

UNITED NATIONS  
  
**General Assembly**  
FORTY-SIXTH SESSION  
*Official Records*

**FIRST COMMITTEE**  
19th meeting  
held on  
**Monday, 28 October 1991**  
at **10 a.m.**  
New York

---

**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 19th MEETING**

**Chairman:**

**Mr. MROZIEWICZ**

**(Poland)**

**CONTENTS**

**General debate on all disarmament items (continued)**

---

This record is subject to correction.  
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned  
within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2 790,  
2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

**Distr. GENERAL**  
**A/C.1/46/PV.19**  
**7 November 1991**

**ENGLISH**

**91-61583 6874V (E)**

**Best Copy Available**

29p.

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 47 TO 65 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Mr. NANDOE (Suriname): My delegation joins previous speakers in congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the chairmanship of this important Committee. Our congratulations also go to the other members of the Bureau. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank your predecessor, Ambassador Rana of Nepal, for his excellent contribution to the work of this Committee during the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

Many representatives who addressed the Committee earlier paid considerable attention to disarmament in the context of the new world order. Indeed, the end of the cold war has opened up new prospects for international cooperation which the emerging new world order symbolizes. The signing of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the reduction of their strategic arsenals will contribute to achieving nuclear disarmament.

The declarations by the two Presidents most recently of their intentions to destroy or reduce whole categories of nuclear weapons have been welcomed by the international community and are indeed very encouraging and promising.

However, the end of the cold war does not in itself mean the end of international conflicts, but it need not mean a return to an earlier style of international relations based on the balance of power and shifting alliances.

The post-cold-war era should mean that wars are not likely to occur within the context of a bipolar world dominated by two ideological opponents.

(Mr. Nandoe, Suriname)

We, therefore, believe that these fundamental political changes in the international political arena will direct us to a system of collective security and an international rule of law. In this context the Charter of our Organisation and the instruments available under it can play a major role and gain increasing credibility.

This should imply that our Organisation could exercise peacemaking and conflict control effectively if those Members that are first and foremost responsible for the maintenance of peace and security accept and consistently apply the principles articulated in the Charter of our Organisation. In this regard, my delegation wishes to acknowledge the important contributions of our Organisation in the field of disarmament, peace and stability. We believe that in the past our Committee has played a major role in tackling very complex items and that today's challenges can be met with confidence.

From the start of the nuclear age in 1945, enormous expenditure of ingenuity and ink have been devoted to analyses and discussions of nuclear strategy. Yet all these discussions and paperwork have produced only one plausible scenario for the use of nuclear weapons in war: a situation where there is no prospect of retaliation, either against a non-nuclear State or against one so weakly armed as to permit the user to have full confidence in his nuclear force's capacity to achieve a totally disarming first strike. We and, I think, the whole international community, therefore, are grateful for and welcome the unilateral measures announced by President Bush on 27 September and followed up by President Gorbachev.

These initiatives are encouraging and promising, but, as the representative of Nigeria said the other day, the relentless development and acquisition of increasingly sophisticated nuclear weapons in general can only

(Mr. Nandoe, Suriname)

**foster a sense of insecurity and create a feeling of uneasiness among the nuclear have-nots. Therefore it is now for the other nuclear-weapon States to demonstrate some significant action toward8 nuclear disarmament. We, therefore, urge that a comprehensive test-ban treaty be negotiated.**

**As the representative of Brazil has observed, our ultimate goal should be, beyond the present ongoing negotiations, a universal and non-discriminatory convention on the prohibition of the use, development, production and stockpiling of nuclear weapons and on their destruction. In the Latin American and Caribbean region some steps have been taken, I may refer, in this respect, inter alia, to the agreement on the uses of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, signed in Guadalajara in August 1991 between Argentina and Brazil, and to the Declaration of Mendoza on chemical and biological weapons, signed by Argentina, Brazil, Chile and later Uruguay.**

**The Secretary-General has once again expressed his concern regarding the problem of excessive and destabilizing transfers of conventional armaments. We support the initiative for the establishment of a United Nations register for the transfer of arms and we welcome, in this respect, the study of the Secretary-General. This study contains positive elements on ways and means to promote transparency in international transfers of conventional arms on a universal and non-discriminatory basis. Clearly greater knowledge and transparency would enhance the possibilities of limiting conflict-fuelling arms trade. My delegation is of the view that, after serious study of that report and other relevant material, the establishment of a United Nations arms register could be considered, possibly on an urgent basis.**

**The transformation of relations between the major Powers has not only political advantages. It should provide a unique chance for the release of**

(Mr. Nandoe, Suriname)

substantial resources as a result of disarmament. Considerable annual reductions in military spending might be possible. Based on calculations by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), the potential peace dividend in the industrialized countries can be estimated at about \$100 billion a year, possibly rising to between \$200 and \$300 billion a year by the year 2000. Total potential savings would then be between \$1,500 and \$2,000 billion during the course of the 1990s.

Having said that, my delegation would like to emphasize that new resources resulting from disarmament should be invested in social and economic programmes. In an improved international atmosphere it is our view that it should be possible for high military expenditures to be reduced in favour of human development.

As a party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, my country underlines the objectives established in the Declaration on the Zone of Peace and Cooperation of the South Atlantic. The basic obligations of the States parties to the Treaty of Tlatelolco are to use nuclear material and facilities exclusively for peaceful purposes, not to possess nuclear weapons, not to engage in or encourage any nuclear-weapon activities in the region and not to permit any presence of such weapons on their territories. My country remains committed to the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to the strengthening of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

**Wt. (Thailand):** At the outset, Sir, allow me, on behalf of the delegation of Thailand, to express our warmest congratulations to you upon your election as Chairman of the First Committee and through you to the other officers of the Committee. I am confident that under your able guidance the work of the Committee will be brought to a successful conclusion. You can be assured of my delegation's full support.

My delegation also wishes to pay a tribute to the distinguished Under-Secretary-General, **Mr. Yasushi Akashi**, and to the competent members of his staff.

The past year has seen momentous changes in the international scene: the end of the cold war) East-West relations moved from confrontation to cooperation. Positive developments have also taken place in the fields of arms control and disarmament, particularly with regard to nuclear weapons. Unilateral and bilateral reductions in nuclear weapons have either taken place or been agreed upon. The world appears to have taken steps back from the nuclear abyss, but regional conflicts and hot spots remain around the world, and they can escalate into wider conflict at any time. The Gulf War was a case in point. It also demonstrated clearly the danger and threat to international security posed by the spread of weapons of mass destruction. Calls for a global effort to prevent the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons are being heard from every corner of the world.

On the question of nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, my delegation welcomes the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the INF Treaty - and the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) between the United States and the Soviet Union. We also applaud the recent historic initiative of

(Mr. Sinhaseni, Thailand)

President Bush and the equally positive response by President Gorbachev, which will result in unilateral and complementary nuclear disarmament and reduction.

A related issue is the question of a nuclear-test ban. We welcome the fact that the Amendment Conference of the States parties to the partial test-ban Treaty held last December saw the participation of both nuclear- and non-nuclear-weapon States. While it was unfortunate that the Conference was unable to make progress towards a comprehensive test-ban treaty, Thailand fully supports the continued consultations being undertaken by the Chairman of the Conference, Mr. Ali Alatas of Indonesia. We also note that discussions on a nuclear-test ban continued during the Conference on Disarmament in the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban, which was re-established this year. We hope that further progress in the verification system will finally clear the way for the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban Treaty.

My delegation shares the view that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) should remain the centre-piece in efforts to curb the spread of nuclear weapons. Thailand welcomes the recent accession of several States to the Treaty: South Africa, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. We welcome in particular the announcements of China and France - the two remaining nuclear-weapon States - of their intention to accede to the Treaty.

As a party to the NPT, we would like to urge all States that are not yet parties to accede to the Treaty as soon as possible. Universal participation and an agreement on the extension of the Treaty beyond 1995 are essential to ensure the continued viability of the regime.

Non-proliferation agreements must be complemented by appropriate and effective international controls. Events in the Gulf have clearly shown the need for strengthening the effectiveness of the safeguards system. In this

(Mr. Sinhaseni, Thailand)

regard, the International Atomic **Energy** Agency **has** a key role to play. We also **wish** to **commend** the Agency for the tremendous work it is currently undertaking in the Gulf.

The frightful **possibility** of chemical weapons being **used** during **the** Gulf War highlighted for all the need **for the** early conclusion of **an effective** chemical weapons **convention**. Thailand **shares** the concern of the international **community over** the development and stockpiling **of such weapons**. We note the momentum gathered on negotiations at **the Conference** on Disarmament. We were heartened to hear **from the President** of the Conference on **Disarmament**, Ambassador **Arteaga** of **Venezuela**, that substantial **progress** had been achieved in 1991 **and that the next report Of the Conference on Disarmament would** contain the complete text of the convention.

**As a State** that neither produces nor processes chemical **weapons**, and **as a** party to the 1925 **Geneva Protocol** for *more than 60 years*, Thailand fully **supports such efforts**. We will contribute in any way we can. We feel privileged **to have been asked to send a chemical** weapon<sup>8</sup> expert to participate in the **mission of the** United Nations **Special** Committee investigating chemical warfare agents and facilities in Iraq.

**My delegation is** pleased to note **that** the Third **Review** Conference of the Parties to the biological weapon<sup>8</sup> Convention, held in Geneva last month, **reached** important **decisions** on improving **and** supplementing **existing** confidence-building **measures** and on verification **measures**. It **is** our hope that States that **are** not yet parties to the Convention will be encouraged **by** the outcome **of the** Review Conference and **accede to the** Convention.

**Success** in disarmament will remain elusive if insufficient attention is paid to confidence-building **measures**. One **successful case** in implementing the

**(Mr. Sinhaseni, Thailand)**

measures is the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (**CSCE**). We strongly believe that other regions can benefit from similar confidence-building measures. The regional **meeting** on confidence-building measures **in** the Asia-Pacific region, **organized** by the Regional **Centre for Peace** and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific in **Kathmandu**, has provided an extremely valuable impetus. Thailand has fully supported both the concept and the **convening** of such a meeting by providing voluntary contributions.

The proposals for a United Nations arms **register** are receiving much attention. While my Government supports the call for greater transparency and is **cognizant** of the need to **stem** the development, accumulation **and** transfer of arms, it is our view that such a **register** must be universal and non-discriminatory, and **that due** respect must be given to a country's right to **self-defence**. **As the Secretary-General so eloquently and succinctly stated:**

"... we must **seek to develop** fair criteria for multilateral control of arms transfers while at the same time meeting the legitimate security needs of States". (A/46/L. p. 12)

May we add our view that, on this complex **issue**, genuine consensus is required and can **be** achieved only **through** consultations and dialogue.

In conclusion, **my** delegation is of the view that we are witnessing in this Committee **and in** the General Assembly as a whole a greater sense **of** cooperation and **compromise**. More resolutions are being adopted by **consensus**. **Resolutions** dealing with **the** same issues are being successfully merged. My delegation welcomes **this** positive trend and pledges its full support and **cooperation** towards effective **arms** limitation **and** disarmament. **As the** Secretary-General so rightly reminds us in **his** report **on** the work of the **Organization:**

(Mr. Sinhaseni, Thailand)

**"The opportunities now presented to us are not likely to remain open indefinitely." (A/46/L. P. 11)**

Mr. **TUCKER** (Bahamas): On behalf of the delegation of the Bahamas, allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of the First Committee at the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly. My delegation is confident that, given your experience and diplomatic skills, much will be accomplished during this session. Our congratulations also go to the other officers of the Committee. Moreover, may I extend my delegation's gratitude to the former Chairman, Ambassador Rana of Nepal, who so ably steered the Committee's deliberations at its forty-fifth session.

(Mr. Tucker, Bahamas)

The Bahamas is a non-nuclear-weapon State which has no interest whatsoever in acquiring or producing these weapons of mass destruction. When viewed from this perspective, our concern for and commitment to the maintenance of peace, stability, and general and complete disarmament should be clearly understood.

Dramatic developments that have had an impact on these areas have captured both our interest and imagination. A major threat to international peace and security in the post-cold war era was averted when coalition forces accomplished the liberation of Kuwait. The role of the United Nations has thereafter been demonstratively enhanced. Relaxation of East-West tension continues, making the possibilities for the conclusion of bilateral and multilateral agreements more realistic. The cooperation and political will of Member States has led to notable progress in the field of disarmament.

Recent events, particularly in Eastern Europe, are a clear indication that conflict and strife can erupt at any time and precipitate international crises. Further, although a Middle East peace conference is imminent, the region remains for the present a perpetual battleground. The transfer and sale of arms continue unabated. It is imperative that the international community consolidate gains and formulate strategies that will guarantee global peace and stability into the twenty-first century by re-evaluating and reformulating its thinking on the whole question of security and disarmament.

If current trends towards nuclear-arms reduction is to be accelerated, the prevention of nuclear war and the promotion of nuclear disarmament must remain at the top of the international agenda. We must encourage positive further efforts to prevent the proliferation not only of nuclear weapons, but of all weapons of mass destruction and conventional weapons as well.

**(Mr. Tucker, Bahamas)**

It is from this perspective *that* we view recent initiatives in the international **community** and pronouncements by major actors aimed at **curbing** the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The most **significant development in** this area, my delegation believes, was the signing, after 9 years of negotiation, of the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (**START**) between the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union *in* July 1991. Under the **terms of the** Treaty, the **number of long-range nuclear weapons in the arsenals** of both countries will be reduced for the first time. This is essential to the atop-by-stag process of reducing nuclear weapons even for **deterrence purposes**. My delegation further welcomes the eeries of proposals **announced** by President Bush on 27 September and by President Gorbachev on 5 October 1991, that promise unilateral cuts in tactical nuclear weapons and intercontinental **ballistic missiles** with multiple warheads. These proposals give hope to non-nuclear-weapon States that nuclear-weapon States are indeed **committed** to halting the **arms** race.

The **decline** in the *number* of nuclear-weapons tests and the positive developments *in this area are aalutory*. They cannot, however, **obscure** the fact that **thousands of nuclear weapons remain in the arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States**. The 1990 comprahenaive study on nuclear weapons confirms that the **qualitative and vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons remains** a fact despite quantitative reductions. After four *decades*, the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control is still elusive.

A complete ban on nuclear tests is at the **cruz** of preventing nuclear proliferation, **as** the testing of nuclear devices is a critical and indispensable element in the creation of weapons. Banning tests in all environments will curtail the creation of more advanced *weapons and* prevent

**(Mr. Tucker, Bahamas)**

the build-up of **significant** nuclear **arsenals**. The **Amendment Conference** under **Article IX** of the partial **test-ban** Treaty in **January** was **essential** to focusing on this most obvious fact. As one of the States calling for the convening of the Conference, the **Bahamas** regrets that it did not reach agreement on the text of a final declaration. It is **nevertheless** encouraged that some **progress** was made and hopes that the extensive **exchange** of views will eventually lead to constructive contributions towards the achievement of a comprehensive **test-ban** treaty.

The non-proliferation Treaty is an important instrument for **preventing** the further **development** of nuclear weapons. My delegation therefore joins others in **welcoming** the recent accession to the Treaty by the **Governments** of South Africa, **Tanzania** and **Zambia**. The important decision of the two remaining nuclear States, France and China, to accede to the Treaty is equally **welcomed**. These recent **accessions** should encourage other States that have not yet done so to accede to the Treaty in order to strengthen the **regime** and give it **universality**. We are aware that ratification of or **accession** to the non-proliferation Treaty do not in **themselves** guarantee that countries will not **develop** weapons. It is our best **assurance, however**, that States are **willing to be bound** by the **standards** of the international community.

In our **Latin American** and Caribbean region, my **delegation** views the **nuclear cooperation agreement between Argentina and Brazil** as an **important step** towards nuclear non-proliferation. The Bahamas hopes that ongoing **negotiations** of the **safeguards agreement between these two countries** and the **International Atomic Energy Agency** will soon be **concluded, thereby** permitting accession of the **two** countries to the Treaty for the **Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (the Treaty of Tlatelolco)**. The **Bahamas** is a State Party to **this Treaty**, the first to establish a

**(Mr. Tucker, Bahamas)**

**nuclear-weapon-free zone** in an inhabited area. My delegation will therefore again co-sponsor the resolution that will be submitted to this Committee under this item. We further urge those States of the region which have not yet done so to accede to the Treaty at the earliest opportunity, considering that the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean should constitute a priority for all.

Significant progress was made towards concluding a chemical weapons convention during the 1991 substantive session of the Conference on Disarmament. This progress is detailed in document A/26/27, which the Ambassador of Venezuela, in his capacity as Chairman of the Conference, introduced to this Committee on 15 October 1991. Concluding the elaboration of the draft convention as a matter of priority is, my delegation believes, a crucial task for the Conference. A chemical weapons convention would provide an impetus for reducing the threat or use of such weapons. It is hoped that the remaining key issues will be resolved so that the Conference can adopt the draft convention at its 1992 session and so that, with the requisite support it can come into force early, as envisioned. Our best assurance for success is that the convention be effective, non-discriminatory and verifiable. Similarly, my delegation welcomes the progress made at the third Review Conference of the biological weapons Convention recently concluded in Geneva towards the strengthening of that Convention.

The fact that the issue of the clandestine transfer and acquisition of arms has generated such widespread interest during this debate speaks to its critical importance. The Gulf crisis ably demonstrated that the clandestine transfer and acquisition of arms can have disastrous consequences. In this instance, the consequence was to jeopardize world peace and security.

(Mr. Tucker, Bahamas)

But the stability of States can also be threatened when weapons are acquired by groups whose intent is inimical to the national interest. All nation States are entitled under the Charter of the United Nations to meet their individual or collective security needs. This we see as different from unchecked clandestine arms transfers, against which the international community must remain vigilant and which demand sound management strategies. Openness and transparency in the areas of the transfer, production and stockpiling of weapons must become the norm. The conventional forces in Europe process concluded last November, which focuses on the reduction of arms in Europe, and the proposed establishment of a United Nations monitored register of arms, as outlined in the Secretary-General's report (A/46/301), point the way forward to addressing this issue.

In his statement to this Committee on 15 October 1991, the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Yasuahi Akaahi, stated that:

"The international community has to espouse a multidimensional approach to peace and security in which the military aspect will not dominate but will be considered in relation to other priorities such as development, welfare, environment and the protection of human rights." (A/C.1/46/PV.4)

General and complete disarmament, then, must continue to be viewed as offering practical prospects for generating resources to promote economic and social development in areas where underdevelopment, drug trafficking, debt and poverty constitute major problems. The much heralded peace dividend must be brought to fruition. It is only when effective strategies for this purpose are devised by the international community and Governments that the continuing gap in international economic relations between developed and developing nations can be closed, and peace and security can be maintained.

(Mr. Tucker, Bahamas)

A new spirit of pragmatism is evident in the First Committee, and the progress it has helped us to achieve is manifest in our deliberations. We are challenged to remain focused on our objectives in an era of significant change and transformation. My delegation is committed to working cooperatively with other Member States in the First Committee and with its Chairman and Bureau for further progress during this session,

~~Mr. YATIN (Israel)~~, let me on the occasion of my delegation's first substantive statement **this session** express our confidence that you and the other **Committee** officers will **conduct** the **deliberations** of the **Committee** in the **same** skilled and **competent** manner in which they have been conducted thus far.

The debate in **this Committee** offers a good **opportunity** to take stock of **the** progress made in the field of **disarmament** and **arms** control. **since** **this** **Committee** met last year, events of **historic** magnitude have intervened on the international arena. I especially need to mention the significant progress made in the laborious negotiations between the United States and the **Soviet** Union, which culminated in the signature of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START). That Treaty and the decision of the United States and the Soviet Union sharply to reduce tactical **short-range** nuclear weapons seem to provide the world with a promise of a new period of peace and security. That and other examples are bound to be followed in other parts of the world. Indeed, long-standing disputes and **situations** of tension and conflict are showing positive **signs** of moving towards peaceful resolution.

But I shall focus on the **Middle** East, which once again provided the international **community** and **its** **organs** with both deep **concerns** and encouraging prospects of solving its **conflicts** peacefully.

It is with a great deal of satisfaction that I can say today that our region is on the threshold of an auspicious event. In two days' time a peace conference is due to open in Madrid, to discuss face to face **outstanding** problems between representatives of Israel and Arab representatives of our **immediate** neighbours including the Palestinian Arabs who **reside** in the territories administered by Israel. **This** is indeed a historic event, which we hope will lay the ground for **lasting** peace in the **Middle East**.

(Mr. Yativ, Israel)

On the other hand, developments in our area during the course of the year firmly support Israel's concerns over its very survival. These developments include the occupation of Kuwait by Iraq, followed by Operation Desert Storm; the naked aggression by Iraq against Israel; and, most recently, Iraq's intransigence and deceit vis-à-vis its capabilities for mass destruction. The Gulf war has borne out Israel's contention once again that it faces an existential problem. Iraqi threats to obliterate Israel, the firing of some forty missiles on Israel, and the international summons of half a million military to confront the Iraqi deployment are stark evidence of what Israel would have had to face from Iraq alone, had it not been for the invasion of Kuwait.

What are the main lessons to be learned from this aggression, concerning problems of disarmament? As members know, Israel has maintained throughout the years that Iraqi threats against it were backed up by a nuclear programme designed to give substance to those threats. It is now apparent that a mere signature on international agreements such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons cannot in itself guarantee compliance. On the contrary, Iraq, which remains a signatory of the Treaty, exploited that status to benefit from technical assistance to enhance its nuclear programme, details of which are now coming to light. Moreover, Israel has maintained time and again that the non-proliferation Treaty has not prevented a single local war in the world. And it is local wars which have been the bane of the Middle East.

On the other hand, ever since 1986 Israel has proposed, and joined others in proposing, a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Consequently,

(Mr. Yativ, Israel)

Israel has been supporting the consensus reached by the General Assembly relating to this issue. Israel wishes to renew its call to implement this proposal, and to base it upon the following principles: that the initiative to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone should emanate from the States in the region; that there should be free and direct negotiations among the States concerned; that mutual arrangements promoting trust among the States concerned should be introduced; and that the proposed convention should eventually be signed and ratified by all the States in the region.

Israel is prepared to enter into negotiations with each and every Arab State in order to elaborate the ways and means required to implement every aspect of regional arms control. Israel wishes to reaffirm, just as it has been doing since the 1960s, that it would not be the first country to introduce nuclear weapons into the Middle East.

As early as 1988, in his address to the fifteenth special session of the General Assembly, Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir voiced a call to establish the Middle East as a region free from chemical weapons. This was reiterated by the then Foreign Minister, Mr. Moshe Arens, at the Paris Conference in January 1969. A similar call was voiced once again last year by the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. David Levy, in his address to the General Assembly.

Israel is a signatory of the 1925 Geneva Convention and supports the goals of the proposed convention being drafted now in Geneva. On this issue, Israel's Foreign Minister, Mr. David Levy, on 2 October in his address to the General Assembly, stated Israel's position as follows:

"Our region has also known the use of chemical weapons, which Saddam Hussein used against his own people as well as against his Iranian enemy. The elimination of chemical weapons everywhere, and especially in

(Mr. Yativ, Israel)

the Middle East, is of supreme importance. This is why Israel has expressed its agreement to become a party to the convention to eliminate chemical weapons, while maintaining the principle of universality. For the convention to be effective all States in the region must become party to it". (A/46/PV.18, p. 37)

As regards biological weapons, Israel this year joined the Third Review Conference, held last month in Geneva, as an observer in order to indicate its intention to follow closely the international deliberations on this issue also.

In the course of this year, a number of initiatives and plans on disarmament and arms control in the Middle East and globally have been made public. Israel supports all efforts aimed at restraining the arms race in every corner of the world. But in considering any specific blueprint designed for the Middle East, we have to take into consideration the constraints and conditions prevailing in our region.

One thing is very clear: the issue of weapons of mass destruction, both conventional and non-conventional, must be addressed with all urgency. Weapons of mass destruction are, in our view, all those weapons which can kill civilians indiscriminately. The destruction of Kuwait was not carried out by non-conventional weapons. The dozens of Scud missiles which hit Israel during the Gulf war fortunately did not bear any non-conventional warheads. None the less, the destruction was massive. It is eminently clear that conventional weapons can cause mass destruction no less than their non-conventional counterparts. Hence, any genuine attempt to reduce the potential of destruction must address as a first priority the reduction of the arsenals of conventional weapons in the Middle East. For the multitudes who may be killed by such weapons, their so-called conventionality is of no comfort.

**(Mr. Yativ, Israel)**

The Gulf War and its aftermath should be a watershed not only in regard to arms control and disarmament, but also in regard to the overall atmosphere in the region. If before the Gulf war the direction in the region was clearly towards war, we now have a chance to promote peace. Israel's consolidated formula to promote the peace process includes the following principles: the danger of military confrontation, and especially the use of weapons likely, by reason of their quality and quantity, to cause massive destruction must be addressed, reduced and, hopefully, removed; and direct negotiations without preconditions must be held between Israel and its neighbours, in order to sign peace agreements between Israel and each of the Arab States.

Despite the obstacles which still lie ahead, much can be done, including work in the field of arms control. However, all efforts or initiatives of any kind must avoid formulas or resolutions which are meant to impose externally conceived solutions.

There are regional circumstances, especially in matters of security, which can be settled only among the States in the region. Those circumstances pertain to one's immediate neighbours, and they cannot be settled by bland international dispositions. In this regard, the Secretary-General's report on the nuclear-weapon-free zone submitted to the General Assembly in September 1990 states categorically that confidence has to be built among all parties to the conflict. It states that military solutions to political problems are excluded. Most important of all, there must be progress in solving the fundamental conflicts in the region. Without such progress, technical measures will hardly be given serious thought, much less be developed to provide a meaningful barrier to tension.

**(Mr. Yativ, Israel)**

No political process meant to solve the problems of the Middle East can be lasting and meaningful if it is not accompanied and reinforced by a genuine and regionally conceived process of disarmament and arms control. In this respect, it is Israel's hope that the atmosphere of accommodation and understanding which seems to be gaining ground in other parts of the world will indeed put down roots also in the Middle East.

**Mr. TUN (Myanmar)**: The delegation of Myanmar, which I have the privilege to represent here today, is pleased to extend to you, Sir, its warmest felicitations on your election to chair the First Committee, an important forum in our Organization's search for peace and stability. The able manner in which you and the other officers of the Committee have been guiding its work since we commenced our deliberations assures us of a fruitful session.

I wish also to take this opportunity to express my delegation's deep appreciation to your distinguished predecessor, Ambassador Jai Pratap Rana of Nepal, for the exemplary manner in which he guided the work of the Committee at our last session.

As we enter the 1990s there can be little doubt that we are standing on the threshold of a new era which holds the promise of a better world. Nations of the world, freed at last from the rigid structures of the cold-war years, when every issue of international peace and security was viewed through the prism of East-West relations, now have an opportunity to fashion a new international order based on justice and cooperation.

If our hopes for such a world order are to be realized they must be firmly anchored in the principles of the Charter. While doctrines of

(Mr. Tun, Myanmar)

deterrence and balance of power that dominated military thought and planning in the decades of the cold war are outmoded and are to be discarded. The principles of the Charter remain valid and must be held inviolate. Pillars of the Charter such as the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States must be upheld and not allowed to be eroded. No State or group of States should be permitted to arrogate to themselves the right to mould the new order in the image of their choice to serve their own particular goals and interests. Here, the statement of Myanmar's Minister for Foreign Affairs in the general Assembly on 4 October 1991 bears repeating. He said;

"Nothing that has happened since the watershed year of 1965, when events that will surely go down in history as marking the beginning of the end of the cold war first manifested themselves, requires a modification of the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter. Indeed, if anything has become plain from the rapid evolution of international affairs it is that the paramount law of the Charter must be upheld as inviolate and must be scrupulously respected in every sphere of intercourse between nations if today's promise is not to become tomorrow's bad dream." (A/46/PV.22, p. 26)

The momentous changes that have taken place in the international political environment in the past few years have provided a much needed impetus to bilateral disarmament negotiations. Meaningful disarmament measures, which for so long have eluded the world, are now becoming attainable and can no longer be considered Utopian. The package of unprecedented disarmament measures announced by the United States President on 27 September 1991 and the equally bold and positive response of the Soviet

( M r . )

President *on* 5 October have given a further boost to the momentum generated by the 1987 Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles and the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, My delegation is pleased that the latest nuclear-arms initiative<sup>s</sup> of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have been followed up by the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, which on 17 October 1991 decided to cut its nuclear arsenal by a further 700 warheads from a total of 3,600. These developments mark a turning-point in the struggle for human survival.

The elimination of all tactical nuclear weapons on land and on ships, submarines and naval aircraft is an important step. Perhaps more significant than the numbers and types of weapons involved is the confirmation of our belief that we can halt and reverse the unbridled nuclear-arms race. It also validates the principle of seeking undiminished security at progressively lower levels of armaments.

While the primary responsibility for removing the threat of a nuclear holocaust rests with the nuclear-weapon States, it cannot be over-emphasised that all States, large and small, nuclear and non-nuclear, have a vital interest in the negotiations on nuclear disarmament; while progress in the United States-Soviet Union bilateral negotiations is crucial, these negotiations cannot replace the efforts being carried out in the multilateral forum. Bilateral efforts must be accompanied by multilateral negotiations. We are therefore disappointed that the positive trends in the bilateral sphere have not been matched in the single multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament, the Conference on Disarmament. No movement has been registered on seven out of the eight priority items on its agenda.

(Mr. Tun, Myanmar)

My delegation shares the frustration and disappointment expressed by many over the lack of progress towards an agreement on a comprehensive nuclear-test ban. As is well known, preambles to both the partial test-ban Treaty and the Non-Proliferation Treaty expressly underline that the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time is a fundamental objective. Having consistently opposed nuclear testing in all environments, Myanmar became a party to the 1963 Moscow Treaty in the belief that it represents an important first step for the realization of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban and the eventual elimination of all weapons of mass destruction. The absence of a comprehensive test-ban treaty nearly three decades after the treaty was signed tends to raise doubts as to the commitment of the Depositary States of the partial test-ban Treaty.

(Mr. Tun, Myanmar)

Myanmar continues to regard a **comprehensive nuclear-test ban** as an **essential step towards nuclear disarmament**. It would be **unrealistic to expect meaningful disarmament accords** in the future if the **qualitative improvement of nuclear arms continues unabated**. On the other hand, an agreement to **cease all tests** would put **fresh heart into the entire disarmament process**. Indeed, for Myanmar, as well as for the **overwhelming majority of States**, agreement on a **comprehensive nuclear-test ban** would **symbolize the renewed commitment of nuclear-weapon States to seek nuclear disarmament**.

In this regard, the **one-year moratorium** announced **recently** by the Soviet Union is a **welcome step** and we hope that it is a **significant lead towards a comprehensive nuclear-test ban**. We urge other nuclear-weapon States to follow this lead by **suspending all tests through unilateral or agreed moratoriums**. It is our hope that all nuclear-weapon States will now agree to **commence negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty in the Conference on Disarmament**.

The General Assembly has on **several occasions** called for **universal adherence to the Treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as a means of strengthening the non-proliferation regime**. The announced intention of China and France to **accede to the Treaty** will no doubt **enhance the prospects of universality**. The **remaining States**, we feel, will be encouraged to join those nuclear-weapon States demonstrate their unequivocal commitment to pursue **negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament, as stipulated in article VI of the Treaty**.

Another issue that needs to be addressed **expeditiously** is that of **chemical weapons**. The utmost urgency of completing the negotiations on a

(Mr. Tun, Myanmar)

convention on the 'aomplete and **effective** prohibition **of** the development, **production, stockpiling and use of** chemical **weapons** and on their **destruction** has **been underlined by events in the Gulf region**, where the threat **of** the use **of suah** weapons **of mass** destruction was **ever-present**. The **Conference on Disarmament** has already made **significant** headway **on** the text of **the** convention and **we feel that efforts should** be redoubled to conclude the negotiations.

One **fundamental** point that my delegation wishes to **stress is that the verification** regime for the future chemical-weapons convention **should be one that is universally acceptable, fair and non-discriminatory so as to ensure its success**. Most important, any exceptional verification measure to be adopted and any **assessment** to be **made** should be done in a multilateral framework in **accordance** with agreed principles,

My delegation is pleased to note that in presenting the report of the Conference on Disarmament, Ambassador Horacio Arteaga of Venezuela, in his capacity as **President of the Conference**, expressed confidence that the goal **of reaching definitive agreement in 1992** can be met **without** serious **difficulty**.

**Myanmar** remains steadfastly committed to the achievement **of** a total ban on **chemical** weapons and my delegation would **like to avail itself of this opportunity to declare yet again that Myanmar** neither **possesses** chemical **weapons** nor **has** the intention of acquiring them.

We are **witnessing** today important disarmament initiatives **that promise to be the beginning of the end of the nuclear-arms race**. But **weapons of mass destruction** are not limited to **nuclear arms alone**; chemical, biological **and conventional weapons** are no **less** important. Since the Second World War almost **all armed conflicts have been fought with conventional weapons and in** the last two **decades**, with advances in science and technology, there has **been a**

(Mr. Tun, Myanmar)

phenomenal increase in the destructive potential of these weapons. That conventional weapons can be employed with deadly accuracy and devastating results was amply demonstrated in the Gulf War.

Whilst there is growing recognition of the need to curb the conventional arms race, little has been done to place necessary restraints on the production, stockpiling and transfer of conventional arms. Weapons are booming, notwithstanding the fact that in recent months there have been agreements among the major Powers on rules of restraint governing arms transfers.

It is against this background that we have studied the report of the Secretary-General (A/46/301), "Study on ways and means of promoting transparency in international transfers of conventional arms". While the merit of the proposal for the creation of a universal and non-discriminatory register of arms transfers under the auspices of the United Nations is unquestionable, it should be implemented, in view of the breadth and sensitivity of the issue, only after thorough assessment.

As pointed out in the study, politico-military conditions vary from region to region, and measures to promote transparency in arms transfers may not be adopted immediately by all States. Moreover, the proposed register fails to include the production and stockpiling of arms. My delegation accordingly feels that every State should have time to study document A/46/301 carefully and be permitted to make its observations before any action is taken.

(Mr. Tun, Myanmar)

The dawn of a new era of understanding and cooperation gives us hope that it will result in meaningful agreements on disarmament. We now have an opportunity to choose between a continuing arms race and a more stable and just world. Let us work to consolidate and extend the positive trends that we are witnessing today.

The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.