

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

FIRST COMMITTEE  
29th meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 7 November 1989  
at 10 a.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 29th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela)

CONTENTS

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

This record is subject to correction.  
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned  
within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750,  
2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/44/PV.29  
14 November 1989  
ENGLISH

89-63183 4517V (E)

27 p.

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

AGENDA ITEMS 49 TO 69 AND 151 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The efforts of the United Nations in the field of disarmament require, in addition to the political will of all Member States, a well-informed world public opinion. Thus, the decision taken at the twelfth special session of the General Assembly, the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, that it should guarantee

"the widest possible dissemination of information and unimpeded access for all sectors of the public to a broad range of information and opinions on questions of arms limitation and disarmament and the dangers relating to all aspects of the arms race and war, in particular nuclear war" (A/S-12/32, annex V, para. 4).

Since then, the General Assembly has adopted a resolution on that question every year. It is now my honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.4 on the agenda item "World Disarmament Campaign," agenda item 64. The draft resolution is sponsored by Bangladesh, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Peru, the Philippines, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Mexico.

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

Draft resolution L.4 is a repetition, mutatis mutandis, of resolution 43/76 C adopted last year. I shall therefore refer only to the changes that have been introduced into this year's text.

Paragraph 4 has been changed and now reads:

"Urges States that have not yet done so, especially those with the largest military expenditures, to make an initial financial contribution to the Campaign".

The draft resolution also contains a new paragraph, paragraph 9, which reads:

"Also requests the Secretary-General to assess the achievements and shortcomings of the World Disarmament Campaign so far and to submit a brief report in this regard to the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session".

Concerning that request, the sponsors are aware that the Secretary-General has reported on a regular basis on the implementation of the Campaign's programme of activities by the United Nations system. However, we believe that it would be useful for Member States to have, in a brief - and I emphasize "brief" - document, an objective evaluation of the achievements and shortcomings of the Campaign to date.

Mrs. URIBE de LOZANO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.37, entitled "International arms transfers", on behalf of its sponsors, which are: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Costa Rica, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, the Federal Republic of Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, Sweden, the United Kingdom and Colombia.

The draft resolution, which is procedural in nature, is a follow-up to General Assembly resolution 43/75 I of 7 December 1988. It reaffirms the conviction that

**Best Copy Available**

(Mrs. Uribe de Lozano, Colombia)

arms transfers in all their aspects deserve serious consideration by the international community. The following preambular paragraphs take into account the growing awareness by Member States of the significance of international arms transfers for arms limitation and arms control and welcome the fact that the issue has been placed on the agenda of the General Assembly and of the Disarmament Commission.

The fifth preambular paragraph also welcomes the report of the Secretary-General, document A/44/444/Add.1 and 2, which contains the views of several Governments on this question. Although this is not a suitable time for an analysis of those views, we should like to note that all of them consider the possibility of strengthening international peace and security by controlling indiscriminate transfers of weapons by various means.

The sixth preambular paragraph looks forward to the United Nations study on international arms transfers and the report of the study group to be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-sixth session in keeping with resolution 43/75 I and the principles underlying it. We would note that resolution 43/75 I also requests the Secretary-General, with the assistance of governmental experts, to carry out a study on ways and means of promoting transparency in international transfers of conventional arms on a universal and non-discriminatory basis, also taking into consideration the views of Member States.

We believe that the contribution of all States is of great importance in our consideration of this agenda item, and paragraph 1 of the draft resolution urges all Member States that have not yet done so to make available to the Secretary-General their views and proposals on the matters contained in paragraphs 1 and 2 of resolution 43/75 I.

(Mrs. Uribe de Lozano, Colombia)

This year the Disarmament Commission began an important debate on the question of international arms transfers. It is our hope that that work will continue in 1990, and paragraph 2 of the draft resolution requests the Disarmament Commission to do so. In our view, that paragraph is of fundamental significance because the deliberative and democratic character of the Disarmament Commission allows for the participation of all States on this question.

In conclusion, paragraph 3 requests the Secretary-General to continue to make available within the framework of resolution 43/75 I all relevant information on this matter, and operative paragraph 4 decides to include in the provisional agenda of the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly the item entitled "International arms transfers."

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I now call upon Ambassador Daya Perera of Sri Lanka, who will present the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, of which he is Chairman.

Mr. PERERA (Sri Lanka): Since this is the first time I have spoken in the First Committee at this session, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on your election to guide the work of this very important Committee, and to assure you of the continued support of my delegation.

On behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean I have the honour to introduce the report of the Ad Hoc Committee, document A/44/29. As members may recall, on 7 December 1988 the General Assembly adopted by consensus resolution 43/79. Paragraph 7 of that consensus resolution requested the Ad Hoc Committee to hold two preparatory sessions during the first half of 1989 with a view to completing the remaining preparatory work relating to the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean in Colombo in 1990.

(Mr. Perera, Sri Lanka)

Pursuant to that General Assembly resolution, the Ad Hoc Committee held two sessions in 1989, the first from 10 to 14 April and the second from 5 to 19 July. At the request of the Ad Hoc Committee, I consulted the Government of Sri Lanka, the host Government for the proposed Conference, and reported to the Ad Hoc Committee at its 358th meeting, on 13 July, that the Government of Sri Lanka was prepared to hold the Conference at Colombo from 2 to 13 July 1990.

The Working Group established by the Ad Hoc Committee in 1985 continued its work under the chairmanship of Ambassador Edmond Jayasinghe of Sri Lanka. In its various formal and informal consultations the Working Group continued consideration of substantive issues and principles relating to the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. Perera, Sri Lanka)

The Chairman of the Working Group, at my request as Chairman of the Committee, presented two reports on the work of the group in the course of the Ad Hoc Committee's two sessions in 1989. The latest report was presented at the 356th meeting, held on 12 July. This report contained 19 revised substantive issues and principles that the Committee considered appropriate for further elaboration. The Ad Hoc Committee, between the 353rd and 356th meetings and in an informal meeting held on 7 and 8 July, exchanged views on organizational and procedural matters, including the provisional agenda for the Conference, the rules of procedure and the structure of the Conference. The Ad Hoc Committee was not able, however, to agree on a draft resolution which it could recommend by consensus to the General Assembly for its consideration. Therefore, this year's report of the Ad Hoc Committee to the General Assembly does not contain a draft resolution.

At the end of the second session, on 19 July, as the discussions in the Ad Hoc Committee were inconclusive, the Committee mandated me to conduct informal consultations in order to facilitate the adoption by consensus of a resolution at the forth-fourth session of the General Assembly. Accordingly, I have conducted consultations with the members of the Ad Hoc Committee. However, I regret to report to you that despite the view of the overwhelming majority of members of the Ad Hoc Committee that sufficient preparatory work had been completed to make possible the convening of the Conference in Colombo in July 1990, I was not able to bring about consensus among the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on this question. As a result of this, I do not have a draft resolution that I can submit to this Committee. I would therefore request the Committee itself to consider the matter and take a decision on this question.

(Mr. Perera, Sri Lanka)

Before concluding my remarks, I have the pleasure to report that the Ad Hoc Committee, pursuant to paragraph 9 of resolution 43/79, commemorated, at its 357th meeting, on 13 July, the tenth anniversary of the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, held in July 1979. The meeting was attended by members of the Ad Hoc Committee and the representatives of Bhutan, Myanmar, Nepal and Viet Nam, and the representatives of non-governmental organizations.

Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish to deal with a very important matter, "Israeli nuclear armament" - item 68 of this session's General Assembly agenda. Though year after year the Arab States have with great frequency drawn the attention of the international community represented at the United Nations - including the Powers able to exert pressure on Israel - to the gravity of Israel's nuclear armament, we see no indication of serious determination to deal with the matter. This is dangerous not only for a specific area but for the peace and security of the entire world.

This year we are faced with an important development. Authoritative information pertaining to the item under discussion has been disclosed by United States media. It describes the co-operation taking place between Israel and South Africa through an agreement under which Israel, with the assistance of South Africa, is manufacturing medium- and long-range nuclear missiles. In return South Africa is providing Israel with the enriched uranium used to manufacture the nuclear warheads that are attached to those missile. Furthermore, Israel is striving to obtain more sophisticated and advanced computer techniques for use in the development of missiles and the production of the hydrogen bomb. This is in



(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

flagrant defiance of the efforts of the efforts of the United Nations to transform Africa and the Middle East into nuclear-weapon-free zones, and it is leading to an arms race in this field between the countries of the area, which gravely threatens the security of Africa, the Middle East and the whole world.

There is a contradiction that should be stressed here. At a time when the world is witnessing an important relaxation of tensions in international relations; at a time when diligent efforts are being made towards conventional and nuclear disarmament; at a time when preparations are being made for the Fourth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons - at this of all times Israel is moving in the opposite direction, striving to strengthen its nuclear capability and to develop nuclear-weapon delivery systems. This is being done under a veil of utter silence, especially on the part of those that could exert pressure on Israel.

Any observer would note in all fairness that Israel's objective in strengthening its nuclear capability is to impose its hegemony on the area and step up its aggressive designs. Israeli practices, in actual fact, confirm that Israel is irresponsible, ignores the consequences of its actions, and is indifferent to peace and security. Thus Israel destroyed the nuclear reactor in Iraq built for peaceful purposes, and violated the sovereignty of Tunisia, an independent Member State of the United Nations, by attacking the headquarters of the Palestine Liberation Organization. Israel uses all oppressive means in confronting the Palestinian people who resist occupation and seek self-determination in their own homeland. Last but not least, Israel is sending long-range missiles close to the Libyan shores.

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

My country signed the non-proliferation Treaty early this year because we are convinced of the need to protect our world against destructive nuclear weapons and devoutly wish the Middle East to be a denuclearized zone. Today, my country, aware of its responsibilities as a peace-loving country, appeals to the international community to shoulder its responsibility in the maintenance of international peace and security and calls for this situation to be considered with all due seriousness because it involves the security of the Middle East and Africa and is leading to a nuclear-arms race.

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

We ask the international community to take a clear-cut position when confronted with the challenge to the will of mankind represented by the co-operation between the two racist régimes of Tel Aviv and Pretoria in the development of medium- and long-range missiles which can be fitted with nuclear warheads. My country believes the United States has a special responsibility and can play a fundamental role in this regard.

Dame HERCUS (New Zealand): On behalf of the delegations of New Zealand and Australia, I have the honour to introduce to the First Committee the draft resolution in document A/C.1/44/L.50, entitled "Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty".

The text was, as in the past, drafted by New Zealand and Australia in consultation with a small group of other delegations. It is sponsored by the following States: Australia, Austria, Barbados, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Iceland, Japan, Ecuador, Malaysia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, the Solomon Islands, Sweden, Vanuatu and Zaire. The draft before you is based on resolution 43/64, adopted by the General Assembly last year by 146 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.

The 28 sponsors of this draft resolution are convinced of the urgent need to conclude a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. Such a treaty, in our view - a view expressed in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution - is an essential step in order to prevent the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear weapons. It would also help prevent horizontal proliferation and contribute to the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons. This is a goal we all share.

(Dame Hercus, New Zealand)

This resolution recognizes the progress made in the nuclear testing negotiations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In their 23 September 1989 statement, both countries reported the agreement they had reached on verification procedures which will enable them to ratify the 1974 threshold test-ban Treaty and the 1976 Treaty on peaceful nuclear explosions. We urge them to complete this process.

But, as our draft makes clear, we consider that the most effective way to bring an end to nuclear testing by all States in all environments for all time is through the multilateral negotiation of a treaty which would attract the adherence of all States. The Conference on Disarmament has a particular responsibility in this regard, a responsibility which is spelled out in paragraphs 2 and 3 of our resolution. We are well aware that the Conference has so far been unable to agree on a mandate for an ad hoc committee on item 1 of its agenda, "Nuclear test ban"; however, a useful process of dialogue has been initiated, which we all hope - as this draft resolution makes clear - will lead to substantive work in 1990.

In the meantime, however, the verification requirements of a comprehensive test-ban treaty are being addressed by the Ad Hoc Seismic Group. Our text supports their efforts and encourages the widest possible participation in the Group's technical test, which will take place next year.

This Committee will have before it this year recommendations on other ways to bring an end to testing. We believe them to be serious recommendations worthy of close consideration. While the routes we have chosen may be different, there is no doubt that our goal remains the same: the urgent cessation of nuclear testing. We hope, therefore, that the text in document A/C.1/44/L.50 will again receive the widest support of the United Nations General Assembly. We commend it to all Member States.

Mr. WATSON (United States of America): Today the United States delegation is introducing, under agenda item 69, a draft resolution entitled "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements" (A/C.1/44/L.54). It follows the same lines as resolution 43/81 A, which was adopted without a vote last year.

In the current draft, there is a new tenth preambular paragraph that welcomes the universal recognition of the importance of the question of compliance in the context of arms limitation and disarmament agreements. This new paragraph has been added to take into account the importance that all Member States have come to accord the compliance issue, as reflected in the consensus this resolution has enjoyed during the past several years.

Paragraph 6 of the draft is also new. This paragraph has been added to take note of the contribution that verification experiments can make in enhancing confidence in the effectiveness of verification procedures. Examples of such experiments include the trial inspections that some countries have undertaken with regard to chemical facilities, and bilateral experiments such as the United States and the Soviet Union have already undertaken and are planning to conduct.

A third change in the draft resolution is in the final operative paragraph, which calls for inclusion of the item "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements" in the provisional agenda for the forty-sixth session. In moving this issue to a two-year cycle, where it will be on the General Assembly's agenda every other year, we hope that, in keeping with what we believe is the common desire for rationalizing the work of the First Committee, other well-established resolutions will be handled in a similar fashion.

(Mr. Watson, United States)

If the number of draft resolutions considered by the First Committee is reduced significantly, more time will be available for substantive consideration of new issues, and also for greater attention to a smaller set of established issues at two- or three-year intervals. The United States believes that compliance with agreements lays the groundwork for effective negotiations for further arms limitations. This is so because negotiating parties are more likely to reach agreement if they work in an atmosphere of greater mutual trust, predicated on a history of compliance with existing agreements. Negotiations are also facilitated when the negotiators have confidence that the international community as a whole, and not just the negotiating parties alone, is committed to ensuring the principle of compliance with agreements.

(Mr. Watson, United States)

The United States believes that the adoption of this draft resolution again by consensus would constitute a strong reaffirmation by the global community of the crucial importance of compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements. It would also send a message to disarmament negotiators in all forums - multilateral, regional and bilateral - that the international community strongly supports their efforts to develop new agreements that would serve the security interests of the negotiating States as well as international security.

I am pleased to note that this draft resolution on compliance is being submitted under the sponsorship, as of now, of Australia, Austria, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zaire and my own delegation.

We are very grateful to the numerous sponsors of this draft resolution, which cover almost the entire geo-political spectrum, and we invite all members of the Committee to give it their full support.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): I wish to speak today on behalf of the 12 members of the European Community, on agenda item 63 (b), on the relationship between disarmament and development. The Twelve share the international community's concern at the considerable expenditures world-wide on financing weapons and military forces. That tying up of economic, financial, technological and human resources affects developed and developing countries alike and is particularly alarming because today the international community is facing challenges that demand broad international use of resources.

(Mr. Morel, France)

With that in mind, the Twelve have taken an active part in the work of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held in New York from 24 August to 11 September 1987 pursuant to a French initiative. At the end of that Conference, the Twelve contributed actively to reaching the compromises necessary for the 150 States participating to adopt the Final Document by consensus. In that same spirit, the Twelve came out in favour of General Assembly resolutions 42/45 of 30 November 1987 and 43/75 B of 7 December 1988.

The relationship between disarmament and development is complex, owing in part to the legitimate concern of all States for their security. Moreover, the link between the desired lightening of the defence burden and the financing of development should be defined and requires additional study.

The Twelve would recall that the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development stressed that disarmament and development are two of the most urgent challenges facing the world today and that they are two pillars on which international peace and security can be built.

For there to be progress in both disarmament and development, there must be greater transparency and trust among nations. That is a fundamental requirement. It is also seen now that those ideas are indispensable for the strengthening of international peace and security. The adoption of such measures could avoid misunderstandings and false assessments of the intentions and military capabilities of others, and could therefore dispel suspicion. It is important also because if we are seriously thinking of reaching the goal of reallocating resources to development, we must pursue that goal with determination, mindful of all its aspects.



(Mr. Morel, France)

Advances towards peace, through the improvement of East-West relations and the abatement of certain regional conflicts, contribute to an improvement in the climate of security and trust in international relations.

It was in that context that the Secretary-General, in conformity with General Assembly resolution 43/75 B of 7 December 1988, prepared a report (A/44/449) on the implementation of the Action Programme of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. I wish on behalf of the Twelve to welcome that contribution to the implementation of the Final Document of the 1987 Conference. We have taken note of the measures proposed by the Secretary-General and implemented by the special high-level team set up under him, as well as the specific measures taken within the framework of the Organization or in liaison with it. The Twelve note with satisfaction the implementation of the Action Programme; they hope it will be pursued with determination and with the assistance of all.

The Twelve would therefore be pleased if draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.32, introduced by Yugoslavia on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, were adopted by consensus.

Mr. KENYON (United Kingdom): I am speaking today to introduce to the First Committee the draft resolution on objective information on military matters, on behalf of the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and 26 other sponsors. Members of the Committee will have seen the text in document A/C.1/44/L.15/Rev.1, distributed today. Relative to the version issued on 30 October, the revision consists in a substantive change of one word in the fifth preambular paragraph and some technical changes, the most visible of which is the rewording of operative paragraph 6.

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

The draft resolution represents the successful merger of texts on the subject drafted by my delegation and the delegation of the Soviet Union. The delegations sponsoring the draft resolution cover a wide spectrum of the countries represented here. The United Kingdom is particularly pleased that support for the ideas embodied in the draft resolution is becoming increasingly widespread.

The draft resolution builds upon its predecessors and carries the subject forward for consideration in the Disarmament Commission in 1990. It reflects developments during the last year: the new standard of openness enshrined in recent agreements, agreements whose value is clear to all of us. It also reflects the growing acknowledgement of the ideas we are trying to promote: those of openness and transparency in military matters and the contribution they make to the enhancement of security. We are pleased that more States have announced that they will implement the international system for the standardized reporting of military expenditures. More than 20 States have submitted information this year. That is a crucial example of the way the principles of openness and transparency can take concrete form, and we continue to attach particular importance to it.

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

The draft resolution, like its predecessor General Assembly resolution 43/75 G, continues to invite States to communicate to the Secretary-General each year measures they have adopted to facilitate the availability of objective information on military matters.

Finally, in the draft resolution the Disarmament Commission is asked to include in the agenda for its 1990 session an item entitled "Objective information on military matters". We believe that the subject will benefit from in-depth consideration in that forum. We hope that the deliberation that will take place will result in a useful document commanding consensus on the item and thus serve as a guide for the future. In resolution 43/75 G States were invited to communicate to the Secretary-General their views on the ways and means of further consolidating the emerging trend towards greater openness in military matters for consideration at the Disarmament Commission. On behalf of the United Kingdom, I can confirm that we will be submitting a paper early next year. For those States that also intend to do so, a deadline of 15 March 1990 would be reasonable to allow time for the Secretariat to process the documents before the Disarmament Commission meeting in May.

We believe that the subject which this draft resolution addresses is one whose topicality continues to increase and whose importance is becoming more widely recognized. For that reason, we commend it with some confidence to the attention of all delegations. We hope for the support of all States represented here.

I should also like to take this opportunity to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations" contained in document A/C.1/44/L.12. I do this on behalf of the delegations of Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

The immense significance for all States represented in this room of the progress made in the bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union is evident. Those two countries possess between them the overwhelming number of nuclear weapons in the world, as well as the greatest capability for the military use of space.

In the First Committee last year, I introduced on behalf of a similar group of sponsors a draft resolution on that subject that welcomed the ratification by the Soviet Union and the United States of the Treaty on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Nuclear Missiles - the INF Treaty - and the commencement of its implementation, and encouraged those two States to proceed to further negotiations on a complex of questions concerning space and strategic arms. The intervening year has seen further implementation of the INF Treaty in accordance with its provisions. The people of the world, through the medium of television, have watched real disarmament in action in the destruction of those intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles by both sides. The provisions in the Treaty for effective verification have been implemented, not only on the territory of the countries primarily involved, but also in other countries like my own where the missiles have been stationed.

The Committee has also heard from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America that they have made substantial progress in the past year towards a treaty on a 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive arms within the framework of the Geneva nuclear and space talks. The matters under negotiation are complex, and vital security issues are at stake. Nevertheless, both sides have recorded extensive and significant areas of agreement, and detailed positions on remaining areas of disagreement. The negotiations are firmly set on a positive

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

path. An early successful conclusion would be of great importance to international peace and security.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America have both reported on the state of negotiations to the General Assembly and have also given briefings to the Conference on Disarmament. In doing so, they have responded to the invitation in General Assembly resolution 43/75 O to keep other Member States informed of progress.

It seems to us desirable that the United Nations should both welcome the achievements of the bilateral process in 1989 and call for continued progress in the year ahead. That is the thrust of the draft resolution we are introducing today. Those two points have been emphasized in virtually every statement in our plenary debate and it should therefore be possible for us to agree on a single resolution text and adopt it without a vote. Such an outcome would enable the General Assembly to give a clear and strong statement of encouragement. My delegation, together with the other sponsors, looks forward to continuing the discussions already begun with the delegation of Yugoslavia, sponsor of the draft resolution in A/C.1/44/L.31, in an attempt to achieve that.

Mr. WATSON (United States of America): In listing the sponsors of the draft resolution entitled "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements", I inadvertantly failed to mention Greece, which has been a very strong supporter of compliance for many years and whose co-sponsorship of that draft resolution we value highly and very much appreciate.

Mr. SZABO (Hungary): As a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.15/Rev.1 entitled, "Objective information on military matters", which has just been introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom, my delegation is firmly convinced that the provision by States of objective military information

(Mr. Szabo, Hungary)

has a beneficial effect at global, regional and sub-regional levels. It promotes confidence and greater understanding among States and paves the way for possible disarmament agreements.

Without objective and reliable information, it is inconceivable that it would be possible to dispel distrust, increase the degree of predictability of each other's intentions, reduce the level of military confrontation, and arrive at concrete and feasible disarmament agreements.

It is a strange contradiction that in this era of informational revolution, the flow of military information related to arms limitation and disarmament efforts lags behind the pace at which glasnost is progressing in other fields. One reason for that lies in the fact that inter-State relations have been overburdened by ideological considerations during the past decades. A hopeful sign is the growing recognition today that the interdependence of countries with different social systems requires a fundamental change in that respect, too.

The elimination of that unwholesome relationship requires, among other things, that military openness be treated as a natural norm of inter-State relations and a means and basis for real and verifiable disarmament measures. It is a hopeful sign that today hardly any State denies the indispensable role played by the multilateral flow of objective military information in strengthening confidence and security or in the verification of compliance with disarmament agreements.

(Mr. Szabo, Hungary)

At the same time, mistrust of military openness still exists. Such mistrust, based on an obsession with military secrecy, might be detrimental to the disarmament process because it will inevitably result in a lack of objective information on the military strength of States, thus increasing uncertainty, mistrust and apprehension. In my delegation's view, the climate of today's international relations requires and inspires a diametrically opposite approach.

Hungary is actively seeking to promote the cause of military openness, favouring the mutual release of data on the level and main characteristics of the armaments and armed forces of States inside and outside military alliances.

Acting in that spirit, Hungary is making the necessary preparations to join the United Nations international system for the standardized reporting of military expenditures. As a first step, some data on its defence budget has already been published.

Hungary's desire for openness has been demonstrated by its proposal on the creation of a regional security- and confidence-building zone, partially free from offensive weapons, along our common borders with Austria and Yugoslavia. In that initiative, Hungary undertakes as a unilateral measure, inter alia, to provide regular information about the size and dislocation of the forces remaining in the zone, to allow regular information to be obtained about the activities of troops, and to permit military observers of the two neighbouring States to attend all manoeuvres in the zone.

My delegation would like to seize this opportunity to express its full support for all the initiatives, within and outside the United Nations, providing for the exchange of objective - that is to say correct, reliable, assessable, comparable and verifiable - information on military matters.

It is in that spirit that Hungary joined in sponsoring draft resolution  
A/C.1/44/L.15/Rev.1.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Canada): I am very pleased that Canada is once again introducing the draft resolution that this year is contained in document A/C.1/44/L.24 of 30 October 1989, entitled "Prohibition of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes". The draft resolution is sponsored by Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Botswana, the Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Romania, Samoa, Sweden, Uruguay and Canada, a group drawn from every continent and every group of countries.

It is our view that this draft resolution, whose predecessors we have been privileged to introduce for a number of years now, makes an important statement. It is a reminder to all of us that there are several differing paths that need to be followed in our shared pursuit of a nuclear-weapon-free world. A comprehensive test ban will certainly contribute to that end, but even the total cessation of nuclear testing by itself can be no guarantee that the manufacturing and updating of nuclear weapons could not continue in spite of that achievement. Thus, a ban on the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes constitutes another important element in any progress towards nuclear disarmament. The objective of this draft resolution, which is to choke off at the source the production of a requisite for the manufacture of nuclear weapons, nicely complements the test-ban approach.

We believe this is a realistic draft resolution, because it takes the position that progress towards the achievement of such a ban is related to progress towards the realization of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban.

In that respect there continue to be encouraging developments, developments which give additional meaning to the draft resolution before us. The commencement two years ago of full-scale stage-by-stage negotiations on nuclear testing by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was one



(Mr. Robertson, Canada)

important milestone. The holding of the United States-USSR joint nuclear verification tests in 1988 constituted another landmark for the enhancement of verification capabilities. The recent Wyoming meeting achieved progress on verification issues towards the ratification of the threshold test-ban Treaty as well as the peaceful nuclear explosions Treaty, leading to further limitations on the size and number of tests. The ratification of those treaties will represent another significant step towards our goal.

Those are the reasons why I urge all delegations to give their support to this draft resolution, which the sponsors sincerely hope will continue to attract strong and broad support.

Mr. REESE (Australia): Australia wishes to speak in support of the draft resolution entitled "Urged for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty", document A/C.1/44/L.50, introduced by my colleague from New Zealand earlier this morning.

For Australia, the achievement of a nuclear-test ban is a matter of high priority. With New Zealand, we first took the initiative in 1983 of sponsoring a test-ban resolution in the United Nations, with the aim of promoting a mandate for work on testing issues to get under way in the Conference on Disarmament. The necessary consensus on the formation of an ad hoc committee in the Conference on Disarmament has foundered on the question of a negotiating mandate. Australia would strongly prefer direct negotiations towards a comprehensive test-ban treaty and understands those who have been reluctant to accept anything less. Our greater concern, however, has been to see the Conference on Disarmament begin concrete work on the outstanding issues such as scope, verification and compliance. Essential work directed at a comprehensive test-ban treaty can be done under a non-negotiating mandate.

(Mr. Reese, Australia)

We have therefore held the view that the Conference on Disarmament should not be prevented from doing the work essential to a comprehensive test-ban treaty simply because that work is not described as the negotiation of a treaty.

It is a matter of regret that we still have not reached agreement on that mandate. What has been noticeable in the past year is a growing concern among Conference on Disarmament members that we must get agreement on such a mandate. We hope that by putting forward our draft resolution again this year we will stimulate the achievement of that goal.

We should, however, acknowledge that there has been some welcome movement between the principal nuclear-weapon States, the United States and the Soviet Union. The mandate for these negotiations is, of course, far more limited than the negotiation of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

(Mr. Reese, Australia)

But we nevertheless welcome what we hope will be prompt and expeditious negotiations towards militarily significant interim limitations on nuclear testing. These negotiations are not a substitute, however, for a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The frustration that nations have felt over the absence of negotiations towards a comprehensive test-ban treaty is evident in the proposal for a conference to amend the partial test-ban Treaty.

As I said in our statement before the First Committee on 18 October, Australia will participate in the conference to amend the partial test-ban Treaty, but we regard the Conference on Disarmament to be the correct place for negotiation and realization of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

We must get on with this work, our goal being a comprehensive test-ban that will attract the adherence of all States and effectively realize the imperative of nuclear disarmament.

The meeting rose at 11.35 a.m.