



# General Assembly

Fifty-sixth session

First Committee

**12**<sup>th</sup> meeting

Monday, 22 October 2001, 10 a.m.  
New York

Official Records

*Chairman:* Mr. Erdős ..... (Hungary)

*The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.*

## Agenda items 64 to 84 (continued)

### Thematic discussion on item subjects; introduction and consideration of all draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security items

**The Chairman:** As I mentioned at our meeting on Wednesday, in accordance with the programme of work and timetable, this morning the First Committee will begin the second phase its of work, namely, a thematic discussion and the introduction and consideration of draft resolutions.

I would like to reiterate again that, during this stage of the work, a certain degree of flexibility will be maintained, as in previous sessions. In accordance with the adopted decisions on the rationalization of the work of the Committee, we will combine the discussion of specific subjects and the introduction and consideration of all draft resolutions. Again, as I mentioned, for easy reference delegations have before them document A/C.1/56/CRP.2, which contains subjects for thematic discussion. This document has already been made available to all members of the Committee.

I have been requested to draw members' attention to the position of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) and the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly with regard to the use of the phrase "within existing resources".

In its first report on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001, the ACABQ included two paragraphs on the subject. They read as follows:

"The Advisory Committee notes with concern the growing practice of some intergovernmental bodies of attempting to determine the method of financing of mandates to be approved in the context of substantive resolutions, in contravention of the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 41/213 and 42/211 of 21 December 1987. The Committee recalls section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, whereby the General Assembly, *inter alia*:

'1. *Reaffirms* that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters;

'2. *Reaffirms also* the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;

'3. *Expresses its concern* at the tendency of its substantive Committees and other intergovernmental bodies to involve themselves in administrative and budgetary matters'.

"In a related matter, the Advisory Committee notes the use of the phrase 'within

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.



existing resources' in a number of resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly. Upon enquiry, the Committee was informed of the difficulties that such limitations have on the implementation of mandated activities. The Committee has written extensively on this. The Committee emphasizes the responsibility of the Secretariat to inform the General Assembly thoroughly and accurately about whether there are enough resources to implement a new activity; in order for this to be meaningful, programme managers must be fully involved." (A/54/7, paras. 66-67)

The Fifth Committee, in reviewing the report of the ACABQ, reaffirmed this position in the General Assembly resolution entitled "Questions relating to the proposed programme budget 2000-2001", which reads in part as follows:

*"Reaffirms that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters". (resolution 54/249, para. 1)*

In that light, I would like to bring it to the Committee's attention that the use of the phrase "within existing resources" or of similar phraseology would appear to be in contravention of resolutions 41/213 and 42/211. It is hoped therefore that Member States will avoid using such phrases in their draft resolutions.

**Mr. Donowaki** (Japan): I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to take the floor at this time to speak on the subject of the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects as a representative of Japan who has been involved in the matter for the past several years. We all look forward to hearing Ambassador Camilo Reyes Rodriguez, President of the Conference, present his official report on the results of the Conference and introduce a draft resolution on behalf of its original sponsors: Colombia, Japan and South Africa. Japan wishes to express once again its deep appreciation to Ambassador Reyes for his skilful guidance and undaunted efforts in leading a successful conference. A word of thanks goes as well to Ambassador Carlos dos Santos of Mozambique for his excellent work as Chairman of the Preparatory Committee and also at the Conference itself, where he sought to work out a compromise.

Of course, the Conference owes its success also to a number of other efforts, including those of the European Union and other regional organizations, which culminated in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons, the Brasilia Declaration and the Bamako Declaration. Further, I may be justified in mentioning the efforts made by the 1997 Panel and 1999 Group of Governmental Experts on Small Arms, which carried out what may be called the pioneering work. It was the 1999 Group's report that suggested the exact title of the Conference and the desirability of adopting a programme of action. It also recommended that the objective of the Conference should be

*"to develop and strengthen international efforts to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects". (A/54/258, para. 125)*

As may be noted, the latter part of that phrase became the title of the Programme of Action that was adopted at the Conference.

Now, I wish to take this opportunity to offer a few remarks as one who had the honour of presiding over the high-level segment of the general exchange of views of the Conference. As many of the delegations that participated in the meetings of the Preparatory Committee may remember, it was decided at the Preparatory Committee's third session, held in March this year, that the Conference should be held at the ministerial level. That was because the Conference itself was regarded as an important opportunity to mobilize the political will throughout the international community to combat the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects.

In view of that decision, the Conference was organized in such a manner that parts of the morning and afternoon sessions of the first day and the remaining four morning sessions of the first week were set aside for the high-level segment of the general exchange of views at the ministerial level, and the General Assembly Hall was made available for those sessions. Since it became clear that not all the representatives wishing to take the floor could be accommodated within the normal meeting hours, the last three morning sessions had to be held from 9 a.m. to well past 2 p.m.

During those sessions, 142 representatives participated in the general debate. Of these, 134 were

representatives of States while eight representatives spoke on behalf of various international organizations, including specialized agencies and organs within the United Nations system. Of the 134 State representatives, nine spoke on behalf of various regional groups, which meant that almost all United Nations Member States and Observer States participated in the general debate either directly or indirectly. Also, of the 134 State representatives who took the floor, at least 65 were State ministers or deputy ministers, or were of equivalent rank.

Some of the proposals or suggestions presented during the general debate — such as the idea to set aside 9 July as the annual day for the destruction of small arms, and offers to provide financial and technical assistance — were affirmatively echoed in the statements of other representatives. The atmosphere of the general debate was, if I may say so, both sober and inspiring.

However, it would not be fair to try to cite just one or two of the statements made during the general debate, because each of the 142 representatives conveyed the very strong will and determination of the Government or organization he or she represented to combat the problem of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects. The entire length of the general debate, in which so many representatives spoke, was well over 20 hours in the course of the five days of the first week. Indeed, I should say that it served as an unprecedented opportunity for the international community to demonstrate its strong political will on the subject of small arms and light weapons. Thanks to the strong will mobilized throughout the international community, we managed to assemble and start a machine that is called the Programme of Action, which we all know is nothing but a process that has to be followed up with care and attention. The momentum must not be allowed to dissipate easily.

Of course, in the wake of the atrocious terrorist attacks of 11 September, we must devote our strength to the fight against terrorism. Combating terrorism is surely one of the highest priorities of the twenty-first century. However, let this not distract our attention from other pressing issues. The non-proliferation and disarmament of weapons of mass destruction is also a priority issue. Of no less importance is the combat against the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects. As a matter of fact, both the non-

proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the combat against the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons are closely linked to the fight against terrorism.

Therefore, let me conclude my intervention by reiterating the need to vigorously follow up the process we successfully initiated at the July Conference on small arms and light weapons.

**Mr. Nébié** (Burkina Faso) (*spoke in French*): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having granted me the floor in order to express the position and vision of Burkina Faso on the question of nuclear disarmament. Considering this item on the agenda of our Committee, it is important to bear in mind that the main mission of the United Nations is to avoid humanity's reliving the suffering created by the first two world wars in the space of a human lifetime. It is therefore not by chance that this Committee was named as being the first.

Before going into my statement, I would like to express my congratulations and those of my delegation to Mr. Kofi Annan, the Secretary-General, and the entire United Nations staff for the Nobel Peace Prize, which has been justly granted for their fight and their unreserved commitment and sometimes for the supreme sacrifice for the sake of peace. I would also like to note my satisfaction for the quality of the documents that the Secretary-General submitted to us to facilitate our debates and work.

General and complete disarmament still remains a distant objective to be attained. Nevertheless, if we wish to create a world of peace and security and to rid ourselves of the haunting fear of a third world war, which unfortunately would leave no hope of humanity's survival, we truly need to attain this goal.

The Secretary-General clearly emphasizes this concern in his report A/56/309, entitled *Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda*. Likewise, in his report A/56/400, concerning *Reducing nuclear danger*, the Secretary-General announced specific measures to provide for security in this area. Burkina Faso supports these measures, which, if they are applied in good faith and without reservation, can considerably contribute towards a reduction of the nuclear danger.

For its part, Burkina Faso does not possess nuclear weapons, but it is committed and is a party to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).

The country refrains from and prohibits any nuclear testing for non-peaceful purposes on the whole of its territory. Burkina Faso supports all efforts deployed at the international level against the further development and proliferation of all these weapons of mass destruction.

As to the convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, my country fully endorses this idea. However, we wish all United Nations Member States to participate in it with commitment and determination to adopt specific provisions that are measurable and verifiable in order to attain real disarmament.

Burkina Faso reaffirms its commitment to work towards a world free from any threat of nuclear weapons and wishes to emphasize here that the balance of terror through the arms race cannot guarantee the security of any State or any people. Only confidence, friendship and fraternity — which must of course be sincere — among peoples and citizens of the world can guarantee peaceful international relations.

As of next week, we will be proceeding to the adoption of resolutions that will sanction our debate today. These resolutions will undoubtedly reflect the views of the Committee regarding the adequate measures to be taken for a lasting solution to questions of nuclear disarmament. Subject to changes that it might introduce in order to take account of our relevant observations, my delegation was a co-sponsor of most of these resolutions. My country also calls upon the political will of all, so that these measures can be adopted and implemented without delay.

**Mr. Borrie** (New Zealand): I have the honour to introduce a draft decision on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), document A/C.1/56/L.10, to be considered and adopted in the First Committee of the fifty-sixth session of the General Assembly. This draft decision is submitted in close consultation with Australia and Mexico.

The intention to submit a draft decision on the CTBT this year was made in light of the forthcoming Ministerial Conference facilitating the entry into force of the Treaty, which is to take place in New York immediately after the First Committee meetings, from 11 to 13 November.

That is a Conference we wish had not been necessary. It is deeply disappointing that the CTBT has

not entered into force five years after it was open for signature. The CTBT will contribute to international peace and security in unmistakable ways. By creating an international norm prohibiting all nuclear test explosions in all environments, the Treaty will make a significant contribution towards the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It will also provide impetus to the process of the total elimination of these weapons.

It would not be appropriate for us to present a resolution on the eve of this Ministerial Conference charged with addressing the entry into force of the CTBT. That is why we have table this straightforward decision. We hope that it can be adopted by consensus.

**Mr. Paolillo** (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the States parties of the Southern Cone Common Market (MERCOSUR) — Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay — and of the associated countries Bolivia and Chile, and to express our views on agenda item 82 on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

In September of this year, with the deposit of the instruments of ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty on behalf of Paraguay and Uruguay, MERCOSUR and its associated countries became one of the first institutionally organized subregions where nuclear tests have been completely banned.

With this move, we have implemented what the States parties to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) sought at sixth Review Conference, which took place last year, and which called for the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. We hope that adherence to the Treaty by all the States of MERCOSUR and its associated countries will be an incentive to the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean to give their support to ensure the Treaty's entry into force at the earliest possible date.

Because MERCOSUR shares the goals of the Treaty, we reaffirm the provisions of General Assembly resolution 55/41, which called for maintaining moratoria on nuclear tests until the Treaty enters into force. We also trust that the second Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty — to be held in November under the able leadership of our Mexican colleagues — will achieve the outcome that the majority of the international community desires.

The countries of MERCOSUR and its associated countries understand that, at a time when the international community has received such clear and terrible signs of the dangers facing it, it is more necessary than ever to consolidate solidarity among Governments and peoples, eliminate our rivalries and differences and prepare ourselves to better confront our common enemies. Taking the necessary measures to ensure the universal application of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty will undoubtedly be an important step forward in that direction. MERCOSUR and its associated States therefore once again urge all States that have not yet done so to ratify, or adhere to, the Treaty as soon as possible.

**Mr. Khairat** (Egypt): I have the pleasure to introduce the draft resolution entitled “Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East”, which is contained in document A/C.1/56/L.5.

The General Assembly has annually adopted a draft resolution with this title since 1974 — since 1980 by consensus. That consensus emerged over the years, and the proposal has also received steadfast support in bilateral declarations and in various multilateral forums, one of the latest instances being during the 1999 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, with the adoption by consensus of the Principles and guidelines on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the states of the region concerned. Those principles and guidelines encouraged the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in regions with regard to which consensus resolutions of the General Assembly exist, such as the Middle East.

The latest instance of such support came during the 2000 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), whose consensus Final Document invited

“all States, especially States of the Middle East, to reaffirm or declare their support for the objective of establishing an effectively verifiable Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons as well as other weapons of mass destruction, to transmit their declarations of support to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to take practical steps towards that objective.” (*NPT/CONF.2000/28, Parts I and II, p. 18*)

The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East would greatly contribute to arresting the proliferation of the threat from nuclear weapons and to strengthening the security of all States of the region, and consequently would be deemed an important confidence-building measure towards the achievement of a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East.

During the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly, the study (A/45/435, annex) on effective and verifiable measures which would facilitate the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East was presented for the Committee’s consideration. The study was well received as a useful and balanced approach to attain an important objective, which indeed we have to pursue.

For over 21 years now, the Middle East nuclear-weapon-free zone has been unanimously anticipated — a record which indeed testifies to the overwhelming support for the creation of such a zone. However, the plain truth is that this objective seems to be eluding us. No concrete measures, no operational measures and no serious talks have yet been held, formally or even informally, among regional parties with a view to putting into practice what all of us here seem to aspire to or preach.

Despite the general frustration over the stagnation of the efforts to establish the Middle East nuclear-weapon-free zone, Egypt firmly supports implementation of the resolution that is annually adopted. Nevertheless, our endorsement must not be misconstrued or misinterpreted as tacit acquiescence. To the contrary, Egypt continues to be committed to the earliest and speedy establishment and implementation of the principles and provisions for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, and indeed of a zone free from all weapons of mass destruction. In a region fraught with tension, such as the Middle East, such a zone cannot be looked upon as an a posteriori peace dividend; instead, it should be seen as an essential confidence-building measure facilitating, and leading the way towards, a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East, a peace which indeed will provide a better future for coming generations.

We fully realize that peace, security and stability in the region of the Middle East will only be achieved when a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the disputes in the Middle East is attained. It is

essential to create the necessary conditions and suitable climate that would facilitate the achievement of this objective. In our view, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone would contribute substantially.

It is our considered opinion that the time is now more than ripe to proceed towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. For this reason, paragraph 10 of the draft resolution endeavours once again to utilize the good offices of the Secretary-General to inject the necessary stimulus into the process. It seems timely today to seriously embark on laying a solid foundation on which to proceed in this regard. The same paragraph requests the Secretary-General to pursue his consultations with the States of the region and other concerned States.

I also draw the Committee's attention to the eighth preambular paragraph and paragraph 9, in which reference is made to the establishment of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, thus aiming to broaden the scope of the 1974 initiative by adding chemical and biological weapons. Since the announcement by President Hosni Mubarak on 9 April 1990 of this initiative, later encompassed by his broader initiative of June 1998 to convene an international conference to free the world from all weapons of mass destruction, the 1990 initiative has been attracting ever-growing support. For example, the Security Council adopted in April 1991 resolution 687 (1991), which in paragraph 14 reiterates the need to work towards the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free from all weapons of mass destruction.

Finally, as the draft resolution retains the same language as last year, with no changes, I commend it to the First Committee, earnestly hoping that it will receive the same support as in the previous 21 years and that, as in the past, it will be adopted without a vote.

**Mr. Westdal** (Canada): I formally present to the First Committee draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.31, entitled "The Conference on Disarmament decision (CD/1547) of 11 August 1998 to establish, under item 1 of its agenda entitled 'Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament', an ad hoc committee to negotiate, on the basis of the report of the Special Coordinator (CD/1299) and the mandate contained therein, a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons

or other nuclear explosive devices". The acronym derived from this title is very long and essentially unpronounceable.

This draft resolution is identical to resolution 55/33 of 20 November 2000, adopted without a vote by this Committee and the General Assembly. We all are aware of the long history of this proposal and of the fact that complex negotiations lie ahead. The draft resolution is strictly procedural, anchored firmly in the expectations and current realities of the international community.

Canada values this draft resolution. It expresses determination that we might all together conclude a multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. Such a treaty is fundamental to both disarmament and non-proliferation. We thus very much hope that this draft resolution will be adopted without amendment and without a vote.

The draft is open for co-sponsorship; the sheet is available from members of the Canadian delegation. We welcome all who wish to join us in this expression of fundamental security interest.

**The Chairman:** Indeed, draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.31 has, as the representative of Canada noted, a long and unpronounceable, but very familiar, title.

**Mr. Albin** (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I have the pleasure of submitting draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.16, entitled "United Nations conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament", under item 74 of the agenda of the General Assembly, entitled "General and complete disarmament".

The Government of Mexico, in keeping with its longstanding tradition of support for the objective of returning to a world free from nuclear weapons, has decided to submit a new initiative in the field of nuclear disarmament. The starting point is the proposal made by the Secretary-General at the Millennium Summit to convene a United Nations conference on ways to reduce nuclear danger. Our heads of State and Government welcomed this initiative, which was reflected in the Millennium Declaration.

We must acknowledge that we have not been able to make progress in the field of nuclear disarmament,

as required by circumstances and by the billions of human lives at stake. Our efforts have not borne fruit. It has not been possible to convene the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, despite the intensive debates we have held in recent years.

We all welcomed the results of the sixth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). However, today there are no objective grounds for optimism. Practically no progress has been made in the implementation of the 13 steps towards nuclear disarmament that were agreed upon by consensus at the year 2000 Conference.

Mexico is convinced that the international context offers the opportunity to supplement the efforts made in the context of the process of the NPT review, as well as those of the Conference on Disarmament, which, paralysed and with no prospects for progress in the near term, is only multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament.

In its first preambular paragraph, the draft resolution notes the threat to humanity represented by the existence of nuclear weapons. It also reaffirms the commitment of the international community to achieving a nuclear-weapon-free world. It includes references to the Millennium Declaration and to the note by the Secretary-General entitled "Reducing nuclear danger", which, in our opinion, provides an appropriate conceptual framework for that kind of effort.

The operative part of the draft underlines the need for the international community to address nuclear disarmament and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in all its aspects. It also underlines the importance of complementing the efforts of the Conference on Disarmament and the review process of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to address nuclear disarmament.

In operative paragraph 3, it decides to convene a United Nations conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament. Taking into account the comments made during informal consultations, which the Mexican delegation endorsed, it indicates that the conference should be held in New York not later than 2006.

In operative paragraph 4, it decides to establish an open-ended preparatory committee which will hold no fewer than three sessions, the first session to be held in New York not later than July 2003, the dates of which will be decided at the fifty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

Operative paragraph 8 stresses the need to ensure the widest possible and effective participation and support of the conference and its preparatory work by non-governmental organizations and civil society.

In the preparatory process of the conference, we will define its objectives, agenda and possible final outcome. We do not intend to duplicate, or interfere with, other ongoing processes. We are convinced that adequate preparation will only confirm the validity, relevance and timeliness of holding a conference of this nature.

Mexico hopes that draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.16 will be considered from that viewpoint and that it will promote the political will of all Member States to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

The delegation of Mexico would also like to submit, on behalf of Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela, draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.17, with regard to item 80 of the agenda, entitled "Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin American and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)".

The priority that the Governments of the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean attach to the consolidation of the regime for the prohibition of nuclear weapons established by the Treaty of Tlatelolco has once again been made clear this year by the fact that the draft resolution has been sponsored by almost all of the States parties to and signatories of the Treaty.

In its operative part, the draft resolution welcomes the concrete steps taken by some countries of the region during recent years for the consolidation of the regime of military denuclearization established

by the Treaty and urges the countries of the region that have not yet done so to deposit their instruments of ratification of the amendments to the Treaty approved by the General Conference of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin American and Caribbean in its resolutions 267, 268, and 290.

Paragraph 3 decides to include in the provisional agenda of the fifty-eighth session the item on the Treaty of Tlatelolco — that is, it decides that the item will be dealt with on a biennial basis. We hope that draft resolution A/56/L.17 will, like those of past years, receive the broadest support of the First Committee and that it will be adopted without a vote.

**Mr. Bakhit** (Sudan) (*spoke in Arabic*): I have the honour to introduce on behalf of the African Group, chaired by my country, draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.9, entitled “African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty”. Africa attaches particular importance to this Treaty, through which the African countries are contributing to the preservation of regional and international peace and security. This was reaffirmed in April 1996 by the Security Council, which welcomed the signing of the Treaty as a means of strengthening international peace and security.

The draft resolution calls upon African States that have not yet done so to sign and ratify the Treaty so that it can enter into force. It expresses its appreciation to the nuclear-weapon States that have signed the Protocols that concern them, and calls upon those that have not yet ratified the Protocols concerning them to do so as soon as possible.

The draft resolution calls upon the African States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons that have not yet done so to conclude comprehensive safeguards agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency. The African States also consider that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, especially in the Middle East, would enhance security in Africa and the viability of the African nuclear-weapon-free zone.

The draft resolution also calls upon the States contemplated in Protocol III to the Treaty that have not yet done so to take all necessary measures to apply the provisions of the Treaty for which they are, *de jure* or *de facto*, responsible. In addition, the draft resolution expresses its gratitude to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity and the Director General

of the International Atomic Energy Agency for the diligence with which they have rendered effective assistance to the signatories of the Treaty.

The African States also call upon all Member States to support the draft resolution, as in past years, in order to strengthen peace and security on the continent.

I also have the pleasure to introduce, on behalf of the African States, under agenda item 74 (c), draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.33, entitled “Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes”. It is no secret to Member States that it is dangerous to dump any form of radioactive waste, which could be used in radiological warfare, as well as having other harmful effects on regional and international peace, especially in developing countries. Africa attaches particular importance to this matter, as shown by the adoption by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity of a number of resolutions concerning the ban on importing radioactive wastes into Africa and the control of its transport across borders.

In this regard, the draft resolution calls on all Member States to take appropriate measures with a view to preventing any dumping of nuclear or radioactive wastes that would infringe upon the sovereignty of States. It requests the Conference on Disarmament to work towards the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of radiological weapons, and to consider radioactive waste as part of the scope of such a convention.

The draft resolution also appeals to Member States to become party to the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management, and to do so in time to attend the First Review Meeting of the Contracting Parties. We hope that, as in the past, members of the Committee will support this draft resolution in order to strengthen peace and security on our continent.

**The Chairman:** Does any other delegation wish to take the floor, either to introduce draft resolutions or to make a statement with regard to the discussion on nuclear issues?

That appears not to be the case.

I call on the representative of Japan, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

**Mr. Noboru** (Japan): We believe that the statement made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on Wednesday, 17 October, does not deserve a response, because it was based entirely on unfounded or distorted information. However, for the record, I would like to take this opportunity to explain the position of my delegation concerning some issues raised by that delegation.

At the outset, I would like to make it clear that the allegation made by the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea that Japan was attempting to become a military Power and revive militarism is entirely unfounded and absurd. Under the Constitution, the national security policy of Japan is exclusively defence-oriented, seeking only to maintain effective self-defence capabilities.

In the bilateral context, Japan has been making enormous efforts to normalize its relationship with North Korea as a way of contributing to peace and security in North-East Asia. Its policy is in no way hostile to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Now let me clarify the specific points raised by the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Firstly, the launch of the H2A rocket was carried out in accordance with the principles of the peaceful uses of outer space enshrined in our national laws, and it has no military implications whatsoever. Secondly, as a matter of course, nuclear energy is used only for peaceful purposes in Japan. The IAEA full-scope safeguards are applied to all nuclear facilities and nuclear materials, including plutonium. Thus, it is fully understood by the international community that outer space and nuclear activities are strictly limited to

peaceful purposes. Thirdly, the revision of the law on self-defence forces, which is now under deliberation by the Japanese Parliament, does not in any way relate to the overseas deployment of the self-defence forces. Its objective is solely for the purpose of ensuring the effective activity of the self-defence forces within Japan.

As a nation that has experienced the devastation of nuclear bombs, Japan shares with other nations a strong desire for peace and the elimination of nuclear weapons. To that end, the Government of Japan has continued to make diplomatic efforts aimed at achieving steady and step-by-step nuclear disarmament. It is for this reason that Japan has again submitted to the Committee the draft resolution entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons", which I will formally introduce in the Committee tomorrow.

**The Chairman:** I would like to inform delegates that we will devote tomorrow to the issue of nuclear weapons. I want us to make full use of our time. At this point in time I would simply like to invite delegations to kindly introduce their drafts as early as possible, so as to allow delegations to make comments on them and to allow consultations on them. We now have a number of resolutions that have been submitted, so I would like delegations to make use of the remaining time today for effective consultations. Since I have no other choice than to adjourn the meeting, I would like again to remind delegates that we will be meeting tomorrow, 23 October, in this room, and I hope that the performance then will be better than today in terms of the number of statements made.

*The meeting rose at 11.05 a.m.*