



---

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 29th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. Roche (Canada)

CONTENTS

- CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS (51 TO 69, 139, 141 AND 145) (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 DC2-150, 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 fascicle for each Committee.

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 51 to 69, 139, 141 and 145 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Ms. URIBE de LOZANO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.22, entitled "International arms transfers, which is sponsored by Australia, Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Peru and Sweden. Additional sponsors are Bangladesh, Paraguay and the Philippines.

This draft resolution recalls what has been said for many years now - in particular at the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament - about the need to tackle as soon as possible a problem that persists in the world today, with all its dramatic and terrible consequences.

To illustrate the magnitude of the problem of international arms transfers, and to demonstrate its urgency and the humanitarian and pragmatic approach that we must adopt in our efforts to find a solution, let me quote from several statements that were made during the general debate at the third special session by the heads of State and foreign ministers of various countries.

The Prime Minister of Finland said:

(spoke in English)

"There are a number of areas - even a growing number - in which a multilateral approach is necessary. Chemical weapons is one, conventional arms and arms transfers is another." (A/S-15/PV.4, p. 21)

(continued in Spanish)

The Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia said:

(spoke in English)

"We should also open up the question of how we might together regulate international arms transfers in both their overt and covert forms. The

(Ms. Uribe de Lozano, Colombia)

spectacle of States attempting to solve political or foreign policy problems through arms transfers is seen too often, and is clearly revealed as providing no solution at all." (A/S-15/PV.3, p. 57)

(continued in Spanish)

The Minister for External Affairs of Nigeria said:

(spoke in English)

"We in the developing part of the world who have had to endure the consequences of the more than 150 wars since 1945, continue to be the victims of the aggressive marketing of conventional weapons by the arms producers.

...

"... my delegation hopes that this session will agree on an unambiguous statement to the effect that an essential element of the disarmament process is an undertaking by the major exporters of conventional weapons to reduce progressively arms exports to the third world." (A/S-15/PV.11, p. 41, 42)

(continued in Spanish)

The Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany said:

(spoke in English)

"... arms exports must be brought under control. We need, at last, a United Nations register of the arms exports and imports of all countries."

(A/S-15/PV.8, p. 36)

(continued in Spanish)

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ghana said:

(spoke in English)

"Since the end of the Second World War not only have most regional conflicts been fought or are being fought in third world countries but also some of those countries have become greedy customers for conventional arms in order to

(Ms. Uribe de Lozano, Colombia)

prosecute protracted wars and have thus unwittingly turned themselves into laboratories for testing weapons produced by developed countries.

...

It is the view of the Ghana delegation that this special session of the General Assembly should accord deserved attention to the problems of conventional weapons and their transfer." (A/S-15/PV.6, p. 61, 63)

(continued in Spanish)

Thus, that Prime Minister and those Foreign Ministers demonstrated need for legislation to prevent international arms transfers. Indonesia, New Zealand, Uganda, Guyana, as well as Italy, Luxembourg, Costa Rica, Peru, the Soviet Union, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Pakistan, Iraq, Somalia, the United States of America, Sweden, Denmark, Senegal, the League of Arab States, Gabon, Haiti and Belize all referred to this matter. Belize made the proposal:

(spoke in English)

"that the human dimension assume the highest priority in disarmament."

(A/S-15/PV.21, p. 16)

(continued in Spanish)

We should like to make a similar proposal at this session. We are here to champion the cause of human beings. That is the meaning of document A/43/668, in which the views of my Government on this issue are expressed. It is also our fundamental reason for submitting draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.22.

(Ms. Uribe de Lozano,  
Colombia)

In the preamble, we refer to the responsibility on the part of all States, a responsibility incumbent upon them under the Charter of the United Nations, to promote the maintenance of international peace and security. Implicit in that responsibility are the rights of all peoples to live in peace and to develop in dignity, without recourse to weapons to defend those rights.

We also bear in mind that the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, points out, in paragraph 22, the need to hold negotiations on international arms transfers and calls attention to the general principles that should govern such transfers, including the need for States to protect their security.

We also bear in mind the knowledge and experience acquired and conveyed by Member States and groups of experts on various topics dealing with international arms transfers, experience which is made clear in studies and documents that are of great value in the consideration of the subject with which we are dealing.

The operative part restates, almost word for word, the concerns of many States regarding international arms transfers and suggests possible measures on which we could focus our attention and future deliberations.

In operative paragraph 2, the Assembly would request Member States to consider the possibility of taking action on the national, regional and international levels. These are not new concepts. These measures have been the subject of careful study by various experts and result from the experience of certain Member States. They have already been identified as the most relevant measures for controlling international arms transfers and countering the harmful effects of those transfers on international peace and security.

We shall now comment on those measures.

(Ms. Uribe de Lozano,  
Colombia)

In requesting Member States to reinforce their national systems of control and vigilance over the arms produced by them or transported through their territories, we are calling attention to the obligation on the part of all States to act in a constructive manner to achieve peace throughout the globe and also to the obligation of all States to respect international norms within their own frontiers. This fundamental principle makes States responsible vis-à-vis international law and is the corollary of the sovereign right of States.

National control measures must cover all types of arms, in particular those that are the object of clandestine traffic.

Ways and means which we could consider on a regional basis to limit the acquisition of arms that go beyond legitimate national security requirements or which could generate uncertainties in the region, could have many positive effects, inter alia, that of developing confidence in the region and reducing the need for trade in those arms, thereby making it possible for greater resources to be allocated for development purposes. We should also envisage the possibility, in a regional context, of finding ways and means to avoid such clandestine trade.

The measures I have mentioned, to be credible, require greater openness and transparency. As is clear from subparagraph (c) of operative paragraph 2, Member States are requested to consider agreement on the establishment, within the United Nations, of a system of information on arms transfers on a universal and non-discriminatory basis. Such a system, in our view, could throw light on the dimensions of the problem and could also contribute to identifying the covert aspects of international arms transfers.

The efforts which have been made to achieve agreement on conventional disarmament on the international level are still tentative. Suffice it to note that up to now conventional disarmament has not been the subject of study in the

(Ms. Uribe de Lozano,  
Colombia)

sole multilateral forum authorized to negotiate agreements on disarmament, that is, the Conference on Disarmament.

This is indeed a paradox, for it is precisely conventional weapons that have been used since the Second World War and that, during that time, have resulted in the death of millions of persons. It is also extremely paradoxical to see that in 40 years we have not managed to achieve agreements on the avoidance of war or the build-up of conventional weapons, which constitute the major part of global military expenditures, nor have we been able to prevent the traffic in arms, with its serious consequences for international peace and security. Therefore, in this draft resolution Member States are requested to step up their work and to discuss these questions in the Disarmament Commission, the only United Nations forum for deliberations on disarmament to which all States have access.

Without denying the importance we attach to nuclear disarmament, and without wishing to deny the inalienable right of all sovereign States to protect their security, we must stress that it is no longer possible to delay substantive study of this problem and the formulation of international agreements regarding international arms transfers.

It has been stated that progress in the field of disarmament requires systematic co-ordination and planning in which all States take part. This shows that it is up to the Member States to point out the practical ways in which they can guide their efforts towards action. In the case of this draft resolution, the set of studies and investigations on the question of arms transfers, in addition to what we ourselves have experienced and suffered, would be a valuable contribution to consideration of the means mentioned in operative paragraph 2, and would support the views of States on this matter.

(Ms. Uribe de Lozano,  
Colombia)

In this task, we would also count on the co-operation of the Secretary-General who, with the assistance of governmental experts, could explore the nature of mechanisms which might assist in the implementation of the provisions of paragraph 2 of this draft resolution.

To give an impetus to disarmament efforts, it is necessary not only for States to take action on an equal footing, but also for the peoples of those States to take an active part in those efforts. In fact, in the World Disarmament Campaign, various movements and organizations are playing an important role. I am sure we shall be able to continue to count on the valuable co-operation of that Campaign in compiling information dealing with arms transfers and the consequences of those arms transfers for international peace and security.

In so far as a General Assembly resolution can give rise to a commitment on the part of Member States, this draft resolution, if it is adopted, would make a significant contribution to the solution of a problem which, like international arms transfers, involves commitments on the national, regional and international level.

We cannot ensure peace so long as we limit the concept of disarmament. International stability can be affected by the frequent conflicts which arise between underdeveloped countries which are tempted to use arms and which sometimes find that more attractive than peaceful means of resolving disputes.

The best contribution we can make to world peace is to begin serious and open negotiations which would be in accordance with conditions as they really are and which would allow for genuine disarmament.



Mr. HYLTEINIUS (Sweden): I have asked for the floor to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.37, on "Naval armaments and disarmament". I do so on behalf of the delegations of Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, China, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, Iceland, Indonesia, Mexico, Sri Lanka and Yugoslavia and of my own.

The General Assembly last year recalled its request in 1985 to the Disarmament Commission to consider the issues contained in the United Nations study on the naval arms race (A/40/535) with a view to facilitating the identification of possible measures in the field of naval arms reductions and disarmament, pursued within the framework of progress towards general and complete disarmament, as well as confidence-building measures in this field. In so doing the Disarmament Commission was asked to take into account also other relevant proposals.

During its 1988 session the Disarmament Commission continued its consideration of the issue. The meetings held resulted in a confirmation and elaboration of a number of substantial findings and recommendations on the subject. These are contained in a working paper of the Chairman (A/CN.10/113), which met with the approval of all delegations participating in the substantial consultations and which, in their view, could form the basis for further deliberations on the subject.

This document again underlined the axiomatic principles originally identified in the United Nations study on the naval arms race and the

"widespread concurrence of view that, at this stage, confidence-building measures of various kinds, both in the global and regional context, would be more amenable to further consideration and possible negotiation in the appropriate forums" (A/CN.10/113, para. 8).

A number of possible measures were suggested. Among them two concrete measures were specifically mentioned, that is:

"a multilateral agreement concerning the prevention of incidents at sea beyond the territorial sea in addition to existing agreement" (ibid., para. 10)

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

and

"updating the Hague Convention VIII of 1907 on Laying of Automatic Submarine Contact Mines" (ibid., para. 12).

It was also recognized

"that the harmful effect that conflict at sea could have on the freedom of navigation and other uses of the sea, in accordance with current international law, for States neutral to or otherwise not involved in an ongoing conflict, have been amply demonstrated in recent years" (ibid., para. 14).

While three years of deliberations on the subject in the Disarmament Commission have thus deepened the understanding of this set of issues and defined some concrete measures on which negotiations could be pursued, several important issues would need further elaboration by the Disarmament Commission.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.37 is of a procedural character. It requests the Disarmament Commission to continue, at its forthcoming session in 1989, under the agenda item entitled "Naval armaments and disarmament", the substantive work it has undertaken so far and to report on its deliberations and recommendations to the General Assembly at its forty-fourth session.

On behalf of the sponsors, I wish to commend this draft resolution to the full support of the First Committee.

Mr. FREIER (Israel): Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.6, on Israeli nuclear armament, once again summons the First Committee to come down hard on Israel. The sponsors are so numerous that I cannot but think of Psalm 69, Verse 4, which reads: "They that hate me without a cause are more than the hairs on mine head."

We cannot hope to stem the tide of ill intent. It has been and continues to be unconditional. Past voting stances in this Committee and others have condoned the deportment of the sponsoring Arab States and their associates. It is on the

(Mr. Freier, Israel)

significance of these voting stances that I wish to speak, as we view them in Israel.

Any vote in favour of the draft resolution affirms, and any abstention condones: first, the intent of the biggest arms importers in the third world - Syria, Iraq, Libya and Saudi Arabia - to turn on Israel at "a time of their choosing", as they say; and, secondly, the singling out of Israel from among all States which are purported to have nuclear competence. Who would undertake to question India or Pakistan, to mention only two?

A vote in favour affirms, and an abstention condones: thirdly, the refusal of the Arab States to sit down with Israel and negotiate a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East along the lines laid down by the Palme Commission and sanctioned by the United Nations; fourthly, the option retained by the sponsoring Arab States to wage wars against Israel - this is the only conclusion we can draw from their refusal to negotiate a nuclear-weapon-free zone with us, which would be based on direct negotiation and mutual reassurances - and, fifthly, the disregard of authoritative Israeli statements on its nuclear policy, a disregard unparalleled in any other instance.

Lastly, any vote in favour of the draft resolution affirms, and any abstention condones: the damnatory, punitive and exceptional paragraphs contained in the draft resolution. Let me list them and comment on them.

Operative paragraph 1 refers to the refusal to renounce possession of nuclear weapons. No State has ever made a blanket statement of this kind, not even signatories to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which can opt out of the Treaty.

Operative paragraph 2 refers to nuclear co-operation between Israel and South Africa. There is no nuclear co-operation between Israel and South Africa. We have

(Mr. Freier, Israel)

provided United Nations references in this matter earlier in this debate. They are documents A/36/431 and A/Con.137/CRP.2.

Operative paragraphs 3 and 4 demand that Israel place all its facilities under full-scope safeguards. Israel has repeatedly stated and explained its non-proliferation policy. Members have heard it here, and the General Assembly has heard it from the Prime Minister. It is by way of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, based on precedents and the recommendations of the Palme Commission. Once we have such a zone, full-scope safeguards will of course be part of it, made credible by a mutuality of reassurances. Israel means what it says and will not be told what to do in matters in which each nation is sovereign. The Committee would not dare tell India, Pakistan or other States what to do.

Operative paragraphs 5 and 6 call upon all States and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to suspend co-operation with Israel. These requests, like the lie to the Charters of the United Nations and IAEA.

Operative paragraphs 8 and 9 call on the Secretary-General to continue to report to the General Assembly and include the item on next year's agenda. This is only to make sure the First Committee does not forget to discuss Israel in perpetuity.

(Mr. Freier, Israel)

Also, in a preambular paragraph, the Committee is invited to be deeply concerned about Israel's declared policy of attacking nuclear facilities. This imputation is false. In 1985 the General Conference of IAEA accepted Israel's declaration of policy as satisfactory and struck the item off its agenda.

Those are our comments. They are intended to bring home to those who vote affirmatively what their message is and equally to those who abstain what it is that they condone.

I hope we shall be able to protect ourselves against our committed adversaries. We have no request of them in this Committee. We do have a request, however, of those States which contemplate abstention. Would they please meditate well on the serious implications of their voting stance, which I set out earlier on? Their vote on the draft resolution as a whole is the only one which will be on record, and we would request them to vote against the draft resolution.

Let me recall to them the words of the prophet Elijah, as reported in I Kings 18, verse 21:

"And Elijah came unto all the people, and said, How long waver ye between two opinions?"

Mr. STEPHANOU (Greece): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community, on item 64 (d) of our agenda, "Conventional disarmament".

While the reduction of nuclear arsenals remains one of the highest priorities for the countries on whose behalf I speak, the Twelve have consistently stressed that conventional disarmament is an integral and essential part of the overall disarmament process and should be pursued urgently on a global as well as on a regional level. The processes of arms control and disarmament must apply in the conventional as in the nuclear field. Both processes could contribute to enhancing

(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

security. The Twelve continue to see as one of the central and pressing tasks for the international community progress towards balanced and verifiable reductions of conventional armaments. The Twelve firmly believe that the aim of the process of conventional disarmament should be to seek effectively verifiable arms-control agreements ensuring security at the lowest possible level of forces and armaments. This process should remove military threats and existing imbalances which challenge security and stability.

It is conventional weapons that have been the cause of many millions of lives lost in conflicts throughout the world. Increasingly powerful weapons continue to be deployed in all areas of the world. The expenditure on conventional armaments and forces absorbs an overwhelming proportion of all military budgets in the world, and thereby has increasingly become a serious economic strain on a large number of countries.

The growing recognition of the overall importance of conventional-arms control and disarmament should be welcome. Not only the major Powers, but all the States of the world have to become involved in the process of conventional disarmament. Regional agreements are of particular relevance. The approach on a regional level may well prove to be the most practical for achieving progress in the foreseeable future.

Conventional-arms control is an issue which we take very seriously in Europe, where the concentration of troops and armaments is high, and we are making serious efforts to deal with this question. To enhance security in Europe it is necessary to establish a stable and secure balance of conventional forces at lower levels and to introduce a further set of confidence-building and security-building measures. We look forward to the start, within the framework of the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), of negotiations on such confidence-building and security-building measures and on conventional stability,

(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

where the aim will be to eliminate existing disparities prejudicial to stability and security, and to eliminate the capability of launching a surprise attack and initiating large-scale offensive action. In view of the potential offered by negotiations on conventional stability covering the whole of Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, particular importance is attached to the achievement of a mandate and to the early commencement of those negotiations. A successful conclusion of the Vienna CSCE follow-up meeting would secure the opening of those negotiations.

The Twelve are firmly committed to a balanced outcome of the Vienna follow-up meeting which would be of benefit to all people in the 35 participating States. The CSCE process remains the central element of an East-West policy aimed at peace and security based on co-operation and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

We support the draft resolution in document A/C.1/43/L.61 on confidence- and security-building measures and conventional disarmament, sponsored by a number of member States of the European Community. At the request of the General Assembly, this year the Disarmament Commission considered in a working group the item on conventional disarmament. The Twelve participated actively in the deliberations of that working group. While many proposals on this question were put forward and while a comprehensive report was presented by the Chairman, who belonged to one of the Twelve, with a view to reaching consensus on a set of recommendations on the subject, it did not prove possible to find agreement on the substantive content of the draft report.

The 12 member States of the European Community reiterate that the subject of conventional disarmament should be kept at the forefront of the multilateral debate on disarmament. We hope that at its 1989 session the Disarmament Commission will be able to agree on a substantive report on the subject. We support the draft

(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

resolution in document A/C.1/43/L.10, introduced by Denmark, one of the 12 member States of the European Community, on this issue.

In conventional disarmament, as in other areas of disarmament, the 12 member States of the European Community remain convinced that a better flow of information would help to relieve international tension. In order to prevent misperceptions and miscalculations of the intentions and military capabilities of others, the Twelve have consistently advocated a more free and open flow of objective information on military matters and have implemented a wide variety of measures the aim of which is to contribute to the widest possible degree of openness to that end. The need for transparency, openness and reliable data is reflected in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/43/L.19. We, of course, support that draft resolution. The Twelve also note with interest the draft resolutions of other States, including the one put forward by China (A/C.1/43/L.15) and that introduced by Peru (A/C.1/43/L.70), which we welcome.

I wish now to comment, on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community, on agenda item 64 (j), entitled "Review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament."



(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

As I underscored in my statement on behalf of the Twelve in the general debate, the Twelve are convinced that the United Nations must play a central role in the quest for disarmament pursuant to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

In this context, the Twelve have continuously supported endeavours aimed at strengthening the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. The detailed views of the Member States of the European Community on this issue of our agenda were submitted by the Federal Republic of Germany on behalf of the Twelve to the Disarmament Commission in document A/CN.10/112, as well as to the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The subject has been under consideration for four years now in the Disarmament Commission and we hope that a report and recommendations can be submitted to the next General Assembly.

The United Nations has played an important role in the field of disarmament and should continue to do so. Serious efforts should be made with the aim of organizing the work within the United Nations in the field of disarmament in a more efficient way.

Let me first come to the work of our Committee. I would like above all to stress that we welcome in particular your personal efforts, Mr. Chairman, which, with the Friends of the Chair, you are pursuing with the goal of improving the working methods of the First Committee.

In particular the First Committee, as the main subsidiary body of the General Assembly for dealing with disarmament and related international security questions, should continue to fulfil its deliberative functions. In the view of the Twelve, it is the extent of meaningful consensus that will enhance the credibility of this Committee. Our work is already truly global in character thanks to the contributions of a great number of States with different geographical, economic and

(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

security backgrounds. If we can combine and optimize these advantages, we will be able to perform our duty of helping the international community to make progress in the field of disarmament. A serious and successful effort to reach a meaningful consensus was undertaken with the support of the Twelve, during the forty-second session. Let us hope that that encouraging precedent will be followed at this year's session, thus increasing the influence of the First Committee.

The Twelve fully support the contents and spirit of General Assembly resolution 41/42 N on the rationalization of the work of the First Committee.

The Twelve wish to reaffirm their conviction that the Disarmament Commission serves as a place for in-depth deliberation and thus constitutes an indispensable element in the multilateral disarmament process. It will have other important contributions to make in the future. The progress achieved outside the multilateral disarmament process should have a positive impact as well.

In this year's substantive session, the Disarmament Commission achieved agreement on verification as well as on confidence-building measures. It is a positive step and an encouraging precedent for the work of the Commission. Members of the Twelve will continue to participate actively in the work of the Disarmament Commission.

The member States of the European Community have always attached great importance to the work of the Conference on Disarmament as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum for global disarmament questions. They wish to reaffirm their commitment to the Conference. It remains an indispensable forum in the field of disarmament. The Twelve look forward to the results of the discussions undertaken within the Conference on Disarmament which will strengthen the effectiveness of the Conference in its disarmament efforts.

(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

The Twelve attach particular importance to the chemical weapons negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. We consider that the earliest possible conclusion of a global, comprehensive, effectively verifiable ban on chemical weapons remains one of the most urgent priorities in the Conference on Disarmament and will enhance its authority.

The Twelve wish to see strengthened the primary role of the Department for Disarmament Affairs in co-ordinating the resources of the United Nations in the field of disarmament in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of work. The role of the Department is equally important in regard to aspects of the activities of the specialized agencies which have a bearing on disarmament questions. In this context the Twelve wish to praise the Department for organizing an impressive number of events, both at United Nations Headquarters and elsewhere, with effectiveness and very limited resources.

The Twelve consider very useful the United Nations Fellowship Programme and look forward to its continuation.

Furthermore, the Twelve firmly believe that United Nations studies can make a valuable contribution to the discussion and consideration of disarmament issues. In this context the Twelve have a long and consistent record of supporting the concept and objectives of the United Nations disarmament studies programme.

In accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, the Twelve see the need for studies conducted under United Nations auspices to be related to specific practical objectives and to be the subject of proper consultations.

The Twelve further recall their interest in the effective functioning of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), to whose funding certain member States of the European Community voluntarily contribute, together

(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

with other States. They would also like to see the co-ordinating role of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies strengthened in order to ensure that studies and research are carried out as effectively as possible and avoid overlapping with other studies.

Mr. TANASIE (Romania) (interpretation from French): I have the honour to present draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.58, entitled "Reduction of military budgets", of 31 October 1988, which the following countries have joined in sponsoring: Bangladesh, Indonesia, Ireland, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Senegal, Sweden and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

One of the major conclusions of the Secretary-General's report on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and military expenditures is that

"During the 1980s the arms race has continued, in particular in its qualitative aspect, unabated, in fact expanding in scale and accelerating in pace". (A/43/368, para. 171)

(Mr. Tanaaie, Romania)

Concerned about the ever-spiralling arms race and growing military expenditures, Romania and Sweden jointly took the initiative several years ago within the United Nations in drawing up the principles governing activities of States in negotiations on the freezing and reduction of military budgets, in an attempt to harmonize the views of States and thereby to promote the launching of negotiations on specific measures for freezing and reducing military expenditures.

That process took place in the Disarmament Commission, which has now reached an advanced stage in working out those principles. As noted in the report of the Disarmament Commission to the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (A/S-15/3), in 1986 consensus was reached on the text of a complete series of principles designed to govern the future actions of States with regard to the freezing and reduction of military budgets, with the exception of one principle concerning the transparency and comparability of data.

Last year the General Assembly, while noting that the Disarmament Commission at its 1986 session had agreed upon all the above-mentioned principles except one, requested the Commission to continue its consideration of the item entitled "Reduction of military budgets" and, in that context, to conclude, at its 1988 substantive session, its work on the last outstanding element of the principles.

At its session this year the Disarmament Commission came very close to achieving consensus on the outstanding principles concerning the transparency and comparability of data. Given the developments and encouraging prospects that have recently occurred in the area of transparency and comparability, the subject of that paragraph, our delegation has at the current session of the General Assembly held consultations with interested delegations to arrive at a compromise text on the outstanding principle.

(Mr. Tanasie, Romania)

For various reasons we have found that there is a preference for continuing that exercise in the Disarmament Commission next year in order to conclude work on the still-outstanding element.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.58 is basically the same as earlier resolutions on the same subject adopted by the General Assembly by consensus.

The General Assembly declares again its conviction that it is possible to achieve international agreements on the reduction of military budgets without prejudice to the right of all States to undiminished security, self-defence and sovereignty.

The General Assembly also requests the Disarmament Commission to continue consideration of the item entitled "Reduction of military budgets" and, in that context, to conclude at its 1989 substantive session, taking into account the content of paragraph 7 as a whole, its work on the last sentence of that outstanding paragraph of the principles that should govern further actions of States in the field of freezing and reduction of military budgets, and to submit its report and recommendations to the General Assembly not later than at its forty-fourth session.

In the draft resolution the General Assembly again draws the attention of Member States to the fact that the identification and elaboration of the principles that should govern further actions of States in freezing and reducing military budgets could contribute to harmonizing the views of States and creating confidence among them conducive to achieving international agreements on the reduction of military budgets.

At the same time, the General Assembly urges all States, in particular the most heavily armed States, to reinforce their readiness to co-operate in a constructive manner with a view to reaching agreements to freeze, reduce or otherwise restrain military expenditures.

(Mr. Tanasie, Romania)

In conclusion, my delegation would like, on behalf of the sponsors, to express the hope that the draft resolution I have just introduced will receive full support and will be adopted by consensus. That would be fully in keeping with the constructive spirit that has prevailed throughout the work of the First Committee.

Mr. VARGA (Hungary): On 4 November the representative of the United Kingdom, Ambassador Solesby, introduced in the First Committee a draft resolution on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons, A/C.1/43/L.9. Hungary is a co-sponsor of that draft resolution.

My delegation fully agrees with the line of argument put forward in favour of the draft resolution on the prohibition of radiological weapons, bearing in mind the early conclusion of a convention on that question. At the same time, my delegation would like to commend the work of the Ad Hoc Committee presided over by Ambassador Solesby in 1988.

At the Conference on Disarmament further and more concrete results could be achieved within a relatively short period of time if the participating delegations are determined to continue negotiations with a view to a prompt conclusion of the work, although much remains to be done in this area.

Our position is motivated by the very evident circumstance and the growing awareness that, with the increasing application of atomic energy and nuclear technology, more and more States are becoming interested in the success of the negotiations that have now been under way for almost a decade.

The fact that radiological weapons do not yet form part of the military arsenal of any State cannot be considered an obstacle to the conclusion of a treaty banning radiological weapons. On the contrary, there seems to be a growing international consensus that such weapons should be banned regardless of whether or

(Mr. Varqa, Hungary)

not they are already in existence. The solution of that issue seems readily available on the basis of the proposals under consideration in the Conference on Disarmament. That is the conclusion we have drawn from the debates that have taken place in the First Committee as well.

The other facet of the problem is the prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities. As a concrete contemporary need, that issue is closely related to the safety of peaceful nuclear activities, which should be safeguarded by - among other pertinent factors - a reliable international régime prohibiting attacks against relevant nuclear facilities. The deliberate destruction of nuclear-power plants or other installations may have consequences similar to those resulting from the use of weapons of mass destruction, including radiological weapons.

In conclusion, let me state that my delegation supports the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.9 in the belief that the prohibition of radiological weapons and the closely related efforts to prohibit attacks against nuclear facilities are indispensable for international security.

My delegation would also like to take this opportunity to express its support and full endorsement to you, Mr. Chairman, for the efforts and actions you have undertaken, with your Friends and here in the Committee, to rationalize and streamline the Committee's work in order to enable it successfully to accomplish its task for the sake of disarmament and enhancing peace and security for the benefit of all the peoples of the world.



Mr. OBEIDAT (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to say at the outset that I am speaking on behalf of the member countries of the Arab Group, of which my country holds the chairmanship for the month of November. I wish to introduce to the Committee draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.6, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament", submitted under item 69 of the agenda of the General Assembly. The sponsors of the draft resolution are Algeria, Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Iraq, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, Yemen and my own country, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

In the preamble to the draft resolution the General Assembly would recall resolutions adopted by the Assembly, the Security Council and the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) relating to Israeli nuclear armament.

It would also recall that the Security Council by its resolution 487 (1981) of 19 June 1981 had called upon Israel urgently to place all its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards and that the Security Council had specifically requested Israel to heed that call. It would note that Israel had persistently refused to commit itself not to manufacture or acquire nuclear weapons, despite the repeated calls to do so.

In operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution the Assembly would reiterate its condemnation of Israel's refusal to renounce any possession of nuclear weapons and its condemnation of the co-operation between Israel and South Africa in this respect.

In operative paragraph 3 the Assembly would request the Security Council to take urgent and effective measures to ensure that Israel complied with the Council's resolution 487 (1981).

In paragraph 4 the Assembly would once more demand that Israel place all its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards.

(Mr. Obeidat, Jordan)

In paragraph 6 it would reiterate its request to IAEA to suspend any scientific co-operation with Israel that could contribute to its nuclear capabilities and in paragraph 7 it would request the Agency to inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations of any steps Israel might undertake to place its nuclear facilities under Agency safeguards.

In paragraph 5 all States and organizations that had not yet done so would be called upon to discontinue co-operating with, and giving assistance to, Israel in the nuclear field.

Paragraph 8 contains a request to the Secretary-General to follow closely Israeli nuclear activities and to report to the General Assembly at its forty-fourth session, which would have the issue on its agenda.

I wish to reaffirm that Israel is still continuing to develop its nuclear capability, as it has been doing since 1952. It has made considerable strides in this respect. This has been revealed by its dissident agents. It has also become evident since the unveiling of its nuclear piracy and its dealing with its counterpart in racism, the racist régime of South Africa.

In conclusion I would point out, in the climate of international détente prevailing in the world today, that our area - and I am sure the Committee is very familiar with this fact - is the birthplace of all the revealed religions. It was the birthplace of Jesus Christ and it is also the cradle of the other two revealed religions, Judaism and Islam. This part of the world is a source of both cultural and spiritual enlightenment for all the world. May I remind you that Israel's nuclear capability presents a threat to this area. This area, which has been the centre of spiritual enlightenment in the world, is threatened with the use of nuclear weapons by Israel itself.

(Mr. Obeidat, Jordan)

The Arab Group hopes that this draft resolution will receive a majority of votes in the Committee and subsequently the widest measure of support in the General Assembly.

Mr. LAY (Italy): It is my pleasure to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.28, on the international transfer of conventional armaments. I shall limit myself to a few essential considerations, since the issue was raised and discussed by Italy and by numerous other Member States, as well as by the Secretary-General, during the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Moreover, the head of my delegation raised the problem once again during the general debate in this Committee, on 19 October.

Italy, of course, fully endorses the statement made by the representative of Greece on the same subject on behalf of the twelve member States of the European Community on 4 November.

Italy is convinced that the time has come for concerted international action that would serve to curb the arms race and to restrict the flow of arms to areas beset by tensions, as well as to halt and prevent clandestine and illicit international arms trafficking. As we stated in the general debate, we appreciate the initiative taken by Colombia in this field and, in fact, we have had extensive consultations with the representative of Colombia and other interested delegations. Although we fully understand the wish of Colombia and the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.22 to tackle as many dimensions of the problem as possible immediately, we have suggested a more gradual approach, to set the process in motion.

(Mr. Lay, Italy)

While we certainly do not have the solution to the problem, nor do we claim to be presenting firm conclusions on its various dimensions, as we pointed out in consultations in recent weeks, we continue to believe that any steps should rest on a solid foundation. In fact, as we examine these issues, it is obvious to us that one should first of all clarify a situation that is too often clouded by uncertainties with regard to its dynamics, responsibilities and mechanisms, and even by a lack of reliable data. This clarity and greater concerted action for monitoring the transfer of conventional weapons and its implications and for promoting restraint in such transfers should not and could not detract in any way from the right of each State to self-defence and the protection of its security. It seems to us that greater transparency in this matter is necessary in order to establish a solid premise for action; the United Nations could, we are convinced, provide the framework for such transparency. Of great concern to us also is the increase in the clandestine and illicit arms trade, which should be prevented.

Against that background, we have taken the initiative of submitting draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.28 - a document which is perhaps too modest, but which reflects our conviction that the search for greater transparency should be urgently started in order to allow us to set a sound process in motion.

The draft resolution has nine preambular and six operative paragraphs.

The aim of the preamble is to stress the urgent need of finding a solution to the problem of the transfer of conventional weapons and its implications, which are in sharp contrast both with the principles and with the provisions of the United Nations Charter and with increasing efforts to build international relations on a more stable and secure foundation. Reference is made, inter alia, to Articles 26 and 51 of the Charter and to the pertinent paragraph - paragraph 22 - of the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, to the drafting of

(Mr. Lay, Italy)

which Italy contributed in 1978, as well as to the Final Document of the Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.

Operative paragraph 1 concerns the need to promote restraint and greater transparency in the transfers of conventional arms with a view to keeping these armaments at the lowest possible levels in all regions of the world.

Operative paragraph 2 envisages inviting all Governments to abstain from supplying arms to areas of conflict.

Operative paragraph 3 concerns consultations between main suppliers and buyers of armaments, with a view to curbing the international illicit arms trade.

Operative paragraph 4 envisages a study by the Secretary-General on these matters, to be completed by 1990, with the assistance of governmental experts - we are in favour of the smallest possible group of such experts - and taking into account information provided by Member States, which, in the next operative paragraph, are therefore invited to submit views and proposals on these matters in 1989.

Operative paragraph 6 - the last operative paragraph - concerns the inclusion in the provisional agenda of the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly of an item entitled "Promotion of transparency in international arms transfers and prevention of the illicit arms trade".

Mr. Chairman, we are fully aware and appreciative of your personal efforts to meet the widespread wish to rationalize our work also from the perspective of combining and - we would hope - merging the several draft resolutions which might exist, as in this case, on the same subject. We should like to assure you that the Italian delegation intends to continue to consult with all interested delegations with a view to reaching a general consensus on these important matters of growing concern to Member States.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the Secretary of the Committee, who wishes to make an announcement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform members of the Committee that the following countries have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.4: Bulgaria;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.8: Romania, German Democratic Republic;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.12: Bangladesh, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Jordan, Malaysia, Morocco, Nigeria, Viet Nam;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.13: Romania;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.20: Cameroon;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.22: Philippines;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.23: Romania;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.26: Romania;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.33: German Democratic Republic, Romania;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.37: Malaysia;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.42: Malaysia;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.43: Malaysia;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.44: Ecuador;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.45: Ecuador;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.46: Indonesia;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.51: Ecuador, Singapore;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.52: Ecuador, Turkey, Uruguay;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.53: Ecuador, Philippines, Thailand;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.58: Nigeria;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.62: Argentina, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka;

(Mr. Kheradi)

- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.63: German Democratic Republic;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.65: German Democratic Republic, Malaysia;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.67: Malaysia, Turkey;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.69: Singapore;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.70: Ecuador, Philippines;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.71: Ecuador;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.72: Romania.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): In this brief statement I shall be introducing three draft resolutions of which the delegation of Mexico is a sponsor along with the delegations that I shall indicate in each case.

The first draft resolution relates to the World Disarmament Campaign. It is sponsored by 10 delegations - those of Bangladesh, Egypt, Indonesia, Pakistan, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Mexico - and is contained in document A/C.1/43/L.33, dated 31 October.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The draft resolution begins by saying that in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, the General Assembly declared that

"it was essential that not only Governments but also the peoples of the world recognize and understand the dangers in the present situation", and stressed the importance of mobilizing world public opinion on behalf of disarmament.

In the operative part of the draft resolution the General Assembly begins by commending the manner in which the Campaign has been geared by the Secretary-General in order to 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 limitations and disarmament and the dangers relating to all aspects of the arms race and war, in particular nuclear war.

It goes on to recall that, as was agreed by consensus at the second special session devoted to disarmament, it is an essential requirement for the universality of the Campaign that it receive "the co-operation and participation of all States".

It is for this reason that the General Assembly once again endorses the statement made by the Secretary-General that the criterion of universality also applies to pledges of contributions, since "a campaign without world-wide participation and funding will have difficulty in reflecting this principle in its implementation". The General Assembly "reiterates its regret" that most of the States which have the largest military expenditures have not so far made any financial contribution to the World Disarmament Campaign.



(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

As is customary in this kind of draft resolution, the Secretary-General is asked to submit to the General Assembly at its forty-fourth session a report covering both the implementation of the programme of activities of the World Disarmament Campaign by the United Nations system during 1989 and the programme of activities contemplated by the system for 1990. Finally, the Assembly decides to include in the provisional agenda of its forty-fourth session the item entitled "World Disarmament Campaign".

The second of the three draft resolutions that I wish to introduce appears in document A/C.1/43/L.26. It concerns the implementation of General Assembly resolution 42/39 H, on a nuclear-arms freeze. It is sponsored by the delegations of Indonesia, Pakistan, Peru, Sweden and Mexico.

The purpose of the preamble is to stress the dangers of nuclear weapons. It recalls the deep concern frequently expressed by the General Assembly over the "threat to the very survival of mankind" posed by "the existence of nuclear weapons and the continuing arms race". It also recalls that, as has already been mentioned, existing arsenals of nuclear weapons are more than sufficient "to destroy all life on Earth" and stresses that mankind is therefore confronted with a choice: "halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament, or face annihilation".

In the preamble to this draft resolution the General Assembly welcomes "the improvement of the relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America and the conclusion of the Treaty on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, as well as their agreement in principle to reduce by 50 per cent their strategic nuclear arsenals".

The preamble concludes by expressing the General Assembly's conviction of the urgent need to pursue negotiations for the substantial reduction and qualitative

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

limitation of existing nuclear arms and on a nuclear-arms freeze, which, while not an end in itself

"would constitute an effective step to prevent the continued increase and qualitative improvement of existing nuclear weaponry during the period when the negotiations take place ..."

The operative part of the draft resolution is made up of only three paragraphs. In the first, the Soviet Union and the United States are urged to proclaim, either through simultaneous unilateral declarations or through a joint declaration, an immediate nuclear-arms freeze, whose structure and scope are defined. It would be subject to appropriate and effective verification measures and procedures and it would be for an initial period of five years,

"subject to prolongation when other nuclear-weapon States join in such a freeze, as the General Assembly urges them to do".

In operative paragraph 2 the above-mentioned two major nuclear-weapon States are asked to submit a joint report or two separate reports to the General Assembly, prior to the opening of its forty-fourth session, on the implementation of the present resolution. And in the final paragraph the Assembly decides to include in the provisional agenda of its forty-fourth session an item on the implementation of the resolution.

The third and last of the three draft resolutions that I wish to introduce - draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.23 - as I said at the outset, calls for the cessation of all - I stress "all" - nuclear-test explosions. The text of the draft resolution is self-explanatory. Therefore, I suggest that members read the first three preambular paragraphs and I will refer only to what is mentioned in the last two.