UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SIXTH SESSION

*Official Records*

FIRST COMMITTEE
30th meeting
held on
Thursday, 7 November 1991
at 10 a.m.
New York

# VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 30th MEETING

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Chairman: | Mr. MROZIEWICZ | (Poland) |
| later: | Mr. ALPMAN (Vice-Chairman) | (Turkey) |

## CONTENTS





Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/46/PV.30
15 November 1991

ENGLISH

91-61706 7212V (E)

478.

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

AGENDA ITEMS 47 TO 65 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee for an announcement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): to inform the Committee that the following countries have joined in sponsoring the following draft resolutions:

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.8: Afghanistan;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.9: Bulgaria, Turkey and Uruguay;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.16: Singapore)

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.17: Afghanistan;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19: Afghanistan;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.22: Malta;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.23: Afghanistan, Costa Rica and Venezuela;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25: Afghanistan;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27: Bulgaria;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.33: Sweden; and

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/l.34: Ireland, Spain, Togo and Uruguay.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I call on the representative of Mexico, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.1.

**Mr. HERNANDEZ BASAVE** (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): This session is taking place at a time of rapid and profound change in the world political situation. The cold-war period is behind us for ever; this has provided the international community with great opportunities to move forward toward8 the establishment of an effective system of peace and security.

The arms-reduction and arms-elimination agreements reached in recent years by the two super-Powers and the unilateral measures recently announced by the Presidents of the United States and the Soviet Union give us reason to hope that this is at last the beginning of an authentic disarmament process that aould enable mankind to live free of the fear of total destruction by nuclear weapons.

Therefore, it is more urgent than ever that the United Nations not lag behind in the sphere of disarmament. Revitalising multilateral disarmament negotiation8 is of greater urgency than ever, and we must endeavour to achieve this. To reach that objective, it is most important that public opinion be well informed.

It is particularly important that government officials, the mass media, non-governmental organisations, educators, academic research institutions and elected representatives know, understand and support the work of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

For that reason, the World Disarmament Campaign launched in 1982 by the General Assembly had the primary objectives of informing, of educating and of generating public understanding of and support for the objectives of the United Nations in the area of disarmament and arms control. Since its

(Mr. Hernandez Basave, Mexico)

inception the Campaign has focused on organising conferences and regional meetings, on a broad programme of publications and on the holding of special events such as Disarmament Week, which always begins on 24 October, United Nations Day.

The rapidity and intensity of the current process of change makes it vital that we have balanced and objective information on the vast possibilities of the United Nations with respect to the establishment of a system of international security based on mutual trust, enabling us to move forward in a genuine process of disarmament, and especially in the area of nuclear disarmament.

It is my honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.1, entitled "World Disarmament Campaign,', under agenda item 61 (d). I do so on behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Egypt, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mongolia, Myanmar, Peru, the Philippines, Romania, Sri Lanka, Ukraine, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Mexico. For the reasons I have stated, the draft resolution recommends in its paragraph 4 that the Campaign further focus its efforts on activities to foster informed debate on arms limitation, disarmament and international security.

In the draft resolution the General Assembly would welcome the report of the Secretary-General on the World Disarmament Campaign. In paragraph 5 the Assembly would invite all Member States to contribute to the World Disarmament Campaign Voluntary Trust Fund, and in paragraph 6 it would decide that at its forty-seventh session there should be a tenth United Nations Pledging Conference for the World Disarmament Campaign and would express the hope that

(Mr. Hernandez Basave, Mexico)

on that occasion all those Member States which have not yet announced any voluntary contributions would do so,

In paragraph 8 the Assembly would decide to include in the provisional agenda of the forty-seventh session the item entitled "World Disarmament Campaign", a title agreed by consensus in 1982 - the sole tangible result of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

As in 1990, the text of the draft resolution omits points that in the past had been of concern to some delegations, which demonstrates the flexibility of the sponsors. Indeed, this text was revised last year and was adopted without a vote at the forty-fifth session. For that reason, the sponsors of the draft resolution trust that once again it can be adopted without a vote by thie Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Canada, who will introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.11, A/C.1/46/L.15 and A/C.1/46/L.36.

Ms. MASON (Canada): honour and privilege today to introduce first draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.36, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". In addition to Canada and Poland, the following 42 Member States are also sponsors: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Viet Nam.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

A number of major developments have taken place in the last year that have significantly affected the circumstances in which the negotiations are taking place in Geneva on a convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction. I will not comment on those details now except to suggest that their cumulative impact has been such as to make more urgent than ever before the need for such a convention. Perhaps the single most important positive development, however, has been the decision of the negotiators to intensify, as a priority task, their negotiations with a view to striving to achieve a final agreement on the convention by 1992.

Given that major development, the sponsors of the draft resolution concluded that it would be appropriate for the text to highlight the importance of that decision. Moreover, as the negotiations are entering their final phase, we considered that it would also be appropriate to introduce other changes to the text to underline the essential message that the negotiations should be completed next year. By establishing clear and strongly focused expectations for the negotiations, the General Assembly could make a significant contribution to their success.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

Accordingly, the draft resolution differs in a number of significant ways from that adopted at last year's session of the general Assembly, as follows.

First, we have slightly amended the first preambular paragraph to include the phrase "and use", in reflection of the Conference on Disarmament's decision to amend the negotiating mandate so as to cover the "use" aspect.

Second, we have amended the third preambular paragraph to take particular note of the Conference on Disarmament's changed mandate.

Third, in recognition of the importance of this decision, we have added a new operative paragraph 3 to commend the Conference for its decision, which we think every Member State will applaud.

Fourth, we have amended operative paragraph 4 so as to underline this body's support for concluding the negotiations as sood as possible in 1992.

Fifth, as a further illustration of the international community's resolve finally to achieve a convention, we have introduced new language in the fourth preambular paragraph to take note of the fact that the States participating in the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention inter alia declared themselves in favour of the early conclusion of the negotiations.

Sixth, given our concern that the draft resolution should focus as aucb as possible on the desire to conclude the negotiations, we considered the several, diverse preambular paragraphs and came to the conclusion that the elements addressed in many of them night now he taken for granted as already being factored into the negotiations, and that these paragraphs might therefore be deleted. However, in rscoguition of the importance attached by States to these elements, we slightly amended operative paragraph 7 to take

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

account of ths various initiatives taken in support of the negotiations and to urge further such initiatives to achieve rapid agreement in the negotiations on, and universal adherence to, the convention,

Seventh, in the same vein, we have added language to the final preambular paragraph that takes note of the statements made by groups of States in the last 12 months concerning the issue of declarations of intent to become original signatories to the convention.

Eighth, and finally, in support of the goals of the convention - in particular, the desirability of universal adherence - we have amended operative paragraph 8 to call upon all States to consider declaring their intention to become original States parties. In making such a call, we are aware that some members of this body are concerned to ensure that their rights and responsibilities, in particular their constitutional responsibilities to their parliaments, are duly taken account of.

We are convinced that the language proposed - in particular, the call on States to "consider" such declarations - affords the necessary protection of these rights and responsibilities. The draft resolution contains no implication that States can or should take actions that override their constitutions.

The draft resolution before the Committee is the result of broad consultations among several delegations, all of which have demonstrated a gratifying degree of cooperation and good will. In this regard, I particularly wish to express my deepest appreciation and gratitude to you, Sir, and your delegation for your close collaboration in preparing the draft resolution. We also sincerely appreciate the constructive support and

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

cooperation shown by all the other sponsors, as well as other delegations, in elaborating this draft. We regard this cooperation as an encouraging sign of the universal wish to realise finally the long-desired goal of a convention on chemical weapons,

For the past several years, a similar draft resolution has enjoyed the unanimous support of the Member States of this body. The spirit of cooperation shown by all in the development of this year's draft encourages us to believe that Member States will once again wish to adopt the draft resolution by consensus. In doing so, the Member States will demonstrate the keen desire we all feel to achieve the convention, and will send a strong message to the negotiators of the support of the entire international community for finalising their work in 1992.

I now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.11.

The Canadian delegation is pleased to introduce again the draft resolution entitled "Prohibition of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes", contained this year in document A/C.1/46/L.11. This draft resolution is sponsored by Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belarus, Botswana, Cameroon, Denmark, Finland, Indonesia, Ireland, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Romania, Samoa, Sweden, Uruguay and Canada. This group represents States from every continent.

I wish to draw the attention of representatives to two substantive changes to the draft resolution from the resolution (45/58L) adopted on the subject at the forty-fifth session of the general Assembly. The fourth paragraph is new, and has been included to give appropriate recognition to the important developments over recent months in the area of nuclear disarmament,

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

notably the conclusion of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty and the unilateral nuclear-weapon initiatives subaeguently announced by President Bush and President Gorbachev. These developments are of relevance to the goal of a prohibition on the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes, and, indeed, enhance prospects for the realisation of this goal.

The second change is found in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. In this paragraph the Conference on Disarmament is now requested "to continue to pursue its consideration*@ of adequately verified cessation and prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons. This wording acknowledge8 that the iasuo has been the subject of consideration at the Conference on Disarmament, in the *form* of interventions by representatives, while encouraging the Conference on Disarmament to continue its consideration. It is for the members of the Conference on Disarmament to decide, of course, how they wish to consider this subject.

Apart from these changes, the focus *of* this procedural draft resolution remains substantively unchanged from resolution 45/58 L. Canada urge8 all delegations to lend their support to this draft resolution, which the sponsor8 hope will be adopted with broad support.

I now turn to consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.15.

On behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, Nigeria and Sweden and my own delegation, I have the honour to introduce the text of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.15, on the subject of the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons.

Canada had the privilege this year of chairing the Conference on Disarmament's Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapon8 and of working closely

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

with other Conferencoon Disarmament lelegations - in particular, the Bulgarian and Nigerian coordinator8 of the discussions on track8 A and B - in considering further relevant texts and elements. A8 the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, Mr. Robertson, noted in his statement to the Conference on 15 Augustlast, we wereparticularly pleased with the very positive, cooperative and professional spirit displayed by all delegations, which we regard a8 having been a major factor in the constructive work carried out this year. In our view, progress was achieved on both tracks, but particularly on track A, where a potentially significant alternative proposal on scope and definition8 was added to the text of the draft articles for a convention. In addition, new agreed text8 were elaborated for other elements of the draft convention.

Further intensive work will, of course, be necessary on both track8 to enable the Conference to proceed effectively. To this end, we strongly support the recommendation that the Ad Hoc Committee be re-established at the beginning Of it8 1992 session.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

The draft resolution before the Committee is a very straightforward one; eroaatially it taker note of the work carried out this year and the recommendation by the Conference on Disarmament for the re-establishment *of* the Ad Hoc Committee at it8 1992 session and encourages the Conference to continue it8 work expeditiously. It is thus very similar to previous resolutions of the General Assembly. In past years, those resolutions have enjoyed the unanimous support of all Member States. We therefore hope that Member State8 will once again wish to adopt this resolution by consensus.

Lastly, I should like to take this opportunity to speak with regard to a Canadian bibliography on arms-control verification.

Delegations may recall that in November 1990 Canada promised to continue making contribution8 to the United Nations consolidated database on all aspects of verification and compliance. That promise was made in response to tha adoption of the consensus report on verification by the group of qualified governmental experts, a report which called inter alia for contributions to the consolidated database by Member States.

I am pleased to announce that we are making available today a detailed bibliography on arms-control verification covering more than 1,500 entries, from 1962 to 1991. Copies of that text are now available at the back of the room. Wore detail *on* the background to this Canadian contribution is included in the *accompanying* letter to the Under-Secretary-General *for* Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Akashi.

A8 I said in my opening statement to this Committee, Canada hope8 that other States will be able to make similar contribution8 in order to assist the United Nations in it8 • ffOtt8.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank the representative of Canada for the kind words she addressed to the Polish delegation and for the outstanding work which has been done in order to put together the bibliography, which I think is very important.

**Mr. O'SULLIVAN** (Australia): Mr. Chairman, may I commence by supporting and echoing your comment commending the Canadian delegation for the excellent work on the bibliography on arms control which they are circulating today.

I take pleasure this morning in presenting to the Committee a draft resolution on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons, contained in document A/C.1/46/L.16. It has a wide group of sponsors and is directed at supporting measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol. That Protocol remains the major international norm against the use of chemical weapons. It continues to be the central concern of the sponsors that the authority of the Protocol should be enhanced pending the conclusion of a comprehensive chemical-weapons convention. Indeed, because that convention still has not been concluded, Australia decided, after consultation with a wide group of countries, that it was worth while to present another draft resolution on the subject in 1991.

In framing the draft resolution this year, we have drawn largely on elements from a similar consensus resolution in 1990, General Assembly resolution 45/57 C. We have modified the contents of that resolution to reflect the events of the past year.

This year's draft resolution recalls the previous condemnation of the use of chemical weapons and deplores all threats, especially those made most recently, of the use of chemical weapons. The draft resolution also repeats

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

the vigorous condemnation of actions that violate or threaten to violate the 1925 Protocol; renews the call to all States to observe that Protocol8 welcomes recent decisions, declaration8 and initiatives of the United Nations aimed at upholding the authority of the Protocol; and supports activities by regional and international disarmamert conferences and decisions by national Governments aimed at hastening the conclusion of the chemical-weapons convention as a step towards the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction.

The framing of such a resolution after the events of 1991 has not been an easy task. The balanaed nature of the text refloats the views of many different nations. Nevertheless, we believe that in today's circumstances it maker a helpful and substantial contribution to the Gereral Assembly's consideration of this subject. It is a contemporary ● rprer6ion of our determination to avoid the use or the threat of use of chemical weapons by observing the principles of the 1925 Protocol.

May I take this opportunity to thank the wide end very representative group of sponsors, Bolivia, Chile and Singapore being the most recent. I also thank the many other countries which have indicated support for this draft resolution, and I wish to encourage those Stat88 which have not yet don8 80 to add their name8 to the list of sponsors, 80 that the international community will be seen to be continuing to enhance the norms against the use or threat of use of chemical weapons. We commend the draft resolution to the Assembly for adoption by consensus.

Mr. HAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): On behalf of the European Community and it8 member States, I wish to go on record concerning item 59 of our agenda, on Chemical and Bacteriological (Biological) Weapons.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

The negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva on a multilateral convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction have made substantial progress this year.

The year started with some difficult political issues to solve. After a major policy change by the United States following the gulf conflict, a clear-cut commitment never to use chemical weapons, without any reservation, could be included in the draft Convention. Less than a year ago the States of the international community were faced with a situation in which a serious threat of the use of chemiaal weapons existed. The experience of the Gulf War has demonstrated once again, however, that there is simply no place My more for such repugnant weapons.

The Twelve note with great satisfaction that the draft treaty now provides for the destruction Of all chemical weapons and all chemical-weapons production facilities within 10 years. Agreement has been reached inter alia on the provision of assistance in the event of the use or threat of use of chemiaal weapons, on the imposition of sanctions in the event of violations of the convention Md on economia and technological cooperation. Other articles related to the granting of assistance in case of the use or threat of use of chemical weapons, to sanctions in the case of violation of the aonveation, to economia and technological aoogeration and to some other subjects.

A few major complicated issues remain to be solved. Paramount among them is the question of verification. Substantial discussions On challenge

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

inspections and on the verification of non-production of chemical weapons in the chemical industry have taken place. The Twelve want an effectively verifiable convention and will continue to work in a constructive and positive way to achieve that goal.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

To that end they support an effective system of routine inspections of chemical plants which are capable of producing chemical weapons and their precursors. They also strongly support provisions concerning the right of intrusive challenge inspections as the final deterrent against violations.

Other complex issues that remain to be solved include: how to ensure universality of membership for the future chemical weapons convention, the membership of the executive council of the future organisation for the implementation of the chemical weapons convention, and the handling of old and/or abandoned chemical weapons.

Many problems have been solved. A few difficult ones remain. The negotiators in Geneva are totally engaged in an attempt to achieve a final agreement on the convention by 1992.

A vigorous collective effort and the resolute determination of all participants in the negotiations will be required if the deadline of, say, mid-1992 is to be met. It can be done.

Recent events in the Gulf, where there was a serious threat to use chemical weapons, have underscored the vital importance of upholding the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare.

The Twelve have reaffirmed repeatedly the validity and importance of the 1925 Geneva Protocol, in particular at the Paris Conference in 1989 and, again, at the Third Review Conference of the Biological and Toxin Weapons

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

Convention where they pointed out the close relationship betweenthe Convention and the Protocol.

Universal adherence to both the future chemical weapons conventionand ta the Biological and Toxin Weapon8 Convention will be vital for these treaties to be effective.

The Twelve express the hope that States will make theft commitment to the future chemical weapon8 convention unambiguously clear. It is important that those weapons be banned everywhere and forever. The Twelve have already stated their intention to be among the Original signatories to the convention and appeal to all States to ensure its early entry into force.

They also call on all Stat88 to declare their intention to become original State8 parties to the convention 80 a8 to assure it8 early entry into force, it8 effectiveimplementation and it8 universal aharaater.

During the recent Third Review Conference of the Biologiaal and Toxin WeaponsConvention, the State8 Parties reaffirmed their conviction that universal adherence would enhance international peace and security.

The Twelve call upon State8 that have not yetdone so to accede to the Convention without delay.

The Conference made further important advances in the field8 of confidence-building measuresand of verification,

The Twelve believe that the implementation ofthe new confidence-building measuresregime will enhancethe effectiveness *of* the Biological and Toxin Weapon8 Convention and call upon all Stat88 to provide the information required under the new regime on an annual basis.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

The Twelve *further* welcome the establishment *of* an ad hoc Group of Governmental Experts to identify and examine potential verification measures from a scientific and technical standpoint. They express the hope that as a result of that study, implementation of the Convention will become more effective and secure.

Mr. KALPAGE (Sri Lanka): Mr. Chairman, since I am speaking in the Committee for the first time and although my colleague in the Committee may already have done so, may I commend you, Sir, for the admirable skill with which you are steering our work and offer you and the officers of the Committee my best wishes for the successful accomplishment of your task.

I have been asked by the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Group to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.38 entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace". I deem it an honour to do so since it was Sri Lanka, with Tanzania as co-sponsor, that introduced the original resolution on this subject, adopted by the General Assembly in 1971.

The preamble of the draft resolution is essentially the same as it was last year. However, it differs in the operative part because this year the ad hoc committee considered that its preparatory work for the holding of a conference in Colombo has been largely completed.

The first and second preambular paragraphs are exactly the same as they were *in* the draft resolution adopted by the Committee and subsequently adopted by the General Assembly.

The third preambular paragraph is also the same as last year with the addition of the words "held in July 1979" - the date of the Meeting *of* the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. Kalpage, Sri Lanka)

The fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh preambular paragraphr ar8 unchanged from last year's draft resolution.

In the seventh preambular paragraph, however, there is the addition of one word which • ndoavourr to reflect the reality of today. It refers to "the continued military presence of the groat Powers in the Indian Ocean area conceived initially in the context of their confrontation". The slight difference is the addition of the word "initially".

The eighth preambular paragraph is a new paragraph reflecting the recent positive developments in the international political situation. It states:

"Welcoming the positive developments in international political relations enhancing peace, security and cooperation, and • rpro88iBg the hope that the new spirit of international cooperation will be reflected in the establishment Of a zone Of peace in the Indian Ocean."

We believe that what is happening in the world, particularly in Eastern Europe, in the Soviet Union and elsewhere should also be reflected in the Indian Ocean region.

(Mr. Kalpage, Sri Lanka)

The ninth preambular paragraph is the same a8 it war last year.

The tenth preambular paragraph reads:

"Considering that the permanent member8 of the Security Council and major maritime users of the Indian Ocean should work in close cooperation with the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean to ensure the success of the Conference and play their part in the achievement of it8 objectives".

That also reflect8 the new realities of the international situation. It is an expression of the conviction that the permanent member8 of the Security Council and major maritime users Of the Indian Ocean must al80 join the littoral and hinterland Stat88 in this endeavour.

The eleventh preambular paragraph reads:

"Considering also that the creation of the zone of peace requiter cooperation and agreement among the State8 of the region to ensure condition8 of peace and security within the area, a8 envisaged in the Declaration".

No matter what we may do with regard to Powers outside the region, it is essential that Power8 within the region rhould alro got together, cooperate and agree among themselves to ensure conditions Of peace Md security.

The twelfth preambular paragraph refers to the agenda of the proposed Conference .

As I raid, the preamble is largely the same, with the introduction of a few paragraphs to reflect the changed international situation.

Paragraph8 1, 2 and 3 of the operative part are the same a8 they were in last year's resolution.

(Mr. Kalpage, Sri Lanka)

In paragraph 4 the General Assembly notes with satisfaction the preparatory work done by the Ad Hoc Committee in the implementation of the mandate entrusted to it for the convening of the Conference. Am I said before, the Ad Hoc Committee considers its task to be largely completed.

In paragraph 5 the Assembly decides that the Conference should be structured in more than one stage. The reasons for that are explained in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee.

In paragraph 6 the Assembly decides that the first stage of the Conference at Colombo in 1993, or as soon as possible, should be held in accordance with the present draft resolution.

In paragraph 7 the Assembly recommends that participation in the Conference should be at an appropriately high political level.

In paragraph 8 the Assembly calls for the full and active participation in the Conference of the permanent members of the Security Council and the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean.

In paragraph 9 the Assembly requests the Secretary-General to appoint a Secretary-General of the Conference at an appropriate time.

In paragraph 10 the Assembly requests the Secretary-General to invite all States to participate in the Conference.

Paragraph 11 refers to documentation.

In paragraph 12 the Assembly decides that the Ad Hoc Committee will hold a session of five working days in 1992 to perform its preparatory functions for the various stages envisaged for the Conference.

Lastly, in paragraph 13 the Assembly decides to include in the provisional agenda of the forty-seventh session the item entitled

(Mr. Kalpage, Sri Lanka)

"Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean a8 a Zone of Peace", to keep the matter alive until the Conference is held in 1993.

That is the essence of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.38; I present that draft resolution on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and commend it to the Committee, and I hope that it will receive unanimous support. Before I close my presentation, I should like to thank all those who assisted in the work of the Ad Eoc Committee, of which I was Chairman in 1991, in partiaular Mr. Kheradi, chief adviser to the Ad Eoc Committee, whose expertise was always available and invaluable, and Mr. Matsouka, the Conference Secretary, who, like me, was new to the Ad Hoc Committee and who did hi8 very best, for which we are thankful. I also thank all my colleagues in the Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. BELLINA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): I have the honour to introduce on behalf of the delegation of Peru draft decision A/C.1/46/L.10, entitled "Conventional disarmament OB a regional scale".

Peru is deeply committed to regional disarmament efforts and fully convinced of the effectiveness of the regional approach in achieving real, tangible progress in the area of arm8 control and arms reduction. Major global disarmament efforts will he possible Only if their basic components are regional arrangements. There can be no "islands of peace" in a world from which the potential causes of conflict have not completely disappeared, especially in viow of the growing interdependence of all countries.

Latin America ha8 ampiy demonstrated it8 dedication to peace, from the Treaty of Tlatelolao, the Ayacucho Declaration, the Esquipulas agreement8 and the Galapagos Declaration to the proposal made by my country's President, Alberto Fujimori, OB regional disarmament, not to mention other regional

(Mr. Bellina, Peru)

As at the last oe8ion, the draft decision submitted by Peru is intended to make it possible to retain in the provisional agenda of the General Assemblyatit8 forty-seventhsession the item atitled "Conventional disarmament on a regional scale". In the draft decision the General Assembly also welcomes the report of the Secretary-General based on the view8 conveyed by various Member State8 onthis question and invites States which have aot yet doneso to convey to the Secretary-General their viewson the matter.

My country warmly thanks Member States that have submitted their reports to the Secretary-General. We wish topresent a draft resolution on this item once there is sufficient information from Member States, with a view to a balanced and fair consideration of all aspects of the process ofconventional disarmament on a regional scale.

The text presented for consideration is procedural in nature, and we therefore hope that the Committee will adopt it without a vote,

(Mr. Ballina, Peru)

I should also liko to take this opportunity tointroduce draft decision A/C.1/46/L.39, entitled "Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: 1995 Conferenceand it8 Preparatory Committee".

A8 President of the Fourth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty, Peru convened a meeting here at Headquarters of the State8 parties to the Treaty in order to achieve consensus agreement on preparation8 for the 1995 Conference. That agreement is • mbodi8d in the draft decision.

In the draft decision the General Assembly would take note of the intent of the parties to form a preparatory committee in 1993 for the Conference called for in article X, paragraph 2, of the Treaty, and decide8 to include in the provisional agenda of its forty-seventh session the item entitled "Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: 1995 Conference and it8 Proparatory Committee".

I should like to add that the States parties also agreed to convene an informal meeting at Headquarters at the end of 1992 to decide on organisational aspects of the Preparatory Committee, which should meet here at Headquarters in the first half of 1993.

Taking into account the process that led to the agreement embodied in the *draft* decision, and the fact that it was adopted by consensus, my delegation trusts that the draft will be adopted without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Mexico to introduce draft resolution A/C. 1/46/L. 28.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): l f of the delegation8 *of* Bolivia, Indonesia, Nigeria, Peru, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, the United Republic of Tansania, Venesuela, Yugoslavia and my own delegation, I have the honour to iatroduco draft resolution

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

A/C.1/46/L.28, on agenda item 52, entitled "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water".

In 1963 the original parties to the partial test-ban Treaty undertook to work for the permanent suspension of all tort explosions of nuclear weapons and to continue negotiation8 to that end. In spite of that commitment and the urgent appeal8 of the General Assembly for three decades, the international community still does not have a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

The subject ha8 beendiscussed bilatorally and trilaterally and at the Conference oa Disarmament in Geneva. Various problem8 connectedwitha comprehensive test-ban treaty, partiaularly the problem of vorifieatioa of compliance, havo been analysed. It may be raid that no other disarmament question ha8 been studied and debated mare than that ofa comprehensive test-ban treaty. It is simply a matter of laak of political will.

In order to mobilise world publia opinion further, particularly in countries where testing continues, a group of countries proposed a tow year8 ago the convening of an Amendment Conference, in accordance with tho procedure laid down in article II of the partial test-ban Treaty, to turn it into a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

The Amendment Conference held an organisational meeting from 29 Way to 8 June 1990, and began it8 substantive work at a meeting hold from 7 to 18 January this yoar. Tho draft resolution would take note of tho decision adopted by the Amendment Conference that, since further workwas needed on certain aspects of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, particularly With regard to verification of compliance with the treaty and possible sanctions against non-compliance, the President Of the Conferenceshould conduct consultations

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

with a view to aahieviag progress on those issues and resuming the work of the Conference at an appropriate time.

Under paragraph 3 the General Assembly would welcome the ongoing consultations being aonduated by the President of the Amendment Conference and the holding in 1992 of more structured open-ended consultations, as well a8 the establishment of a group of friend8 of the President in order to examine various aspects of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban, with a viow to resuming the work of the Conference a8 soon a8 possible.*

By the draft resolution the General Assembly would recall it8 recommendation that arrangement8 rhould be made to ensure that intensive effort8 continue, *under* the auspices of the Amendment Conference, until a comprehensive nuclear-test-bM treaty is achieved. Therefore, undor paragraph 4 the General Assembly would call upon all parties to tho Treaty to participate in, and to aontribute to the success of, *the* Amendment Conference for the achievement of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban at an early date, a8 an indispensable measure towards implementation of their undertakings in the preamble to the Treaty.

Furthermore, after urging all States, especially those nuclear-weapon State8 which have not yet *done* so, to adhere to tho Treaty, the Assembly would reiterate it8 conviction that, pending the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-tert-ban treaty, the nuclear-weapon States rhould suspend all nuclear-test explosions through an agreed moratorium or unilateral moratoria.

---

* Mr. Alpman (Turkey), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

Under the draft resolution the General Assembly would also recommend that arrangements be made in order to ensure the fullest possible participation of non-governmental organisations in the Amendment Conference. That is an important aspect, because public opinion is fundamental for the success of the Conference.

For years now the General Assembly has been reiterating its conviction that a comprehensive nuclear-teat-ban treaty is the highest-priority measure for halting the nuclear-arm race and bringing about nuclear disarmament. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28 share that conviction.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Yugoslavia to introduce draftresolutions A/C.1/46/L.8 and A/C.1/46/L.37.

Mr. KOTEVSKI (Yugoslavia): I have great pleasure in introducing two draft resolutions on behalf of the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. They are draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.8, "Relationship between disarmament and development", and draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37, "Bilateral nuclear-arm negotiations".

The draft resolution on the relationship between disarmament and development is mainly of a procedural nature. Its purpose is to welcome the report of the Secretary-General (A/46/527) and actions taken in accordance with the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. The Secretary-General is requested to continua to take action for the implementation of the action programme adopted at the International Conference in 1987. He is also requested to submit a report to the General Assembly at it8 forty-seventh session.

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

The non-aligned countries attach particular importance to this issue, ● rpuially in the current international circumstances, which provide realistic prospects of full implementation of the action programme adopted at the International Conference. It is our belief that the relationship between disarmament and development is gaining new momentum, particularly in preparations for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, to be held next year in Brazil. In that context, I wish only to underline an *idea* that in our opinion is extremely valuable, one that we heard in the general debate on disarmament in this Committee, when the Ambassador of Brazil said:

"As we turn a new page in history, democracy, development and disarmament should constitute the foundations supporting the new structure of peace." (A/C.1/46/PV.4, p. 73)

This is an issue of exceptional importance, and we earnestly believe that the Committee will adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

The second draft resolution which I have the honour to introduce on behalf of the non-aligned countries is related to bilateral nuclear arms negotiations. The proposed draft particularly highlights the breakthrough in relationship between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States that took place since the last session. The emphasis is plain on signing the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), as well as in the recent proposals of President Bush and President Gorbachev for further reduction of strategic weapons.

In our opinion, that clearly demonstrated the will of the two Governments to continue these negotiations. We welcome these developments as a significant contribution to the process of disarmament.

We also recall the stated intention of the two Governments concerned to pursue further negotiations on nuclear and space arms, following the signature of the treaty on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms, and to give these negotiations the highest priority. At the same time, in the view of the Non-Aligned Movement, it is particularly important and timely that the international community give a new impetus to the ongoing negotiations and to stress the need to promote the negotiations on some issues of special concern, such as the achievement of the comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty and prevention of the arms race in outer space.

The positive effects of these negotiations *for* the overall process of disarmament are indisputable. That is precisely why the non-aligned countries wish to emphasise the inseparable link between bilateral and multilateral negotiations that should be complementary and mutually promotional. General and complete disarmament cannot be achieved unless all countries are included in these processes.

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

In that context we call upon the Soviet Union and the United States to keep other Member States of United Nations duly informed of their negotiations.

After many years, we are in a situation where we have only one proposed draft resolution concerning this topio. It is our firm belief that now circumstances in international relations can • ohiovo a breakthrough in bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations and create the necessary conditions where the international community would speak with one voice on this topic of extreme significance for the whole of mankind.

The proposed draft, which I have the honour to introduce today, is the result of the earnest efforts of the non-aligned countries to reflect the remarkable positive developments which have taken place in bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations, a8 well a8 their wish that it represent the opinion of the General Assembly as a whole. We are aware that this proposal can still be improved and therefore we • □□◎□□ our readiness to continue negotiations with all interested countries *and* groups. There, we particularly have in mind the delegation of the United Kingdom, which in previous years ha8 submitted a draft on behalf of the Western Group, with whose members there continues to exist an extremely good spirit of cooperation.

Bearing that in mind, I would like, in conclusion, once again to emphasise our wish and hope that this year's resolution on bilateral and nuclear-arms negotiation8 should reflect the unanimity of the whole international community and that it should be adopted without a vote.

Mt. (United Kingdom): The delegation Of Yugoslavia ha8 just introduced draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37 on bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations. A8 ho point.6 out, for the first time in some years the United Kingdom ha8 not introduced a rival *draft.* The delegations of the United

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

Kingdom and Yugoslavia did work hard to try to produce a text before the deadline for submission, which could have commanded consensus among the supporters of both of last year's resolutions. I thank the delegation of Yugoslavia for their efforts during that period.

Sadly, time ran out on us. However, in order to demonstrate the strength of our wish to see a single consensus resolution this year, *no* alternative text was submitted by my delegation. I have asked to speak, Mr. Chairman, to submit to you, and through you to all delegations, our view that in this of all years it would be very sad if the First Committee were not able to welcome by consensus the momentous bilateral achievements *of* the last 12 months. The self-same point has just been made by the representative of Yugoslavia.

It is not just a question of welcoming the full implementation of the Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles Treaty (INF) *and* the signature *of* the long awaited Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), significant as they are, but also the recent initiative of Presidents Bush and Gorbachev which have given a dramatic new turn to nuclear-arms control and disarmament, seen by the press indeed as the start of the disarmament race.

The United States and the Soviet Union have told us that they themselves recognise that it is only the beginning of a new phase and we are sure there is no delegation here whose Government would not wish to join with the wider international community in encouraging and supporting the two Governments in their continuing efforts, as indicated in operative paragraph 5 of A/C.1/46/L.37. However, what is the value in adopting a resolution which is not supported by both the Governments concerned. To achieve this we need to avoid including language, like the current operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37, which is not factually correct. That paragraph

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

rewrite8 the stated intention of the two Governments in terms which other Governments would like them to be but which do not currently reflect the stated policy of the two principals.

These concerns on a comprehensive test-ban treaty, and on prevention of an arm8 taco in outer space, are of course of groat concern to the wider membership of the United Nations, but thoy are already covered by their own resolution.

Do we really need to insist that these concern8 be pressed in a resolution whose primary purpose is different?

My dolegation intend8 to continue negotiations in the traditional way with the principal sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37 in an effort to agree on those modifications to that text which might mako consensus possible.

IA addition to working in this traditional way with the delegation of Yugoslavia and other8, we would be happy to explain to anyinterested delegation which areas of A/C.1/46/L.37 causes difficulty. Wewould do so in the spirit of cooperation that the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union have alroady shown and for which they should be unanimously thanked.

Mr. WALKER (Jamaica): The United Nations mechanisms to control, resolveand prevent conflicts, though developing throughout tho part decades, have gained momentumin recent years.

IA this connection, attention has been drawn to the examination Of the possibility *of* regulation, limitation and Oqual reduction of armaments and the armed force8 in a coordinated And comprehensive programme. At the same time, there ha8 been extensive consideration *of* the fundamental role of

(Mr. Walker, Jamaica)

confidence-building, the promotion of mutual security among States, and mutual cooperation.

The final document adopted in 1976 during the first special session devoted to disarmament, provides in its programme of action that agreements and the adoption of other measures aiming to strengthen international peace and security and to promote confidence between States must proceed resolutely on a bilateral, regional and multilateral basis.

(Mr. Walker, Jamaica)

Similarly, the World Disarmament Campaign launched by the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (1982) ● ♑♦♋♌●♓♑♒♐♎ a series of objectives and accomplishments refloated in the Regional Centres for peace and development in Africa, in Asia and the Pacific, and in Latin America and the Caribbean, created during the last decade by the United Nations.

We have to recognise that, on the one hand, the practice of dialogue and understanding ha8 ● volvod a8 a means to strengthen international relations. On the Other hand, the sources Of conflict have ● rpandod to include ● ●♐✋✝✌♦♑ which today have acquired a new importance and require our attention.

The task of the Centres, which would complement the decisions that are adopted in New York and in the regions, is every day more relevant in the light of the element8 I have mentioned, particularly with a view to strengthening the possibility Of increasing the ● ff.CtiV.A.88 Of the Organisation's preventive diplomacy and regional efforts in that regard.

My delegation, in it8 Capacity a8 Chairman Of the Latin American and Caribbean Group, is introducing draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14, ● ntitlod "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of tho General Assembly: United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, United Nations Regional Centre for Peace And Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific and United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and tho Caribbean".

Representatives from Africa and Asia will join in supporting the draft resolution.

In it8 preamble, the draft resolution refers to the resolutions of the General Assembly calling for the ● atablirhment of the aforementioned Regional Centres. It also refers to the previous resolutions on regional disarmament.

(Mr. Walker, Jamaica)

The preamble also refers to the significant contribution of the programmes carried out by the Regional Centres, and to the need to provide Atability and financial viability in order to facilitate the • ffoctivo planning ☜■♎ • xoaution oftheir activities.

It also reiterates the conviction that the initiatives and activities mutually agreed upon by Member States of tho respective regions that are directed to the strengthening ofconfidence and mutual • ourity, a8 wll am to the implementation and coordination of regional activities under the World Disarmament Campaign, would encourage and facilitate the development of • ffeotivo measures *of* confidence-building, arm8 limitation and disarmament in tboso regions.

The lastpreambular paragra,.hs give full recognition to theMember States, a8 well as the governmental and non-governmental organisations that have contributed to the trust funds of the three Regional Centres. Thoy also take note, with appreciation, of the Secretary-General's report (A/46/365), and recognise hi8 effort8 in providing the necessary administrative measures for the • ffoativo functioning of the Centres.

In oporativo paragraph 1 the General Assembly would • naourogo the Centres to continue their effort8 in accordance with their mandate with a view to facilitating the development of • ffoctive measures of confidonoo-building, arms limitation and disarmament.

IA operative paragraph 2, the Assembly would commend tho Secretary-General for hi8 • ffOttm in providing assistance to the Regional COAtr.8 for the fulfilment Of their fUACtiOA8 and request the continuation of hi8 support.

(Mr. Walker, Jamaica)

In operative paragraph 3 an appeal is made to Member States, as well as to international and governmental and non-governmental organizations to continue contributing to the trust funds of each Regional Centre in order to strengthen their respective programmes.

Operative paragraph 4 states:

"Decides that, to ensure the continued financial viability of the centres, the administrative costs of the centres shall be financed from the regular budget".

I wish here to emphasize that funding from the regular budget of the United Nations will provide stability to the Regional Centres and allow us to assure non-governmental organizations and other potential donors that their contributions will be used exclusively for academic programmes.

In view of the broad consensus on the draft resolution, we trust and very much hope that it will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. NDIAYE (Gabon) (interpretation from French): Since this is the first time I am speaking in the Committee, I should like to congratulate Mr. Mroziewicz on his election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. I should also like to congratulate the other officers on their election.

On behalf of the African Group, of which I am the Chairman for November, I should like to associate myself with previous speakers on item 61 of the agenda.

Indeed, with the support of our Organization, regional centres for peace and disarmament have been established to promote peace and security throughout the world. The conferences, workshops and seminars that have been organized

(Mr. Ndiaye, Gabon)

by the Centres have bun made possible through donation8 from Member States. For some time these Centres have been experiencing serious financial difficulties in continuing their activities, particularly in terms of administration. The purpose Of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14 is to assure the financial viability of the various Regional Centre8 for peace and disarmament hy means *of* an entry in the regular budget of the Organisation,

On behalf of the African Group, I should like *to* ark tho Committee to lend its Cull rupport to draft rerolution A/C.1/46/L.14 introduced by the representative of Jamaica.

Mr. ACHARYA (Nepal): The representative of Jamaica ham just introduced draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14, on the United Nations Regional Centres for peace and disarmament, on behalf of the sponsors from Asia and the Pacific, Africa, and Latin America and the Caribbean.

According to their mandate, the Regional Centres should provide, on request, • ♌♋♦♦♦♦♦ support for the initiatives and other activities mutually agreed upon by Member States of the region concerned for the implementation of measures for peace and disarmament. In other words, establishment Of the Regional Centres represents recognition by the General Assembly Of the growing emphasis that Member States have been placing on regional approaches to the intricate questions of a-8 control, disarmament and confidence-building measures. Tho report of the Secretary-General, document A/46/365, give8 an • roollwat summary of the activities of the Regional Centre8 over tho past years.

(Mr. Acharya, Nepal)

The Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament for Asia and the Pacific, located in Kathmandu, Nepal, has been active in disseminating information on activities of the United Nations in the areas of arms control and disarmament. The Centre, however, has been engaged in something even more important. Responding to the need felt for confidence-building measures in the Asia-Pacific region, the Centre has organized two major meetings in Kathmandu. Those meetings brought together, in an informal setting, diplomats, experts and academicians - from both within and outside the region - in an effort to identify areas of common approach and elements for possible future agreements.

(Mr. Acharya, Nepal)

I do not need to reiterate here that confidence-building measures are not and cannot be a ● ub8tituto for arms-control And disarmament measures. Their value in creating conditions favourablo for arms-control agreements has, however, been widely recognised. The success of the Conference on Soourity and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and of tho Troaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe are ● xAAple8 that readily comes to mind. Nor do I need to reiterate that each region has it8 own security condition8 and perceptions, and that ● ucao88ful confidence-building measures from one region cannot simply be transplanted to other regions. Nevertheless, the European process provides useful guidelines and examples, among them the incremental nature of the oonfidenae-building measures there. CSCE war developed through patient and protracted negotiation8 spread over many years. The Treaty on Conventional Armed Forcer in Europe was a direct result of those patient endeavours.

My delegation believes that the potential of the Regional COAtr08 should be viewed against that background. The Regional Centre8 depend ● xalu8ivoly on voluntary contributions for their substantive activities. The Secretary-General has been providing them with *ail* feasible support. The Department for Disarmament Affairs, under tho leadership of itsable Under-Secretary-General, Mt. Akashi, deserves *our* appreciation for the optimal wo it has been making of the meagre resources available for the activities of the Centres. The performance and potential of tbo Centres have recently been attracting growing attention from Governments, foundations and non-governmental organisations. Needless to say, voluntary support is predicated on the maintenance of a minimum of administrative structure.

(Mr. Acharya, Nepal)

It is with those considerations in mind that the sponsors of the draft resolution on Regional Centres have decided to approach the General Assembly for the financing from the regular budget of the administrative costs of the three Centres. Making that decision was not easy for us, aware as we are of the views of some Member States on matters of the budget. However, in the larger interest of the continued viability and effectiveness of the Regional Centres, my delegation trusts that Member States will give overwhelming support to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/46/L.14.

Mr. RASAPUTRAM (Sri Lanka): I am very pleased to speak in support of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14, introduced today by the representative of Jamaica. The Regional Centres for peace and disarmament form a vital link between disarmament efforts and confidence-building in disarmament affairs. Recent events have indicated the urgent need for regional measures to increase the peace and security of the entire World. Regional dialogue and regional dissemination of knowledge would enable us to take steps forward and achieve greater progress in disarmament affairs.

The Regional Centre in Asia has made a lasting impact on Governments and non-governmental organisations. In all matters relating to disarmament, differing perceptions of the security interests of States can obstruct progress towards general and complete disarmament unless we search for means that are specific to regions and subregions, and for means of overcoming the problems that are specific to them. We know that cultural, ethnic, linguistic and economic factors are among the major threats to the peace and security of regions. Regional solutions that can be worked into a global framework must necessarily emerge from well-informed discussions and dialogues within the regions.

(Mr. Rasaputram, Sri Lanka)

In order to move forward towards our objective, it is imperative to broaden and expand the areas of understanding and interaction in seeking to roach agreement on vuioua issues that tend to disturb regional stability. The Asian Centre has conducted a number of very useful seminars and workshops to provide up-to-date information to all interested parties.

We have to strengthen those institutions not only to exchange information but also *to* build on areas that are within • a8y roach of agreement and to • a8ura that confidence-building measures have their expected impact.

Tbe resources required for the expansion of tho work of the88 Regional Centre8 would be an extremely insignificant portion of military budgets. As the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Akashi, said in this Committee, it is important to train and immerse the younger generations in peace-making and peace-keeping methods for the good of thoir own futuro. The Regional Centres are appropriately situated to make the younger generations in the region8 understand the problems and to assist Governments to work with speed to arrive at acceptable solutions. Expansion of such work in the Regional Centre in Asia, which has the highest populatic a and a low level of education, would require additional resources. We appeal to all members of the international community to provide continuing and adoquato resources to carry out the important work of all the Regional Centres for disarmament, whereverthey are located.

In order for the Centres to plan and carry out thoir programmes of work undisturbed by undertainties that affect the • ffiaienay of their administrative structure, it is important thatthe administrative costs of all

(Mr. Rasaputram, Sri Lanka)

the Centres be met by regular budget of the United Nations. That would enable the Centres to have the services of qualified people dedicated to working for the cause of peace.

As mentioned by the representative of Jamaica, we are hopeful that the draft resolution will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. BRECKON (United States of America): I have asked to speak this morning to express its views on issues raised in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4 regarding a comprehensive test-ban treaty. We believe that elements of that draft resolution perpetuate a number of myths about nuclear testing. We believe those myths are misleading. Let me try to help dispel them as the members of the First Committee consider how they will vote on this draft resolution.

Allow me to mention a few. Myth number one: A comprehensive test-ban treaty would halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The fact, we believe, is that a comprehensive test-ban treaty would not achieve such a goal. For example, few if any would seriously argue that Iraq's secret nuclear-weapons-development programme, carried out in the absence of testing, and similar ongoing efforts elsewhere would have been affected by a test ban.

Myth number two: Preventing qualitative improvements in existing nuclear weapons would enhance stability. The fact, we believe, is that the lack of qualitative improvements would actually promote destabilization. Nuclear weapons have to met rigorous safety, security and operational standards. A minimum and prudent programme of testing, we believe, is required in order that those standards can be met. Without testing, no one can be sure that weapons are safe and up to standard. The resulting uncertainty could result in miscalculation and thus greater insecurity.

(Mr. Brackon, United States)

Myth number three: Testing cannot be conducted in an environmentally safe way. The fact, we believe, is that there is a large body of unbiased scientific data which attests to the environmental safety of properly conducted underground nuclear tests. Our French colleague alluded to some of therm reports in his statement to the Committee on 30 October. The quantity and quality of there and other reports cannot and rhould not be ignored.

Myth number four: Testing is no longer needed because of improved cooperation between the major nuclear-weapon States and because of the build-down of nuclear-weapons inventories. The fact, we believe, is that improved relations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have permitted very substantial reductions in nuclear weapons, both negotiated reductions and unilateral reductions, but for the United States testing is still required for those weapons which remain. Deterrence continues to be the foundation upon which we and our Treaty allies base our collective defence. Nuclear weapons remain an important part of that strategy. Testing is required to maintain the safety, security and reliability of these weapons so long as they exist.

The United Staten position on a comprehensive test-ban treaty is clear, and has not changed, We see a comprehensive test ban as a long-term objective, and it must be viewed in the context of a time when the United States and its allies no longer nerd to depend on nuclear deterrence to ensure international security and stability, and when the world has achieved broad, deep and effectively verifiable arm reductions, substantially improved verification capabilities, expanded confidence-building measures and greater balance in conventional forces.

(Mr. Breckon, United States)

The United States believes that the myth8 which underlie elements of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4 on a comprehensive tort-baa treaty rhould be reviewed in the light of the fact8 a8 we see them. The myths appeal to our hope8 for a juet world without the need for arm8 for deterrence and defence. They have a powerful allure. All of us, however, have a responsibility to look at the world realistically. While we work to ameliorate the underlying political differences which create tension, we must also be careful to consider with prudence those essential precautions that are vital to international stability end to our national security.

As delegations consider their votee on the draft resolution on a comprehensive tent-ban treaty, the United States delegation asks that they keep these coneideratione in mind.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I ehould like to note that my delegation has juet learned with great sorrow of the death of AmbassadorRikhi Jaipal of India. We wish to convey our sincere condolence8 to the delegation of India upon the death of Ambassador Jaipal. Ambassador Jaipal wae Secretary-General of the Conference onDisarmament and a distinguished representative of India at the United Nations and in various countries. lie was a good friend of the Argentine Republic, and we felt deep friendship for him. He was without question one of the greatest multilateral diplomate of the last half century. We regret the fact that in the part few weeks the world community ha8 lost two great champions of disarmament: Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico and now Ambassador Rikhi Jaipal of India. With a profound sense of friendship, we express out condolence8 to both delegations.

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

Before I turn to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.36, I should like to express my gratitude and that of my delegation to the delegation of France for the statements it made yesterday concerning the study of the possibility of ratifying Additional Protocol I to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which my Government regards as a very valuable step. We are also grateful to the sponsors for deciding to withdraw the draft resolution on the issue that was before the Committee. My Government will study very carefully the draft decision which the Ambassador of Mexico will submit to those concerned.

I wish now to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.36. The negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on the chemical-weapons convention finally seem to have prospects of concluding soon. It is particularly heartening to note the flexible and constructive approach that has enabled a fresh impetus to be given to a negotiating process whose lack of progreer was in marked contrast to the positive international environment. We therefore welcome the political will to conclude the convention as soon as possible, so that 1932 may be the year in which the Conference on Disarmament finally presents the Committee with its first multilateral disarmament treaty,

The deadline is tight, but if anything positive can come from the prolongation of negotiations on this matter for more than a decade, it is that all the participants are now well aware of the specific areas in which we should rapidly concentrate our greatest efforts in the coming months, in this last stage, in order to establish a balanced and effective text. There is no justification for delay.

We are convinced that all countries that are members of the Conference on Disarmament, even those needing more time for reflection, will help to ensure

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

that the First Committee begins its consideration of the convention at the next session of the General Assembly. The draft resolution (A/C.1/46/L.36), introduced by the Ambassador of Canada, will in our view give the matter the proper impetus, and we therefore fully support it.

The CHAIRMAN: I share the feelings expressed by the representative of Argentina concerning the untimely lore of Ambassador Jaipal of India.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.