information technologies and innovation in data collecting, tranemiesion and asreeement techniques and the hardware involved, What is needed in the future, we believe, is the constructive use of scientific and technological achievements in connection with the prohibition of the development,

(Mr. Dietze, German Democratic Republic)

production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons. That is also true when it comes to keeping outer apace free from weapons ayatems and using it for peaceful purposes.

As for conventional diearmament, we think that science and technology can be used to verify agreement on troop ceilings or the limitation of mili tary activities. In that connection conversion becomes a practical task that makes the use of science and technology an urgent requirement. The converts ion of military indus try to civilian production, the destruction of weapons systems with proper regard for the economic and especially the ecological aspects, are topical issues that can only addressed successfully if the latest findings are employed.

(Mr. Dietze, German Democratic Republic)

The draft resolution is based on the proposition that science md technology should be used effectively for the promotion of the disarmament process. In the five preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would Point to the potential contribution that scientific and technological progress could make to the support of disarmament negotiations md to the implementation of their results. It would also welcome the activities undertaken in that area so far and underline the need for m intensification of activities as well as for international W-operation.

In operative paragraph 1, the General Assembly would take note of national and international activities to use scientific ad technological achievements for disarmament-related purposes, while in paragraph 2 Member States and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations would be called upon to intensify such activities, to develop international co-operation in that area, and to keep the United Nations informed about progress in that field. In the last operative paragraph, the Assemb ly would decide to include in the prw isional agenda of its forty-fifth session m i tem on science md technology for development.

The sponsors hops that the metiers of the First Committee will all be able to support draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.46, inasmuch as it deals with a problem that all are interested in solving.

Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) (interpretation from French) I I should like briefly to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/44/L.61, on agenda item 66 (k), entitled "Disarmament Week". The draft resolution is sponsored by Angola, Bulgaria, the Byelorussisn Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Japan, the ho People's Democratic Republic, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Viet Nam and Mongolia,

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

Since its proclamation by the General Assembly at its first special session, devoted to disarmament, Disarmament Week has been well known to all my colleagues. Today, it is an integral element in the efforts of the international community in the field of disarmament. It continues to serve as a useful tool for mobilizing world public opinion in favour of disarmament. It contributes to the improved co-ordination of the efforts of the United Nations and the potential of national and international non-governmental organizations for strengthening international peace and security and achieving disarmament.

Disarmament Week has always been considered by States Members of the United Nations as an excellent opportunity for reasserting their faith in the cause of disarmament and for reminding world public opinion of that cause.

As to the draft resolution, it repeats to a large extent the provisions of last year's resolution, which was adopted by the General Assembly without a vote. To save time, I do not think it necessary to repeat those provisions. One new element contained in the draft resolution this year is that the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to submit to it at its forty-seventh session a report on the implementation of the provisions of the present resolution.

It goes without saying that changes in the date at which the report of the Secretary-General should be submitted - in other words, the fact that the time-limit has been extended - should in no way impinge upon the annual observance of Disarmament Week. The objectives of the Week have lost none of their importance and we must continue to observe Disarmament Week as widely as possible. That is why - and this is the second new element - in the preamble to the draft resolution the Assembly would recognize the significance of the annual observance of Disarmament Week, including by the United Nations.

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

I have given only a brief outline of the two paragraphs that could be construed as new elements in the draft resolution, and its sponsors have undertaken unofficial consultations with the delegations concerned. The draft resolution as a whole enjoys general agreement and approval, and I hope that it will be unanimously supported by the members of the Committee and adopted without a vote, as was the case last year.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): Our delegation has asked to speak today to introduce three draft resolutions - A/C.1/44/L.39, A/C.1/44/L.40, and A/C.1/44/L.41.

On behalf of the delegations of Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Romania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and India, I would like to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/44/L.39, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons".

The rationale behind the draft resolution is simple and clearly stated in the preamble. It is accepted that the existence and use of nuclear weapons poses a threat to life on this planet. It is also accepted that the ongoing nuclear arms race serves only to increase the risk of the use of nuclear weapons. The nuclear winter studies by the TTAPS group, by SCOPE-ENUWAR, and last year by the Secretary-General's Group of Consultant Experts, have all concluded that the use of nuclear weapons, even on a limited scale of .1 per cent of the existing megatonnage, would produce irrerversible consequences for life on this planet.

The euphemism of the term "irreversible" is quickly lost when a writer like Gabrial Garcia Marquez reflects upon it:

> "One minute after the final explosion, more than half of humanity will have died, the dust and smoke of continents in flame will defeat the light of sun and utter darkness will reign anew upon the world. A winter of orange

(Mr. Ghar ekhan, India)

rain and icy hurricanes will reverse the tides of oceans and stem the course of rivers whose fish will have died of thirst in the seething waters, and whose birds will find the eky no more, Eternal snows will cover the Sahara Desert; the vast rain forest of the Amazon, destroyed by hail, will disappear from the face of the planet, and the age of rock and heart traneplante will revert to its glacial infancy.

(Mr. Ghrrekhan, India)

The few human beings to surv ive the f irs t shock of fear and Chore having had the privilege of a safe refuge at 3 o'clock cn the Monday of the Faustian catastrophe will be spared only to die af terwards from the horror of their memories. Creation will have come to an end. In the final chaos of dampness and eternal nights the only trace of life as it once was will be the cockroaches."

Those ate some of the "irreversible consequences" in a writer's vision.

The Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, the sole multilateral negoth ting body where all nuclear-weapon States are represented, ha8 been repeatedly requested by the General Assembly to undertake negotiations with the objective of concluding a convention that would prohibit the use of nuclear weapon. Accordingly, we havr submitted our draft convention to the Conference on Disarmament for its consideration. It is therefore a matter of great regret that after so many years the Conference cn Disarmament has not been able to register any progress on this priority item. At the same time, no logical reasons are put forward an to why such a conven tion rhould not be negotia ted. To rrla te the urgency of preven ting nuclear war to preventing all wars is to deny the special menace than nuclear weapons pose to mankind. Let me reiterate that conventicnal war8 can escalate into nuclear war. That fateful transition, once it happens, cannot be stopped. Nuclear war cannot de-escalate into conven tional war.

We are re-submitting our draft resolution to underline the importance of this issue and in the hope that this body will be able to bring the might of its moral authority to bear on the Conference on Diearmament so that the Conference will commence nego tia tions on th is i tem.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

The draft convention is contained in the annex to the draft resolution. It is based on the recognition by this forum that the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons would be a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and contrary to the Laws of humanity. That was accepted almost three decades ago, in 1961, in General Aaeembly resolution 1653 (XVI),

The world community has since welcomed the statement by the United State8 of America and the Un ion of Soviet Soc ial ist Republ ics declaring that a nuclear war cannot be won and must not be fought. Our draft resolution seeks to transform that understanding into a legally binding commitment. Such a prohibi tion in the form of a legal agreement would help lead towards a qualitative change in security doctrines and policies and the crea tion of the right climate for negotiations leading to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 40, entitled "Nuclear-arms freeze", is being introduced on behalf of the delegations of Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Roman ia and Sweden as well as India. Our delegations have warmly welcomed the improvement in the bilateral relationa of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the aigning of the Treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range nuclear forces, the INF Treaty. At the same time, we are only too conscious that reductions under the INF Treaty are minuscule compared to the existing nuclear ar senals. The Treaty's value lies in its marking a beginning. We would Like to bel ieve that it reflects a real iza tion of the axiom that reducing nuclear weapons enhances the security not just of the two countries that own them but of the en tire global community. The logic of the INF Treaty dictates that the deep cuts in United States and Soviet strategic arsenals currently under negotiations should be followed by multilateral negotiations among all nuclear-weapon States.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

For the reductions we are visualizing to make the desired impact, we must also cap the nuclear-arms race. Strange as it may sound, even after the INF agreement is implemented the two sides may still end up possessing more warheads than they started out with in 1988 - unless of course an agreement on strategic arms reductions (START) is concluded. We are therefore convinced that the quert for more and newer weapons has to be terminated and the production of nuclear ' eapons and f issionable mater ials intended for weapons purpose8 halted, Though not an end in itself, such a measure would constitute an effective step towards preventing the continued increase and qualitative improvement in nuclear weaponry, thus providing a favourable environment for nuclear disarmament negotiations.

Our draft resolution addresses the issue of a freeze in two stager. First, the Assembly would urge the United States and the USSR to reach an agreement on an immediate nuclear-arms freeze, which would imply a halt in the production of nuclear weapons and a cut-off of the production of fissionable materials, Secondly, it would call upon all nuclear-weapon Sta tes, through a joint declaration, to agree to a comprehensive nuclear-arms freeze, which would include a ban on testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles, along with ceaeation of production of fissionable materials for weapons purposete.

We welcome the announcement by the Soviet Foreign Minister, Mr, Shevardnadze, in his statement at this session of the General Assembly that the USSR will cease production of highly enriched uranium for nuclear weapons purposes by the end of 1989. We understand that the United States Congress has for the present put a halt on the production of tritium and plutonium. The political climate is therefore posi tive and conducive to negotiating such an agreement. As a consequence of such measures, fissionable material for peaceful purposes only will be produced, and it can be subject to non-dircrimina tory international safeguards on a universal

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

bas is. That development would be a posi tive step towarde converting the non-proliferation Treaty into a non-discriminatory, universal agreement that could give legal effect tc a binding commitment of all threshold States not to cross the nuclea r-weapons thr eahold.

Lastly, on behalf of the delegations of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Hungary, Indonesia, Polwd, Sri Lanka and Venezuela as well as India, I should like to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/44/L. 41, enti tled "Scien ti fic and technological developments and their impact on international secur ity".

At the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the threat posed to interna tional peace and securi ty by the growing arms race was acknowledged by the world community. It was agreed that, along with quantitative measures, qualitative measures in the field of disarmament also needed to be negotiated if the arms race were to be halted. A decade passed after the adoption of the Final Document, a decade in which qualitative aspects of the arms race did not receive the attention they deserved. That concern was reflected in our initiative at the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and in last year's General Assembly reaolution 43/77 A, which requested the Secretary-General to follow future scientific and technological developments, especially those which have potential military applications, and to evaluate their impact on in terna tional eecuri ty. From the interim report contained in document A/44/407 we find that five broad fields have been identified: information technology, biotechnology, mater ials technology, space technology and nuclear technology. After assessments in those individual fields are prepared, a comprehensive view needs to be taken to evaluate their impact on the international security environment.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

It will be a new kind of exercise for the international community, and it is only appropriate that thia is being undertaken in the United Nations framework. It reflects the emerging role of the Organization and also the indivisible rature of global security.

We are all too aware that the world stands on the threrhold of a new arms race. The cumulative impact of individual drvelopmentr in the five fields identified above could qualitatively trmrform the secur ity environment. The international aommunity must be alert to this real rink, in the interests of genuine and larting disarmament.

It is intereating to speculate whether the security environment would not be better and safer today if attempts by some scientists of the highest rtature had succeeded in creating a shared awareness of the danger inherent in the development of many technologies with their attendant military applicationa with whioh we are burdened today. Tomorrow's weapon8 will be more subtle, more threatening, less verifiable, and will give us rhor ter response ti mes. The impact of some of these can already be seen in areas such as thr graduated use of nuclear explosive power, miniaturization and large-scale computing capabilities, directed energy and laser technology, fuel technology, artificial intelligence and so on. Many others can be perceived only dimly at present, but it is a eobering realization that all weapon technologies and systems begin with the postulation of an idea. Unrestrained human ingenui ty does the r eat.

Only watchfulness and collective action can restrain this dangerour eraalatory spiral, which will undermine global securi ty. We have a common future, and must demonstrate a common determination to give science and teahnology a human face. The challenges of eradicating hunger, poverty and disease; the problems of global warming, ozone depletion and environment management, all of whioh have acquired a global dimension: there require our inventiveness and international co-operation

(Mr. Ghar ekhan, India)

on an unprsceden ted scale. Scientific and tachnoloqical development must continue and be redc ibled, hut oriented entirely in favour of peaceful uses, for the benefit of mankind.

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 41 is a modest step down the road to self -preservation on spaceship Earth. We are all on the same ship; some may be travelling first class and others on the deck, but we all have a common future. We need to understand the holistic nature of our existence and that the security environment is an integral part of it. Only a long view will enable us to devise strategies to deal effectively with these fateful issues.

ALL of us in my delegation hope that the proposals we are introducing today will receive the serious consideration and universal support from this Committee which they deserve.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish)! The subject of! a complete nuclear-teat ban continues to figure prominently on the agenda of the First Committee. This high-priority aspect of nuclear disarmament has been debated in the General Assemhly for 35 years now: on LO October 1963, the partial nuclear-teat-ban Treaty entered into force) five days later, an 1.5 October 1963, this First Committee began its debate on the item entitled "Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear testing". For two weeks after that, the Committee focused almost exclusively on that Item. With few exceptions, the speakers welcomed tho conclusion of the partial nuclear-teat-ban Treaty, and emphas ized the need for thnt ban to be accompanied au soon as poss ible by a total nuclear-teat ban.

The General Assembly, at the end of its session, adopted resolution 1910 (XVIII), in which, inter alia, it noted with satisfaction that, in the preamble of that Treaty the States parties stated that they were oeekinq to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapone and were determined to

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

continue negotiations to that end) also, it requested the Geneva Committee on Disarmament to continue with a sense of urgency its negotiation8 to achieve the objectives eet forth in the preamble of the Treaty. Twenty-six years have passed since the adoption of that resolution. Hundreds of underground nuclear tests and dozens of resolu t ions la tar, the Assembly is still urging the Geneva Conference on Dirarmament, the single multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament matters, to conduct multilateral negotiation8 on a complete nuclear-test-ban treaty.

That is the prime purpose of the draft resolution in document A/C. 1/44/L.11, which it is my honour to submit now on behalf of the dolegations of Costa Rica, Ecuador, Indonesia, Ireland, Myanmar, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Suriname, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Mexico. The substance of the draft rerolution is very similar to the texts we have submitted to this Committee year after year.

The preamble recalls certain basic facts relating to the various statements made by tho General Assembly and the Secretary-General on thir subject. It also refers to relevant provisions of the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty, the non-proliferation Treaty and the Final Declaration of the Third NPT Review Conference. Thir year, we refer specifically to the disarmament declaration adopted by the ninth summit Conference on the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The preamble refers again to the Stockholm Declaration, end notes with satisfaction the continuing progress made by the Ad Hcc Group of Scientific Experts on verification. The last part of the preamble contains a paragraph in which the General Assembly expresses its concern that, after six years of efforts, the Conference on Disarmament has not yet euccaeded in establishing an ad hoc committee on item 1 of its agenda, enti tled "Nuclear-test ban".

In the operative part, the General Assembly rei tera tes its grave concern that nuclear-weapon testing continues unabated, and reaffirms that it attacher the highert priority to the achievement of the prohibition of all nuclear-test

(Mr. Mar in Bosch, Mexico)

explosion8 for all time. It urges the nuclear-weapon States and the States members of the Conference on Disarmament to conduct multilateral negotiation of a treaty to this end. The draft also recommends to the Conference on Disarmament the establishment in 1990 of an ad hoc committee with two working groups to deal, respectively, with the contents and scope of the treaty and with compliance and verification.

We, the sponsors of the draft resolution, truat that it will again receive broad support, and that the nuclear-weapon States will finally give a positive response to the repeated appeals of the international community for them to put an end once and for all to their nuclear testing. In conclus ion, as the Secretary-General observed in his address delivered on 25 October in connection with Disarmament Week,

> "... unless the present positive momentum in bilateral negotiations on var ious nuclear quest ions, including the urgent need for the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests, is soon translated into concrete under takings, the risks of both vertical and horizontal proliferation will become more acute. The threat of further proliferation of nuclear weapons is a very real one. If not fully addressed, it may well jeopardize the constructive atmosphere that has recently emerged in various international forums and reverse the positive processes taking place in in terna tional rela tions generally". (A/C. 1/44/PV. 15, p. 12)

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French) t Today I should like to set out the position of the 12 members of the European Community on agenda i tern 64 (a), relating to regional disarmament.

As the Twelve stated during the general debate, they consider the adoption of regional measures for arms control and disarmament to be one of the most effective means by which States can contribute to the overall process of arms control and disarmament. Thus, they are pleased to note that, as evi denced by many s ta tements during the general debate here in the First Committee, there is a growing awareness of the importmce of a regional approach to disarmament in ensuring international security and stability. The submission of a draft resolution on this subject, which formed the basis of an earlier resolution adopted by consensus in 1987 as General Assembly resolution 42/39 E, attests to the interest that the Twelve attach to it. They hope that the present session will afford a new opportunity to arrive at a consensus within the international community on the draft resolution eponsored by Belgium, which is limited to the idea of regional disarmament per se.

Of course the interest of the Twelve in regional disarmament can be explained by their geographical situation. Indeed, as everyone knows, Europe is the continent where the concentration of troops and armaments is highest. Thus the Twelve take an active part in efforts to move ahead on that matter,

Within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), the Twelve have participated in working out and implementing the Stockholm document on confidence- and security-building measures; they have assisted in arriving at a mandate for the Vienna negotiations on new confidence- and

(Mr. Morel, France)

security-building measures designed to strengthen transparency and openness through a better knowledge of military activities, thanks to new measures designed to increase confidence and security. Further, they have warmly welcomed the agreement that led to the opening of negotiations in Vienna on conventional armed forces in Europe, also within the framework of the CSCE process, between States belonging to military alliances. Those negotiations, as is well known, are intended to strengthen stability and security on the continent through a more stable and more secure balance of conventional forces at lower levels, thus making it impossible to unleash surprise attacks or large-scale offensive actions.

As many speakers emphasised during the general debate, the progress achieved in the Vienna negotiations is encouraging, and the Twelve hope that they will soon produce agreements to achieve increased security and stability for all of Europe, while safeguarding the legitimate security interests of each State participant in the CSCE process.

However, although the Twelve attach special importance to the situation in Europe, they still realize tnat regional disarmament initiatives in the spirit of Chapter VIII of the Charter are a concrete and effective means of realizing the fundamental goals of the United Nations in other regions as well.

It is no happenstance that the security perceptions of the great majority of States are closely linked with the conditions of security prevailing in their own area. Thus the Twelve are convinced that it is up to the countries of each region to decide on the format that will enable them to reach regional disarmament agreements, which, taking into account the specific character of each area, can contribute to greater global stability.

(Mr. Morel, France)

Lastly, the Twelve believe that the disarmament process should not be limited to action by the great Powers or military alliances alone, but that it must include all States. For those reasons they reiterate their hope that the efforts being made in Europe will be echoed in other parts of the world.

Mr. HOU Zhitong (China) (interpretation from Chinese): It is an honour for me to introduce to the Committee two draft resolutions, A/C.1/44/L.14 and L.13, submitted by the Chinese delegation on nuclear and conventional disarmament respectively.

First, we are pleased to point out that draft resolutions submitted by the Chinese delegation on nuclear and conventional disarmament have been adopted by consensus by the General Assembly for several years running. That shows that they have epitomized the common demands and aspirations of the international community with respect to the two major issues of nuclear and conventional disarmament and that they have set forth a realistic way towards, and promising prospects for, realizing our disarmament goals. We wish to express our appreciation to all other delegations for the co-operation they have shown in this regard.

The two draft resolutions submitted by the Chinese delegation this year are based on the consensus resolutions adopted at the last session of the General Assembly, with certain necessary additions made in light of the progress achieved during the past year in the fields of nuclear and conventional disarmament. Prior to formal submission of the new draft resolutions, we solicited opinions from various delegations and did our best, in a spirit of co-operation, to incorporate their suggestions into the text wherever possible. Compared to General Assembly resolutions 43/75 E and 43/75 F, adopted by consensus last year, the present draft resolutions contain no substantive changes but better reflect the latest developments in the international situation.

(Mr. Hou Zhitong, China)

The past year has witnessed some positive developments in the field of nuclear disarmament. The United States and the Sov iet Union are implementing the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the INF Treaty - while expressing readiness to speed up negotiations on reduoing their strategic weapons. The draft resolution on nuclear disarmament now before the Commi ttee (A/C. 1/44/L. 14) gives full *affirmation* to those positive developments. At the same time it voices the common desire of the international community by continuing to urge the United States and the USSR to fulfil their special responsibility *for* nuclear dsisarmament and by expressing the hope that they will reach early agreement in the interests *of* international peace and seourity.

In this connection we wish to commend the Final Document of the ninth Summit Meeting of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which accurately reflected that common will *of* the international community. We also wish to note that similar wishes were epxresaed in the documen ta issued by the United States and the Soviet Union md by the two major military all iances. *We* appreciate the remarks *of* the Secretary-General in his annual report that, notwithstanding the steps in arms reduction taken by the two militarily most-powerful States md the proposals under consideration between the two major alliances, "No complacency is reflected in noting the credit side of the balance,' since it is apparent that , when we survey the entire scene, global stability and peace are still in danger. He stressed:

> "It is apparent that, even when all their proposed reductions are achieved, the members of the two military alliances will still have far more weapons than all others together." (A/44/1, p. 13)

The Secretary-General has indeed voiced the views of the international community.

(Mr. Hou Zhitong, China)

In recent years, the in ternational communi ty has focused ever grater attention on the question of conventional disarmament. The new negotiations between the European countries on the reduction of conventional armed forces hava got off to a good start. With that start, a promiaing turn for the bettrr has emerged in thr European oonvantional disarmament talks, which had been deadlooked for many years. Both sides have made concrete proporala and some oountrira have decided unila terally to reduce or partially withdraw their troops and weapons abroad. The international community welcomes those devrlopmentr and hopes that the nrgotiationr will result in the early conclusion of agreementa beneficial to the security of Europa and the world at large, The draft resolution on conventional disarmament before us gives a full, affirmative assessment to those developments. While stressing the importance of the European conventional disarmament talks in the preambular part, the draft resolution contain, a new operative paragraph to the effect that the General Assembly "welcomes the new negotiations on conventional armed forces in Europe".

Conventional disarmament is a complicated issue involving many regions and countries, and is related to many other questions in the field of disarmament. As in previoua years, the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of China again takes into account all the aspects of the question and tr ies to address the concerns and accommodate the positions of var ious parties. The delegation of China has made great efforts to that end in its consultations with other parties. For instance, although many countries including China regard the qualitative ● ♋□♏□♦ □♐ thr conventional arms race as oometh ing not to be ignored, in view of the practical difficulties expressed by some countries and for the rake of consensus we have demonrtrakd a oonriderrble spirit of accommoda tion. It is our hope that our good will and co-operative attitude will be seen in the proper light by all the

(Mr. Hou Zhitong, China)

parties concerned ard that they will join us in promoting interna ticnal co-operation in the same spirit.

As in the past few years, China hae only one purpose in eponeoring the two draft resolu tions - to strive for continued progreea in the two priority areas of nuclear and conventional disarmament so as to contribute to the strengthening of international peace and security. I wish to re-emphasize here that the two draft resolutions before us contain no substantive changes from the previous resolutions on the same subjects, but that they present a better reflection of the Current situation and new developments over the paet year. AR a result, they are richer and more balanced in con tent. We therefore hope that they will receive continued support from all delegations and will be adopted by consensus in the Committee and also in the General Assembly, th us once aga in express ing the common aspira tion and determination of the international community.

Mr. AZAMBUJA (Brazil): On behalf of a large group of sponsors, my delegation has the honor to introduce under agenda item 63 - "General and complete disarmament" - a draft resolution entitled "Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof", con ta inedin document A/C. 1/44/L. 43. The draft resolution is being submitted by the delegations of Australia, Austria, Botswana, Bulgar ia, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, the German Democratic Republic, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, Japan, Malaya ia, Mongol ia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic,

(Mr. Azambuja, Braz il)

the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain ad Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Viet Nam, Yugoalavia and Brazil.

My delegation took upon itself the task of co-ordinating the presentation of the draft resolution to the United Nations General Assembly at its forty-fourth session as a natural follow-p of our responsibilities, Brazil having occupied the presidency of the Third Review Conference of the rea-bed Treaty that was held in Geneva from 19 to 28 September 1989, in the person of Mr. Sergio de Queiroz Duarte, whose professionalism and skill in the discharge of his mandate have been widely recognized.

The Review Conference was truly successful, not only because it was possible to conclude that the purposes ret forth in the preamble and the provir ions of the Treaty were being fully realized, but also because of the atmoephere of good will and the spirit of flexibility shown by all participating States. I t is important to underline in particular that the obligation8 assumed under article I of the Treaty, relating to the core of that legal instrument, have been faithfully observed by all States parties, a fact that was registered in the Final Declaration of the Conference. It is also relevant to point out that in the Final Declaration all States parties to the Treaty confirmed that they had not emplaced any nuclwr weapons or other weapons of mass destruction cm the sea-bed outside the zone of application of the Treaty as defined by its article II, and that they had no intention of doing so in the future.

Another important conclusion of the Third Review Conference was the new procedure to be applied to the convening of the Fourth Review Conference, in which the Secretary-General will have an important role in reporting on technological

(Mr. Azambuja, Brazil)

developments relevant to the Treaty and to the verification of compliance with its proviaiona, including dual-purpose technologies for peaceful and specified military ends.

As a last remark, I would like to stress that the Third Review Conference renewed its invitation to all States that had not yet done so to adhere to the sea-bed Treaty, particularly those possessing nuclear weapons or any other types of weapons of mass destruction.

It is the expectation of the sponsors of the draft resolution that it will be adopted without a vote. We would like to thank the numerous aponeora for their oo-oparation and ask the members of the Committee to give the draft resolution their full support.

Ms. MASON (Canada): I am pleased to make the Canadian statement in support of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/44/L.50, entitled "Urgent need for a oomprehenaive nuclear-teat-ban treaty". The realization of a negotiated and verifiable comprehensive nuclear-teat-ban treaty continues to be a fundamental objective of Canadian arms-control and disarmament policy.

Canada believes that that objective can be achieved only through a step-by-step approach which, during the process itself, will build confidence and elaborate an effective verification régime. We are pleased to note the progr ess that has been realized in bilateral talks between the United States and the Soviet Union towards the ratification of the threshold teat-ban Treaty and the Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes. It is our hope and expectation that both of those Treaties will be ratified soon and that they will form the basis upon which further restrictions on nuclear testing will be negotiated.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

We alro welcome ongoing work in the area of verif ica tion applicable to a tea ting ban. Seismic detection is ● xpeotad to play a central role in that regard, and the reccnd teahnioal temt of thr Group of Scienti fic Experts will be an essential element in developing and perfecting a global ryrtem.

(Ma, Mason, Canada)

Followinq the first global seismic test in 1987, Canada undertook to upgrade its contribution to an international seismic data exchange by modernizing its Yallowkni fe Seismic Array, Located in the Canadian North. That process was compl eted this year and tho modernized array opened in September dur ing an international workshop hosted by Canada. We look forward to providing data from thin renewed facility as a practical contribution to the development of an effective international seismic detection capability in co-operation with other nations.

Canada aqnin is pleased to be a sponsor of a draft resolution entitled "Urgent need for a comprehens ive nuclear-test-ban trea ty" (A/C. 1/44/L. 50). It remains, in our view, one of the moat important draft resolutions considered by this Committee. Our delegation participated in the formulation of this text, which we consider to be a mnatructive document worthy of careful consideration by all delegations. We believe that draft reaolution A/C.1/44/L.50 provides a realistic Framework within which meaningful progress towards a comprehensive teat ban can be achieved. White the present text. recognizes the progress that has been made over the past year in limiting testing, its essential thrust and message remain unchanged. The sponsors express the conviction that a treaty to achieve the prohibition of all nuclear test explosions by all States in all environments for all time remains a matter of fundamental importance, and urge that specific, immediate and concrete steps he taken in support of that objective.

Canada continues to believe that the particular strength of this draft resolution and a pc incipal cause of the steady increase in support. for similar texts in recent years relate to its effectiveness in defining common ground among the broad ranqe of views and approaches which various countries bring to bear on this issue. Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.50 is a product of negotiation md

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

compromirr . It reflects, in our view, what is achievable in terms of practical s trpr towards the larger object ive. Canada considers that Che draft resolution strikes an appropr iate balance. We urge delegations to signal their continuing support by again voting in favour.

Mr. CHACON (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): I think it wan Erik Horkhrimer who said that politics is as much a struggle of ideas as a rtrugyle of interests. We believe that those aspects clearly illus trats the two dimensions of the work we do at the United Nations or in the spec ialized agencies of the United Nations system. It is a struggle of ideas in the sense that we seek to project our self-image and mould action in terme of our world view. It is a struggle of interests in the sense that there is confrontation between social groups struggling to use the machinery of the State and i ta national and international offshoots for their own benefit.

The United Nations is a world organiza tion of a fundamentally political nature. It is unrealistic to try to portray it as a technical body, because the primacy of the political component is always obvious.

The Organization was established in response to the need to build a new world order on the ruins of one that had demonstrated its ineffectiveness, in a tragic way, in the Second World War. It was conceived as an instrument for change aimed at building a peaceful world where freedom and security based on economic and social development, not on weapons, would prevail.

But from the very outset it was clear that there was a conflict between the ideals of the Charter and the statutes of the specialized agencies on the one hand and the real interests at stake in international politics on the other. There fore, the true intention - a creative United Nations - was soon forgotten and the world rmbarkrd on an arms race, driven by the notion of nuclear deterrence,

(Mr. Chacon, Costa Rica)

In proposing the inclusion of item 151 on the agenda and introducing draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.17, my Government is well aware that it is running against a strong pro-armament tide manifested daily and based on deeply rooted concerns. But we are convinced of the merit of what we are preaching when we act as we do.

We are a country without an army, and we have grown used to living without soldiers. We have learned to live in harmony with ourselves and with others, turning to dialogue and respect for the rights of others - that is, peace - to a recognition more of what unites us than of what divides us, and to an almost untrammeled utilization of freedom.

During a period nearly coincident with the lifetime of the United Nations we have learned that weapons and armies serve only to destroy and to create insecurity. We have also learned that it is not enough to reduce or eliminate weapons and armies. We know that for the close link between disarmament and development to be realised we need more than political or economic decisions by a Government or group of Governments. An entire people must live the life of disarmament and understand that problems can be solved with an open mind, a sense of proportion, objective information, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Without those prerequisites - an aspect of education - the world cannot be disarmed.

That background is reflected in the draft resolution we have submitted under agenda item 151. We view the United Nations as having been created to build a new world not only in economic and social terms but also in terms of human consciousness, and in the first preambular paragraph we invoke Article 2 of the United Nations Charter, and in the second and third preambular paragraphs ideas from the constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). We have not done this to draw that intergovernmental

(Mr. Chacon, Costa Rica)

organization into disarmament negotiations, but rather to draw on the thinking reflected in those texts. As the General Assembly, at its tenth special session, evinced a keen interest in the question of education for disarmament, we have referred in the fourth preambular paragraph to the Final Document of that session, specifically paragraph 106, as we believe that the World Disarmament Campaign is a valuable supplement to the educational work that should be carried out in Metier States' informal md formal educational spheres. We have included ref erences to paragraphs 99, 100 and 101 of the Final Document, and to the role of moulding public opinion as a support for the national efforts of States.

We have been asked why we took account of the principles and recommendations of the world Congress on Disarmament Education, held at UNESCO headquarter8 in June 1980. We did so, first of all, because that is the only world meeting to have been held in the United Nations system for the purpose of reviewing problems of disarmament education. Nearly a decade has passed since that Congress, but it remains our only point of reference in which Member States and their experts were involved. The recommendations contained in its report and final document retain their full validity today.

(Mr. Chacon, Costa Rica)

Secondly, paragraph 107 of the Final Document of the tenth special session states that

"The General Assembly welcomes the initiative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in planning to hold a world congress on disarmament education and, in that connexion, urges that organization to step up its programme aimed at the development of disarmament education as a distinct field of study through the preparation, inter alia, of teachers' guides, textbooks, readers and audio-visual ma ter ials. . , . "

The previous paragraph urges Governments, in the words of the text of the Final Document,

"... to take steps to develop programmes of education for disarmament and peace studies at all levels".

As the Final Document was approved by consensus and as it is the only guide we have so far as regards the disarmament priorities and the programme of action, we think that it is necessary to review what has been done to fulfil, in particular, the request made by the General Assembly in its 1978 Final Document.

Thirdly, in the Report and Final Document of the World Congress on Disarmament Education a whole programme is established, the general elements of which include, first, guidelines for developing education and information on disarmament in schools and universities, educational methods, the training of teachers and educators and the training of the armed forces and foreign policy services) and, secondly, guidelines for developing education for peace outside the schools and universities, with informal approaches to adult education, education in the trade unions and in the family, and also for carrying out campaigns to mould public opinion. Las tly, the Report and Fina.. Document define a plan for the development of research in the context of education and information for disarmament.

(Mr. Chacon, Costa Rica)

We are well aware of the problems facing UNESCO, and we realize that it is a sensitive point to refer to that international organization at this time. It is not our intention to create difficulties and we do not wish to involve UNESCO in disarmament issues. We are therefore prepared to make the necessary changes in the draft resolution in order to smooth the way and to seek broad support from the international community. For this reason, we shall today present a revised draft, which we hope will be an effective response to the concerns that have been voiced to us.

In conclusion, we would wish to stress once more the importance we attach to this subject and to the resolution. We believe that it is basic, and by no means of secondary importance. We shall submit it to the General Assembly with whatever reasonable changes may be needed. We hope that the General Assembly will agree with us when it comes to taking its decision.

Mr. von STÜLPNAGEL (Federal Republic of Germany): Today I would like to introduce, under item 61: "Reduction of military budgets", our draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.44 entitled "Military budgets", on behalf of the Ryelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Denmark, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and my own delegation. This draft resolution differs from the approach taken so far in the traditional drafts on this subject. Its purpose is to increase transparency in the field of military budgets and to improve the prerequisites for transparency and comparability by encouraging the broadest participation possible in the United Rations standardized system for reporting military expenditures. Military expenditure is not a quantity that can be changed in an abstract manner - either unilaterally or by agreement - but depends on the security of States: the smaller the threat, the lower are the military expenditures required.

(Mr. von Stülpnagel, Federal Republic of Germany)

Today there is a general understanding that further progress in disarmament negotiations could and should logically lead also to reductions in military expenditures, and that increased information on military matters, including comparable data on military budgeting and expenditure, is an important prerequisite for achieving agreements on the reduction of armed forces. A necessary first important step can already be taken: creating transparency. We remain convinced that whatever the purpoae of negotiations may be, tr aneparency in thin field requires the elaboration of agreed methods of measuring and comparing military expenditurus between specified periods of time and between countries with different budgeting sys tems. Accordingly, my delegation calls on all States to make use of the repor ting sys tern introduced in pursuance of General Aaeembly tesolu tion 35/142 B of December 1980.

In view of the experience gained through the implementation of confidence-building measures, including those on greater transparency , comparability, notification and predictability, on the one hand, and the lack of transparency which still prevails in military budgets owing to different budgeting and accounting systems on the other, we feel there is a need to give the subject of transparency in mili tary budgets the appropr ia te at ten t ion. Tr ansparency is imperative for qenerating increased confidence, which in turn makes it easier to approach, step by step, the goals of disarmament. In that sense, our draft resolution is linked with our initiative on confidence-building measures.

We deem it necessary to bring the still unfinished set of principles, which is still under consideration by the United Nations Disarmament Commission, into a commonly accepted form. A catalogue of principles which does not have the support of all countries concerned will fail in its implementation and will not bring about the results intended. Voting on this does not help.

(Mr. von Stülpnagel, Federal Republic of Germany)

In paragraph 7 of this set of principles, which is still being negotiated by the Disarmament Commission, a consensus form of words seems to have emerged for the first two sentences, which state that all parties to such negotiationa would be required to have accepted and implemented transparency and comparability, that agreed mothoda of measuring and compar inq military expendi tures between specified periods of time and between countries with different budgeting systems would be required, and that the idea of transparency in this field is accepted as a prerequisite for arms control.

There are indications that inspire hope that in the very near future more countries, militarily important countries, will join those which are already making use of the United Nations standardized reporting system. We warmly welcome these efforts. In submitting draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.44, it is our intention to encourage thoee who for various reasons still hesitate to take up this invitation from the General Assembly.

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel): I would like to say a few words regarding agenda item 68 and draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 21. This Committee is once again called upon to discuss "Israeli nuclear armament". This item is celebrating its tenth ann iver aary th is year. There is no objective reason for this Committee to waste its valuable time on this subject year after year. In his report on this item for the forty-fourth sesson, the Secretary-General wri tes, in paragraph 2 of document A/44/658, that

> "... no additional information has been forwarded to the Secretary-General since the submission of the last report to the General Assembly on the subject (A/43/693)".

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

I would like to quote the authoritative statement made by Israel's representative to the twenty-third Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Dr. Yona S. Ettinger, Director General of the Israel Atomic Energy Commission. Speaking about a similar resolution in that forum, he stated:

"This draft resolution misrepresents Israel's policy towards nuclear non-proliferation and fails to recognize Israel's authoritative statements on this policy. I wish to reiterate that Israel supports the principle of non-proliferation and affirms the necessity of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East along the lines laid down by the Tlatelolco and Rarotonga Treaties."

As we stated in our statement in the general debate:

"Such a nuclear-free zone would by its very nature provide full and satisfactory answers to the question of full-scope safeguards."

No country has ever acceded to any arms agreement without full and free negotiations, and it is manifestly unfair to single out Israel for special treatment. Paragraph 5 of the draft resolution before us requests Israel to submit all its nuclear activities to IAEA safeguards. A call addressed to Israel alone to accept full-scope safeguards is an act of singling out. There are many States not party to the non-proliferation Treaty and not subject to full-scope safeguards. And yet they are somehow immune from being addressed with similar requests and, at the same time, they presume to sit in judgement on Israel.

The conclusion of safeguards agreements is the statutory right of a State. That is provided by article III. A.5 of the Statute of the IAEA. The voluntary nature was also recognized in the technical study entitled "Modalities of Application of Agency Safeguards in the Middle East" - IAEA document GC(XXXIII)/887, which states:

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

"The Agency cannot carry out safeguards within the jurisdiction of a State without the latter's consent. Such consent must be recorded in a specific safeguards agreement which the State negotiates and concludes with the Agency on a voluntary basis."

In addition the draft resolution repeats the untruth about co-operation between Israel and South Africa in the nuclear field. All the most authoritative statements of the Government of Israel, from the Prime Minister down, have clearly stated that no such co-operation exists.

At a time when we are witnessing major moves towards a relaxation of tension throughout the world, we can only regret that the hatred of some Arab States for Israel prevents any progress in our region,

I call on all peace-loving countries to vote against draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 21.

Ms. MASON (Canada): I have the honour today to introduce draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 38, "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". In addition to Canada and Poland, the following 33 Member States are also sponsors of the draft resolution: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, the Netherlands, Norway, the Philippines, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Viet Nam.

As Member States are aware, this draft resolution is traditionally the means by which the General Assembly takes note of developments relevant to its subject matter since the Assembly's previous session, particularly developments in the

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

negotia tions in the Conference on Disarmament on a convention to ban chemical weapons, and expresses the interests and concerns of its members in advanaing and concluding as expeditiously as possible auah a convention. Since it has also traditionally en joyed consensus approval, it thereby represents in tangible form the unanimous desire and will of the world community to eliminate ccnnpletely the scourge of chemical weapons and to ensure that they are never developed, produced, s tockpiled or used again.

As has been noted several times in the general &bates this year, both in the General Assembly and in this Committee, 1989 witnessed developments of the highest importance in the effort to achieve our common goal. Last January the representatives of nearly 150 States met in Paris to consider means of reaffirming the urgent necessity of strict observance by all States of the principles and objectives of the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating , Poisonous or other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925. I think all will agree that that Conference of States parties to the 1925 Geneva Protocol and other interested States was a resounding success, par ticularly in its development of a Final Declaration that, inter al ia, reaffirmed the prohibition established in the Protocol.

Further, with the renewed momentum provided by the Paris Conference, the Conference on Disarmament heeded the Final Declaration's call to redouble its efforts and undertook, during its 1989 sess ion., unprecedented measures to intensify its work on the negotiation of a chemical-weapons ban .

Thirdly, in September 1989 the Australian Government convened the Government-Industry Conference against Chemical Weapons, where representatives of both Government and the chemical industry were able to discuss ways and means of contributing to our common objective.

(Ma. Mason, Canada)

Finally, we would note the encouraging developments that have conourrantly taken place in the bilateral discussions between the USSR and the United States, in the framework of the multilateral negotiations, on issues related to this common goal.

It is in the light of those several momentoua developments that the authors and sponsors offer the draft resolution for the Committee's consideration. We have sought to reflect those developments in a number of paragraphs. The third and fourth preambular paragraphe and paragraphu 4 and 6 of the operative part reflect recognition cf the important achievements of the Paris Conference, in particular the adoption of the Final Declaration, and call upon all States to abide by the commitments undertaken in that Declaration. The fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 7 and 8 recognize the valuable impetus provided by the Canberra Conference towards the goal of a ban on chemical weapons. Paragraph 3 recognizes the view of many States that the forthcoming seas ion of the Conference on Disarmament will, In the light of the continuing developments I have noted, be of pivotal importance in the continuing effort to conclude the negotiations on the convention to ban chemical weapons,

The draft resolution before us is the result of intensive and broad cons ulta t ions among many delega t ions, all of whom have demonstrated a spirit of goodwill and co-operation. I am sure that they will not disagree with me if I choose to single out among the many the particular contribution of the delegation of Poland, which has co-operated very closely with Canada on this draft reeolution. Our two delegations also highly appreciate the generous co-operation and valuable assis tance of Australia and France, as well as that of other delegations that participated in the process of coneulta tions.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

The sponsors of the draft resolution believe that it warrants the unanimoua support of the First Committee, and they hope that it will again be adopted by consensus. Suah a step will clearly and convincingly demonstrate the firm commitment of the world community to the goal of eliminating chemical weapons for all time. It will thus rend a vital message to the Conference on Disarmament that I am sure will be heard and heeded.

Mr. KOTEVSKI (Yugoslavia) : On behalf of the States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, I should like to introduce two draft resolutions.

First, I have the privilege to introduae tho draft resolution on item 67, "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", contained in document A/C.1/44/L.33.

As metiers my recall, the General Assembly at its forty-third session, by its consensus resolution 43/79, decided that the Colombo Conference on the Indian Ocean should be oonvened in 1990, The present draft resolution primarily deals with the convening of the Colombo Conference in 1990 and the programme of work that the Conference has to undertake.

The draft text in its preambular section recall8 the Declaration (resolution 2832 (XXVI)) and previous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on its implementation and reaffirms that the eetablirhment of zones of peace in various regions contributes to strengthening the security of States within such zones and to international peace and security as a whole. It also reaffirms the conviction that the achievements of the objectives of the Declaration would be a substantial contr ibution to the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and peaceful development of the States of the region, It also says that the continued military presence of the great Powers in the Indian Ocean area, conceived in the context of their confrontation, gives urgency to the need to take practical steps for the early achievement of the objectives of the Declaration. The final preambular paragraph states that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean has accomplished to a great extent the preparatory work connected with the convening of the Conference in 1990.

While - in par agraphs 1 and 2 - taking note and expressing appreciation of the work done by the Ad Hoc Committee, in paragraph 3 the text reaffirms full support for the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean am a Zone of Peace. Paragraph 4 recalls the Final Document contained in the report of the meeting of

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia,)

the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, held in July 1979. Paragraph 5 decides that the Conference shall be structured in several stages.

Paragraph 6 decides to convene, in the first stage, the United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean at Colombo, Sri Lanka, from 2 to 13 July 1990, with the objective of:

II (a) Reviewing the situation in the Indian Ocean area with particular reference to the continued dangers posed by the military presence of the great Powers, and also other foreign military presences, whenever they are contrary to the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace;

"(b) Considering the principal elements of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace as contained in the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and as considered at the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean as well as at the subsequent meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, taking into account all its relevant work)

" (c) Adopting a final document containing the principles, modalities, machinery and programme of action for the furtherance of the objectives of the zone of peace;

"(d) Recommending to the General Assembly the future role and functions of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean bearing in mind its mandate as defined in the relevant resolutions".

Paragraph 7 decides that the Conference shall endeavour to adopt modalities and a programme of action embodying practical measures for the maintenance of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace in order to finalize an international agreement with binding arrangements.

Paragraph 8 recommends that the participation at the Conference shall be at the ministerial level. Paragraph 9 requests the Secretary-General to invite the parties listed in its seven sub-paragraphs. In paragaph 10 a request is made to

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

the Secretary-General to transmit to the Conference the reports and documentation of the Ad Hoc Committee and of the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean on their work, and all other relevant documentation of the General Assembly. Paragraph 11 invites the Conference to take into account those reports and relevant documents in its work. In paragraph 12 the Secretary-General is requeeted to appoint a Secretary-General of the Conference and provide other necessary ataff, services and other facilities, including summary records for the Conference. In paragraph 13 the Secretary-General is requested to take all appropriate steps, including the provision of financial resourcea, for the convening of the Conference.

In paragraph 14 the Ad Hoc Committee is requeeted to hold a session during the first half of 1990, with a duration of two weeks, in order to continue its preparatory work, and submit a report directly to the Conference. In paragraph 15 the Secretary-General is requested to render all assistance to the Ad Hoc Committee. Paragraph 16 decides to include in the provisional. agenda of the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly the item entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace".

The present draft has been before the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean since July this year. The intention of the non-aligned members of the Ad Hoc Committee when the draft was submitted to it was to provide a basis for negotiation8 among interested groups and other States members of the Ad Hoc Committee. Subaequently the non-aligned members decided to introduce the same draft in this Committee, with the clear understanding that they are open to discussions and negotiations with a view to reaching a consensus. It is the earnest desire of the non-aligned members to work to this end during the remaining time available.

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

I may mention here that the Heads of State or Government gathered in Belgrade at their summit conference in September this year expressed full support for the convening of the Conference in Colombo in 1990 and called for the full and active participation in it of the permanent metiers of the Security Council and the major maritime users, whose co-operation is essential for the success of the Conference.

We look forward to receiving any concrete suggestions that may facilitate a consensus draft resolution that will enable the holding of the United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean, as agreed by consensus resolution 43/79 of 7 December 1988.

My delegation is also pleased to introduce, on behalf of the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/44/32, entitled "Relationship between Disarmament and Development".

The proposed resolution is mainly a procedural one, its main purpose being to welcome the report of the Secretary-General and actions taken in accordance with the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, as well as to request the Secretary-General to continue to take action, through the appropriate organs and within available resources, for the implementation of the action programme adopted at the International Conference.

In the draft we further request the Secretary-General to submit a report to the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session, and we decide to include the item on the agenda of its forty-fifth session.

We attach extreme importance to the subject dealt with in the draft resolution. May I recall that on that matter the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at their recent summit meeting held in Belgrade stated:

"The close relationship between disarmament and development must be seen as a contribution to the wider efforts to give precedence to economic development

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

over the priorities imposed by the dangerous and irrational race for military might." (A/44/551, Declaration, para. 5)

In that context the Belgrade Declaration also underlined that:

"Given enhanced disarmament prospects, new opportunities are opening for all countries, especially those possessing the largest nuclear and conventional arsenals, for rechannelling additional financial resources, human energy and creativity into development." (ibid.)

On an issue of such importance it is our sincere hope that the Committee will be able to adopt the draft resolution without a vote. In that spirit, we value and appreciate the statement made yesterday by the representative of France, Mr. Pierre Morel, on behalf of the Twelve members of the European Community.

Mr. BELLINA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): It is my honour to introduce to the First Committee today, on behalf of the sponsors, the draft resolutions dealing with the work of the Conference on Disarmament on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons, and with the question of conventional disarmament on a regional scale.

Peru, as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the subject in the Conference on Disarmament at its 1989 substantive session, is submitting the draft resolution on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons contained in document A/C.1/44/L.57. The draft resolution was sponsored by the Byeloruss ian Soviet Social ist Republic, Hungary, the Ne therlandn, Sweden, the Union of Soviet Socialist Hepublics and Peru. It seeks to encourage the Conference on Disarmament to continue its substantive negotiation on the subject with a view to the prompt conclusion of ! ts work, taking into account all aspect s of the problem.

In that connectian, my delegation is pleased to note that the Conference on Disarmament chose to set up two Contact Groups within the relevant Ad Hoc Committee. We believe that that working method will make it possible to achieve substantial progress in the handling of all aspects pertaining to radiological weapons. We therefore very much hope that such working methods can be used by the Conference on Disarmament at its next substantive session.

The delegation of Peru also wishes to high 1 igh t the growing importance , within that general them, of the question of attacks on nuclear facilities that could have consequences equivalent to those of radiological weapons. We feel that it in important for that question to continue to be treated as one of the elements of the subject in general. However, we must also recognize the breadth of the consequences of such attacks, which by their very nature require a thorough

(Mr. Bellina, Peru)

aonrideration on a multi-disciplinary basis within a suitable negotiating framework. We feel that the Conference on Disarmament can make a major contribution to that end within its sphere of competence. My delegation therefore very much agrees that there is a need to deal with the question of attacks on nuclear facilities at an appropriate time by the parties concerned within the broader context of an ad hoc diplomatic conference on the subject.

My delegation has the honour of submitting - on behalf of Bangladesh, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, Romania, Uruguay and Peru - the draft resolution entitled "Conventional disarmament on a regional scale" for consideration by the First Committee under agenda i tern 63 (m) .

The drafting of the draft resolution, which has been distributed in document A/C.1/44/L.56, seeks to reflect the new and important developments that have occurred since the last session of the General Assembly. It also draws on the basic texts for international disarmament negotiations that have been accepted and acknowledged by all. States represented here.

As can be seen from the text, the three main points of the present draft resolution are, first, the complementary nature that can and must exist between subregional and regional efforts for conventional disarmament and those made at the world-wide level, provided that regional and subregional efforts must properly take into account the features peculiar to each region. They must be fully agreed by all parties concerned and implemented in conformity with the principles and norms of the United Nations Charter.

Secondly, our draft resolution is based on the fundamental role which the United Nations can play in the solution of regional and sub-regional conflicts. We see no need to dwell here on the praiseworthy achievements of the United Nations,

(Mr. Bellina, Peru)

which has demonstrated its abilities and its readiness to act, hut we do consider that we must give it our full support so that it may the better achieve its abject ives .

The intrinsic and complex relationship between diearmament and development is the third element of the draft resolution. In that context, the text proposed covers the legitimate concerns of States for their security, while also pointing out that the disarmament processes at the subregional and regional levels must take into account as one of their principal foundations the allocation of resources released from the military sphere for use in social and economic development.

In that context, we must refer to the military applications of science and technology, both because their impact on the upgrading of conventional armaments would make it increasingly difficult to distinguish them from other types of weapons , and because of the vaat resources consumed by so-called convent ional weapons. We who have repeatedly referred to that fact are pleased to note that it is one that has already been endorsed by the Organization, which recently adopted without a vote General Assembly resolutions 42/38 G and 43/75 F on that subject.

Reference to nuclear disarmament issues in this text is designed solely to provide for an appropriate framework for the handling of all asp cts of conventional disarmament, in keeping with the pr iorities for disarmament negotiations established by the international community and contained in the 1978 Final Document,

It is important to emphasize that we cannot talk about disarmament at the regional and subregional levels unless the parties directly concerned, as well as the entire international community, strictly abide by the international norms of conduct set forth in the United Nations Charter, in particular the principles of refraining frum the threat or use of force, respect for the territorial integrity

(Mr. Bellina, Peru)

and sovereignty of Sta tea, and non-interference in any form whatsoever in the internal affairs of States.

My delegation has recognized and welcomed in th is and other international forums the importance and value of global disarmament efforts. That is why we believe that those efforts require a parallel and concurrent effort at the regional and subreg ional level. The *draft* resolution pursues that same objective.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to emphaaize my country's firm belief in the urgent need for the development of processes of conventional disarmament at the regional and s ubr egional level. In that context, we believe in the importance of unilateral initiatives of a constructive and real nature. That 's why we view as an essential condition the need for those processes to be carried out in a balanced manner without detriment to the security of any party involved and with the full and free sovereign agreement of all the parties concerned in both procedure and subetance. We are quite ready to hear constructive euggestione for the improvement of the text within the framework of its general objectives, and we aeek the support of all delegations for the draft resolution in the light of that fact.

Mr. TOTH (Hungary) : As a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 41, enti tled "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security", my deleqation fully shares the view that monitoring future scientific and technological developments having military applications and evaluatinq their impact on international security have become imperative today. These require the widest co-operation of States, especially those that take the Lead in scientific and technological research and development. Openness is also needed to ensure the correct interpretation of intentions as research and development take place.

The position of my delegation coincides with the view contained in the draft resolution, which states the importance of

"ensuring that scientific and technological developments are not exploited for military purposes but harnessed for the common benefit of mankind".

This, of course, as we understand it, can in no way impede research and development for peacef ul purposes.

Access to sophisticated technology is often limited by harriers erected on the grounds of the danger of diverting modern technology to military purposes. Hunqary is aware that such a danqer exists, but at the same time bel ieves that appropriate measures agreed upon by the users of sophisticated technology can preclude diversion to military objectives. We on our part are ready to co-operate in working out methods to prevent divers ion and measures to veri fy their application.

In our view, at a later stage of the resolution's implementation some qualified expert work could be started on establishing quid&Lines for defining technologies that can be used solely for military purposes, as a first step. Agreed guidelines could also be worked out for dual-purpose technoloqies, including

(Mr. Toth, Hungary)

measurer that would preclude their use for military purposes. Such distinctions could facilitate access to technology, and this could in turn be complemented by gradually diminishing tranefer limitations on know-how and technology.

Those are some of the considerations that led my delegation to co-sponsor the draft reeolution and to recommend it for adoption.

I nw turn to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.57, which has just been introduced by the reprerenta tive of Peru,

As a co-sponsor of the draft resol ution, which is the 'traditional" draft resolut ion on the prohibi t ion of the development, production, stockpil ing and use of radiological weapons, my delegation would like to outline the motives behind its support for the draft and to offer some considerations which might usefully be taken into account when we contemplate charting some possible new directions for future action on this issue.

My delegation's support for the draft reeolution is not procedural. It cannot merely be explained by the fact that a representative of Hungary served in 1989 as the Co-ordinator of Contact Group A of the Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapone. The real reason is more deep-sea ted ; it is my country 's full commitment to the early prohibition of radiological weapons. Thus my &legation subscr ibes to the main message of the drat. resolution, as stated in paragraph 4, where the Conference on Diearmament is requested to continue its substantive negotiation on the subject with a view to the prompt conclusion of its work.

The "traditional" draft resolution on the prohibition of radiological weapons is one of the least contested draft resolutions in the First Committee, enjoying coneenrur-bared ruppor t. It is a truism, 'of course, that the main element6 of the draft resolution have remained virtually unchanged and procedural in nature during reoent years.

(Mr. Toth, Hungary)

We hope that the textual continuity of the draft resolution does not imply that there is sustained progress at the negotiating table. Ten years have now elapsed since the Soviet Union and the United States presented, back in 1979, a joint draft treaty prohibiting radiological weapons. It would be fairly difficult to pinpoint areas of the prohibition of radioloqical weapons in the traditional sense where negotiators are much closer now to final solutions than they were a decade aqo.

I hope that my delegation will not be considered to be ignorant of the enormous amount of work which has been invested in the negotiations if it concludes that one of the most promising developments during these 10 years has been the ever-growing recognition that the issue of the prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities should be addressed and settled. It took five years for such recognition finally to become firmly embedded in the mainstream of disarmament thinking, since it was back in 1984 that Sweden put forward its draft treaty prohihi ting not only radiological weapons, but the release of radioactive material for hostile purposes as well.

Such a unitary approach, unfortunately, did not resutt in a final solution to the two matters under consideration. Nevertheless, it was instrumental in bringing about another conclusion now widely shared - that the issue of the protection of nuclear facilities should be settled irrespective of the outcome of negotiations on radiological weapons in the traditional sense. Such a conclusion has been strengthened by a negotiating pattern as a result of which opposing views on issues not always directly related to the prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities prevented any kind of progress on this question.

There have been some further developments recently which have strengthened the prevailing tendency. One is the initiative taken by the Co-ordinator of Contact Group B in moving towards the elaboration of possible elements relevant to the

(Mr. Toth, Hungary)

prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities. Another is the new approach proposed by the delegation of Peru in the form of a draft convention on the prohibition of attacks against nuclear installations. Thus the question of the protection of nuclear facilities has now clearly become an independent issue, demanding autonomous solutions. Such an assessment by us does not run counter to our readiness to prohibit radiological weapons, in the traditional sense, if and when that is feasible.

Why do we so resolutely urge the prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities? First, contemplated attacks against nuclear facilities have obviously been integrated into warfighting scenarios, whether conventional or nuclear. Secondly , even a conventional-weapons attack could conceivably equal the consequences of the worst accidental melt-down in terms of radiation discharged. Such a major release might affect nearly 15 per cent of the territory of a country similar in size to mine, requiring restrictions, which oould last decades, on occupation of a significant part, while the area in which agriculture was restricted might amount to half of its territory. Thirdly, existing legal restraints in the 1977 Additional Protocol to the 1949 Geneva Conventions are insufficient.

My delegation is aware that some countries still do not join in the consensus on these points. We hope that they will give further positive consideration to those concerns which are being raised by non-nuclear-weapon States in this respect. The Hungarian delegation is of the view that nuclear-weapon-State status implies not only additional power, but increased responsibilities towards those States which gave up the nuclear option under the non-proliferation Treaty. The non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the non-proliferation Treaty have fulfilled the it contractual legal obliga t ions. While implementation of the provirionr of the

(Mr. Toth, Hungary)

non-proliferation Treaty on nuclear disarmament is still pending, it is difficult to understand that nuclear-weapon States might want to keep open such additional nuclear options as the destruction of peaceful nuclear facilities. Even the reduction of nuclear-weapon inventoriea might lose its meaning if that option were to be kept open, with an ever-increasing number of peaceful nuclear facilities around the world. What is more, under the terms of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the par ties are not only entitled to en joy, but are obliged to respect, the right to the peaceful uae of nuclear energy - that is, the unhampered functioning of safeguarded nuclear facilities.

The Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons shared that approach by declaring back in 1985 that armed attacks on safeguarded nuclear facilities could involve grave dangers, owing to the release of radioactivity, and that such attacks or threats of attack jeopardized the development of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The Conference acknowledged that the matter was under consideration by the Conference on Disarmament and urged the co-operation of all States for its speedy conclusion.

(Mr. Toth, Hungary)

Not much has happened since then, at least not in the direction of the speedy conclusion of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament. Acknowledging the difficul ties encountered in the negotiations, the Conference on Disarmament as early as in 1986 recommended that the ways and means of how best to proceed further should be considered. As a reflection that the situation has not changed much since then - at least not for the better - it has become a tradition by now that the Ad Hoc Committee concludes its report by saying that the work conducted by the Ad Hoc Committee has merely contributed to a more articulate presentation of the different positions that continue to exist.

The underlying reasons for the lack of progress become even less understandable when we recall some of the events and developments that have occurred since the Third Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; the Chernobyl accident; the Conventions on Early Notification and on Assistance adopted in 1986 within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA); the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the INF Treaty) the negotiations on the 50 per cent reduction of strategic nuclear-weapon inventories of the United States and the Soviet Union; the readiness of the two alliances to negotiate about the future reduction of tactical nuclear weapons) and the 1988 agreement between India and Pakistan on the prohibition of attacks against nuclear installations and facilities.

My delegation can only hope that in 1990 real progress will be achieved in fulfilling the provisions of the Final Document of the Third Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proli fera t ion of Nuclear Weapons in that respect. We realize that there are different ideas on the most appropriate ways and means of addressing and settling the issue of the prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities.

(Mr. Toth, Hungary)

We paid due attention to the position eloquently articulated by the deleqation of Venezuela in this forum last year when it stated that the preparation of an international agreement to prohibit military attacks against nuclear facilities was not a disarmament matter but, rather, one related to the conduct of warring States, and that it should therefore be discussed in a diplomatic conference rather than in the Conference on Disarmament.

Nor did we over look the opinion of the French delegation expressed in the Conference on Disarmament this year, when it stated :

"The Conference on Disarmament is not competent to negotiate an agreement in this field, Nuclear facilities are already protected by the Additional Protocol to the Geneva Conventions of 1949, and if strengthening of the system is necessary, it is within that framework that it would have to be negotiated."

My delegation is flexible on what might be the most appropriate framework for dealing with the issue. Wet find that the points raised by the delegations of Venezuela and France and shared by others are not unfounded and deserve serious consideration. As a matter of fact, the 1977 Additional Protocol itself provides for an eventual possibility that both delegations seem to favour by urging the conclusion of further agreements to provide additional protection for objects con ta in ing dangerous forces.

We believe that the Conference on Disarmament should be given another chance to prove that the issue of the prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities could be successfully dealt with within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament, together with or independent of the prohibition of radiological weapons in the traditional sense, thus making it superfluous for the Fourth Review Conference of the non-proliferation Treaty and the next session of the First Committee to outline possible new approaches.

(Mr. Toth, Hungary)

With those considerations in mind my delegation recommend8 adoption of draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 5 7.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the 12 States member s of the European Community, I should like to make a few observations on agenda item 63 (1), "Review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament".

As I recalled in my statement on behalf of the Twelve during the general debate on 16 October, the Twelve are convinced that, in keeping with the goals and ob jectives of the Charter, the United Nations must play a central role in the search for disarmament, In that context the Twelve have always supported efforts aimed at strengthening the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. The views of States members of the European Community in that connection are set forth in document A/CN.10/112, which was aubmitted to the Disarmament Commission by the Federal Republic of Germany. In our opinion, efforts must be continued to organize the work of the United Nations in the field of disarmament more effectively, particularly by continuing our support for General Assembly resolution 42/42 N.

Beginning with the wor k done here in the First Committee, I should like to express our satisfaction at the efforts that you, Mr. Chairman, have personally undertaken to carry on the effort at rationalization begun in 1984 at the behest of General Assembly resolutions. In the view of the Twelve, the First Committee, as the principal subsidiary organ of the General Assembly entrusted with disarmament and related questions of international security , must continue fully to play its role. However, it is important that it do so with increased effectiveness,

As I emphasized in my statement on 16 October, the First Committee's credibility will be strengthened by the adoption of a greater number of resolutions

(Mr. Morel, France)

by consensus, not by a larger number of resolutions being considered and put to the vote. A serious and fruitful effort, supported by the Twelve, was made at. the forty-third seas ion. We hope that that encouraging precedent will guide our work at the present session and that consensus may be broadened. For their part, the Twelve are determined to make a positive contribution to that end.

In the view of the Twelve the Disarmament Commission remains the proper forum for dealing substantively with specific questions related to multilateral disarmament, and we note with satisfaction the significant results obtained in that field in recent years. We regret all the more, however, that despite improvements in the international political climate it has not proved possible this year to reach a consensus on any of the i terns on the agenda of the 1989 sess ion. In the view of the Twelve that state of affairs demands that some thought be given to ways and means of rebuilding the basis of consensus. The Twelve are prepared to co-operative actively in that regard.

As has been stressed in the past, the Twelve attach great importance to the work of the Conference on Disarmament, the only multilateral negotiating organ on disarmament matters, In our view, the Conference on Disarmament is an indispensable forum in the disarmament field. The Twelve are awaiting the results of the discussions held within the Conference on Disarmament, which we hope will strengthen the effectiveness of the Conference in its disarmament efforts.

The Twelve attach special importance to the ongoing negotiations on chemical weapons within the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva. We consider that the speedy conclusion of convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons that would be general and comprehensive and accompanied by effective verification machinery remains one of the most urgent priorities of the Conference on Disarmament and that it would serve to strengthen its authority.

(Mr. Morel, France)

The Twelve deem it essential that on all matters within the purview of the United Nations in the field of disarmament every effort should be made to use available resources to the full and avoid useless duplication. In that connection the Twelve consider that the Department for Disarmament Affairs plays a fundamental co-ordinating role, one it is performing with competence in so far as its resources permit.

(Mr. Morel, France)

In the view of the Twelve, United Nations studies on disarmament represent a significant contribution to the examination of, and to debates on, disarmament matters. The Twelve consider that, in accordance with relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, the studies should deal with concrete and specific topics and should entail appropriate consultations. The Twelve regard as most useful the United Nations programme of disarmament fellowships, and we hope that it will be continued .

Finally, the Twelve welcome the improvements that have been made in the management and work of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, to which some of them make voluntary contributions. We should like to express our satisfaction at the Secretary-General's ini tia tive to restructure the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters.

Mr. REYES (Phil ippines): I am, pleased to address the First Committee on the draft resolutions on disarmament that the Philippines is sponsoring this year. In this brief statement, I will avoid going into a detailed analysis of the draft resolutions. That task has already been performed. for us by the main sponsors, for which we are grateful. In sponsoring these particular draft resolutions, the Philippines does not wish to imply that other resolutions that it supports and finds noteworthy are of lesser merit. Like other delegations, we have chosen to sponsor the resolutions that fit best into our overall national strategy on disarmament issues.

The Philippines is sponsoring draft resolution L. 25 under agenda item 51, "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water", and draft resolution L.50 under agenda item 52, "Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-bar treaty: report of the Conference on Disarmament".

(Mr. Reyes, Phil ippines)

The Philippines believes that, with the striking current developments in the fields of disarmament, peace and security, now, more than ever, is the time to begin in earnest an attempt to achieve a canprehensive nuclear-test-ban Treaty. The Philippines is one of the 41 parties, composing more than a third of the States parties to the Partial Test-Ban Treaty, that are advocating an amendment conference, to commence with preparations in January 1990, and to be followed up by conferences in May and June of that year and again in January 1991. While the two draft resolutions that I have just mentioned are different in approach and in the forums they address, that are similar in that they are intended to achieve the same end - a comprehensive nuclear-teat ban. The Philippines sees no contradiction - indeed, it sees mutual reinforcement - in sponsoring these two draft resolutions.

The Philippines is sponsoring this year draft resolution L. 24 under agenda item 63 (i), "Prohibition of the production of fissionable mater ial for weapons purposes". It has supported the antecedents of this draft resolution in the past. However, it believes that the draft resolution has special significance at this time, in the light of the implementation of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union GE Soviet Soc ial ist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the INF Treaty. It is relevant in the light of proposals made this year by Soviet President Gorbachev with regard to putting a mutual verifiable halt to the production of uranium and plutonium for weapons purposes. Similar proposals were made in the Baruch Plan of 1946 and by United States Presidents in 1956 and 1964.

A bilateral ban on the production of fissile material could benefit the United States and the Soviet Union by putting an overall ceiling on the size of their nuclear-weapon inventories. It would save the unnecessary expense of having to

(Mr. Reyes, Philippines)

build new plants to produce f issionable mater ial for weapons purposes, to replace the obsol escent ones now in existence. Moreover, it would prepare the United States and the Soviet Union to negotiate an agreement to dispose of, rather than recycle, nuclear-warhead materials, as a result of the INF Treaty and other possible future disarmament treaties. Finally, it would help to convince the other parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, who will soon meet at the fifth review Conference in 1990, that the United States and the Soviet Union, in accordance with article VI of that Treaty, are indeed pursuing 'negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date".

The Philippines is also sponsoring draft resolution L. 38 under agenda item 62, "Chemical md bacteriological (biological) weapons", as it believes that this draft resolution best summarizes the present situation and current developments in the field of chemical and bacteriological weapons and suggests the steps that should be taken to secure, as soon as possible, a convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons.

Turning to conventional weapons, the Philippines is sponsor ing this year draft resolution L.67 under agenda i tern 63 (h), "International arms transfers", as well as draft resolution L. 56 under agenda item 63 (m), "Conventional disarmament on a reg ional scale", because, as it has said repeatedly in its statements on disarmament items, conventional weapons have caused most deaths and moat destruction in all wars since the Second World War. Indeed, a sys tern must be found to control the production of, and trade in, conventional arms on a regional as well as a global scale.

The Philippines is sponsoring draft resolution L.15, under agenda item 63 (f), "Objective information on military matters", and draft resolution L.36 under

(Mr. Reyes, Phil ippines)

agenda i tern 61, "Reduction of military budgets", because it believes that the principles of transparency and the progressive reduction of military expenditurea in favour of development are ways in which the arms race can be abated and the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control gradually achieved.

Finally, the Philippines is sponsoring resolution L. 4 under agenda item 64 (d), "World Disarmament Campaign", L. 59 under agenda i tern 64 (g) "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services programme: report of ' the Secretary-General", L.61 under agenda item 66 (k), *Disarmament Week", ad L.63 under items 64 (e), (h) and (i), which deal with the United Nations regional centres for peace md disarmament in Africa, Asia and Latin America md the Car ibbean.

We see these items as being interrelated and view the draft resolutions as presenting different approaches to the raising of the consciousness md awareness of various const'tuencies on issues of disarmament. In its aponsorsh ip of these draft resolutions, it agrees with the Preamble to the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, which states that "since wars began in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed".

Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) : Two days ago a representative of the Programme Planning md Budget Divis ion gave us an explanation of the procedures to be followed this year with respect to resolutions that have programme-budget implicd t ions. He explained, in particular, the novel situation that we have this year in respect of the Contingency Fund. If I am not mistaken, he said that towards the end of this seas ion priori ties would be set as to how that fund should be used over the biennium.

(Mr. Fahmy, Egypt)

I want simply to point out that it is the view of my delegation that, in setting priorities for the Fund, one cannot ignore the substantive character of the resolutions. We believe, therefore, that the intra-Secretariat consultations in setting out the priorities should involve, at an appropriate stage, the Directors or Under-Secretaries of the substantive departments. Priorities must be set not only on a financial basis but also on a basis that reflects the concerns expressed by Governments throughout the discussion.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanishi: I understand that the Secretariat has noted fully, and will take into account, the comments that have just been made by the representative of Egypt.

Before adjourning the meeting, I wish to remind members that, in accordance on our work programme, as agreed, the Committee will proceed to take action on the first cluster of draft resolutions tomorrow morning. However, as I have stated previously, when the Committee is taking action on those draft resolutions we shall continue to adopt a flexible attitude. Draft resolution L.8, which is in cluster 1, will not be before us for approval, as consultations on it are continuing.

(The Chairman)

It has been requested that the Committee postpone action on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.27 in cluster 1. Once decisions have been taken on cluster 1, we shall proceed to take action on clusters 2, 3 and 4.

In cluster 3, we must for the time being postpone action on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.17, as the Secretariat has received a revised text of that draft resolution, which will be circulated in due course. We shall also postpone consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.63, on which consultations are under way.

Thus, tomorrow the First Committee will be taking action on the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/44/L.6, L.32, L.51, L.62, L.43, L.52, L.4, L.59, L.61, L.23/Rev.1 and L.49.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the First Committee): I should like to inform members of the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/44/L.12, Iceland; A/C.1/44/L.15/Rev.1, Austria; A/C.1/44/L.25, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Suriname, Swaziland and Zimbabwe; A/C.1/44/L.32, the German Democratic Republic; A/C.1/44/L.36, Chile and Colombia; A/C.1/44/L.39, Madagascar; A/C.1/44/L.43, Canada and Yugoslavia; A/C.1/44/L.44, Turkey: A/C.1/44/L.47, the Federal Republic of Germany; A/C.1/44/L.49, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka; A/C.1/44/L.58, Turkey; A/C.1/44/L.63, Japan; A/C.1/44/L.50, Thailand; and A/C.1/44/L.59/Rev.1, the Federal Republic of Germany.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.