



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 38th 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 DC2-750, 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 fascicle for each Committee.

The meeting was called to order at 4.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 51 TO 69, 139, 141 AND 145 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This afternoon, we shall begin with cluster 2 - document A/C.1/43/L.45; then we shall go to cluster 6 - document A/C.1/43/L.11/Rev.1; then cluster 10 - documents A/C.1/43/L.10/Rev. 1 and A/C.1/43/L.15; then cluster 11 - document A/C.1/43/L.49.

I now call upon those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. VON STULPNAGEL (Federal Republic of Germany): It is my pleasure to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.49, entitled "Guidelines for confidence-building measures".

As delegates may recall, these Guidelines have been developed by the United Nations Disarmament Commission over the years and were adopted by the Disarmament Commission, by consensus, in May of this year.

After that, in order to prepare our draft resolution, we held intensive consultations with other groups and other delegations, from which resulted a few changes in the draft resolution as it is before the Committee now.

I should like to read those changes to the Committee. The changes appear in the following paragraphs:

The fourth paragraph of the preamble will now read as follows:

"Reaffirming its conviction that confidence-building measures, especially when applied in a comprehensive manner, have a potential to contribute significantly to the enhancement of peace and security and to promote and facilitate the attainment of disarmament measures,".

The fifth paragraph of the preamble will now read as follows:

"Mindful of the fact that confidence-building measures, while neither a

(Mr. von Stülpnagel, Federal
Republic of Germany)

substitute nor a precondition for arms limitation and disarmament measures, can be conducive to achieving progress in disarmament,".

There is a new paragraph after the fifth paragraph of the preamble, fifth bis. It will read as follows:

"Realizing that effective disarmament and arms limitation measures which directly limit or reduce military potential have particularly high confidence-building value,".

Finally, the ninth paragraph of the preamble will read as follows:

"Pointing to the example of progress in the implementation of confidence- and security-building measures adopted in Stockholm in 1986 that has contributed to more stable relations and increased security, reducing the risk of military confrontation in Europe,".

There is one change in one operative paragraph. Operative paragraph 2 should read as follows:

"Recommends these guidelines to all States for implementation, fully taking into account the specific political, military and other conditions prevailing in a region, on the basis of initiatives and with the agreement of the States of the region concerned;,".

Those are the changes to which the sponsors and co-authors of this resolution agreed, and they asked the Committee to adopt this draft resolution without a vote.

Mr. MORTENSEN (Denmark): I wish today to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "General and complete disarmament: conventional disarmament" and submitted under agenda item 64 (d). Before doing so, however, I should like to make some general remarks relating to conventional disarmament.

The problem of nuclear disarmament and the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction dominated international disarmament efforts in the three decades following the founding of the United Nations. Since the early 1980s, however, increasing emphasis has been put on the need to control the conventional-arms race without diverting priority attention from nuclear disarmament. Thus, there has been a growing recognition of the need to achieve significant reductions in conventional armaments and armed forces in various parts of the world as an essential element of the disarmament process. That development is to be welcomed. The United Nations cannot disregard what is going on in the real world.

Since the Second World War, over 20 million lives have been lost in conflicts waged with conventional weapons. It is conventional weapons that have been and are killing people in vast numbers. The problems relating to the conventional-arms race and to conventional disarmament are crucial and complicated, and all States have an obligation to participate in efforts towards conventional disarmament.

For many years, Denmark has felt a special responsibility for keeping the question of conventional disarmament on the United Nations agenda. In our view, conventional disarmament should have a prominent place in our deliberations. The fact that all States bear direct responsibility in this field gives the United Nations a unique role in generating awareness of the urgency of pursuing conventional disarmament.

(Mr. Mortensen, Denmark)

Since the deliberations on conventional disarmament started in the early 1980s, we have witnessed progress year after year. An important step forward was the submission in 1984 by the Secretary-General of an expert study on all aspects of the conventional-arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces. It was significant in that it represented the first effort at a comprehensive consideration of the subject. The following year, by resolution 40/94 C, the General Assembly decided for the first time in United Nations history to include on its agenda an item entitled "Conventional disarmament".

Since 1987 the issue has been considered by the Disarmament Commission. We were encouraged by the deliberations at last year's session of the Commission. In our view, the Commission came a long way towards agreement on a substantive report. Against that background, the outcome of the deliberations on conventional disarmament at this year's session can only be termed a disappointment. However, judging by the widespread concern over many aspects of conventional disarmament expressed during the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, we are confident that the set-back was only temporary and that the question will receive renewed impetus at the next session of the Disarmament Commission and that we shall move further in our efforts.

The question of conventional-arms transfers has always been part of the larger concept of conventional disarmament. We have before us three proposals dealing with that issue, which was also touched upon by several delegations during the third special session on disarmament. We welcome this emerging readiness to address this problem. The question of arms transfers is a very complex issue, one which has never before been addressed in a comprehensive way in the United Nations. Denmark sincerely hopes that a first step in this direction can be made by consensus during this session; this would start a process of consideration of this important issue.

(Mr. Mortensen, Denmark)

I turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.10/Rev.1. As work on conventional disarmament was not completed at this year's session of the Disarmament Commission, the Commission decided to make the following recommendation to the General Assembly:

"The Disarmament Commission recommends to the General Assembly that the Commission should continue its work on conventional disarmament at its next substantive session in 1989."

It is against that background that my delegation has submitted draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.10/Rev.1. According to the draft resolution, the General Assembly would, inter alia, request the Disarmament Commission to continue at its 1989 session its substantive consideration of issues related to conventional disarmament and to report to it at its forty-fourth session with a view to facilitating possible measures in the fields of conventional arms reduction and disarmament. It would also request the Disarmament Commission for that purpose to include in the agenda for its 1989 session an item entitled "Substantive consideration of issues related to conventional disarmament".

I should like to put forward a revision to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.10/Rev.1. The third paragraph of the preamble, as revised, should read as follows:

"Also welcoming the increased awareness of the implications of many aspects of the conventional arms build-up, both in its qualitative and its quantitative aspect,".

With that revision, I hope the Committee will be in a position to support the draft resolution and that, as with similar texts in past years, the draft resolution can be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will move now to cluster 2: to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.45. I call first on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to make the following statement on behalf of the Secretary-General with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.45:

"By the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.45, concerning the implementation of the conclusions of the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and establishment of a preparatory committee for the Fourth Review Conference, the General Assembly would note that, following appropriate consultations, an open-ended preparatory committee has been formed of parties to the Treaty serving on the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency or represented on the Conference on Disarmament as well as any party to the Treaty which may express its interest in participating in the work of the preparatory committee. In addition, the Secretary-General would be requested to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services, including summary records, as may be required for the Fourth Review Conference and its preparation.

"It should be noted that the Review Conference will be a conference of States parties to the Treaty. The first three review conferences, held in 1975, 1980 and 1985 respectively, like other review conferences of multilateral disarmament treaties, for example the sea-bed Treaty and the biological weapons Convention, included in their rules of procedure provisions concerning the arrangements for meeting the costs of the review conference, including the sessions of the preparatory committee. Under those arrangements no additional cost was borne by the regular budget of the Organization.

(Mr. Kheradi)

"The wording of operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.45 is identical to the wording of General Assembly resolution 38/74, which preceded the convening of the Third Review Conference. Consequently, the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under the draft resolution to provide the necessary assistance and services for the preparation and holding of the Review Conference has no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that, as in previous review conferences, the associated costs will be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the Fourth Review Conference."

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt): I should like to make a brief statement relating to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.45. Since that draft resolution was submitted, my delegation, in its capacity as co-ordinator of the consultations of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, has held consultations, inter alia, on the venue of the preparatory committee meetings. I would like to read into the record the decision taken by the States Parties in this regard. It reads as follows:

"Further to the decisions recorded in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.45 to hold the Fourth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in Geneva in August-September 1990 and to form an open-ended preparatory committee for that purpose, the States Parties have decided that the first meeting of the preparatory committee shall be held in New York from 1 to 5 May 1989 and that all subsequent meetings shall be held in Geneva on dates to be decided by the committee."

I should also like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to all States Parties for their co-operation in making this decision possible. I am confident that, with this issue now resolved once and for all, the other pending issues will be solved expeditiously as well.

Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom): May I first express my appreciation to the Ambassador of Egypt for his leadership in giving to the organization of the Review Conference and its preparatory committees such a successful start.

Before we vote upon draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.45, sponsored by States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which requests the Secretary-General to provide certain services for the Fourth Review Conference, I would like to make a few remarks on the question of resources.

Seen in the long term, providing services for the Review Conference involves no cost to the United Nations, as all sums expended on the provision of services to that Conference are recovered from the Parties. However, we are aware of the fact that with the whole process, from the first meeting of the preparatory committee to the end of the Review Conference itself, being spread over 18 months and with the bills being presented after the Conference is complete, there could be a short-term budgetary problem. With this in mind, the United Kingdom delegation has informed the Secretariat that the United Kingdom Government is prepared to make an advance payment in the first quarter of 1989 of 100,000 pounds sterling, a sum equivalent to virtually the whole of the estimated final proportion of the costs to be borne by my country. In this way, we hope to alleviate the budgetary problem to some extent.

At the meeting of the Parties which established the Preparatory Committee we appealed to other parties which traditionally pay significant proportions of the costs of the Review Conference to consider making similar advance payments.

Mr. MORTENSEN (Denmark): The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is one of the most important arms-control agreements ever reached. Since its entry into force 20 years ago, it has made a significant contribution to international stability and security. Considering the vital importance of the

(Mr. Mortensen, Denmark)

subject-matter of the Treaty, it would be appropriate if adherence to it were universal. We welcome recent accessions to the Treaty, but note at the same time that some important countries have so far chosen to stay outside the Treaty. This is to be regretted. The positive effects of the Treaty on international peace and security is to the benefit of all States. We therefore urge those who have not yet done so to join the Treaty.

Any emergence of new nuclear-weapon States is bound to have far-reaching, destabilising effects triggering unforeseeable developments. Therefore, reports of the nuclear ambitions of certain countries in different parts of the world are extremely worrying. Strong international support for the Treaty régime should ensure that the nuclear option never becomes an attractive solution to perceived security needs. Suspicion and mistrust must be countered by openness and confidence. The régime of the non-proliferation Treaty is an important part of building that confidence, both at the global and at the regional levels.

Denmark attaches great importance to preserving and enhancing the Non-Proliferation Treaty. We look forward to the Fourth Review Conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1990 and will work actively, together with other Parties, to ensure that that occasion will serve to strengthen the Treaty further.

We understand that the United Nations will have some financial difficulties in providing services for the Conference. In response to the appeal made by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the Depositary Governments, Denmark intends, subject to final approval by the relevant authorities, to pay in advance an amount corresponding to our share of the estimated conference costs.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon delegations that wish to make statements in explanation of vote prior to the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.45.

Mr. SHARMA (India): My delegation has asked to place on record our views on nuclear non-proliferation in the context of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.45.

Since it is not a signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, India will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution. India has consistently maintained opposition to all nuclear weapons and has repeatedly called for the prevention of all proliferation of nuclear weapons by nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States alike. It has been our policy to strive for an end to proliferation in all its dimensions, horizontal, vertical and geographical, and we have given effect to that world view in national policy.

However, in our view any approach that seeks merely to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear-weapon States, while creating no formal obligations on nuclear-weapon States in respect of vertical and geographical proliferation, is unequal and discriminatory and cannot be accepted as a genuine, universal disarmament measure.

(Mr. Sharma, India)

While the non-proliferation Treaty of 1968 places verifiable obligations on non-nuclear-weapon States, it falls far short of imposing any corresponding verifiable and binding obligations on nuclear-weapon States to reduce and eliminate their nuclear arsenals.

It is our belief that a genuine and universally acceptable non-proliferation régime should aim at completely arresting the production or acquisition of nuclear weapons, accompanied by a simultaneous cut-off in production by all States of all fissionable material for weapons purposes. In such a case, all nuclear facilities would be declared peaceful and would become subject to a universal system of international safeguards, irrespective of whether they belonged to nuclear-weapon States or to non-nuclear-weapon States.

The time has come for an examination by the world community of the implications of the continuation of a treaty with an unequal character, particularly in the light of the invitation to additional adherence to the Treaty. In a few years, Member States who are signatories to the non-proliferation Treaty will have to decide on a fresh lease on life for the non-proliferation régime.

We submit that, given our shared commitment to preventing all proliferation of nuclear weapons by all States as referred to in the preambular section of the non-proliferation Treaty itself, it would be wholly appropriate to begin serious negotiations towards a treaty that might replace the existing one. Such a treaty would give legal effect to a binding commitment by nuclear-weapon States to eliminate all nuclear weapons within an agreed time-frame and also by all non-nuclear-weapon States not to cross the nuclear-weapons threshold.

Verification would be carried out through international safeguards applicable to all nuclear facilities. Our delegation is ready to co-operate with other delegations in moving towards that shared objective.

Mr. NAZARKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation considers that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) was one of the prime instruments in the history of the limitation of nuclear armaments and has become an important factor in international security and strategic stability.

In our view, the strengthening of that Treaty is one of the conditions essential to a stable and constant process of nuclear disarmament, a process that was initiated by the conclusion of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles and by the attainment of considerable progress towards the elaboration of an agreement on a 50 per cent reduction of Soviet and United States nuclear offensive arms.

The periodic review conferences of the parties to the Treaty are milestones in the history of this Treaty. We trust that the Fourth Review Conference, scheduled to be held in 1990, will, like the preceding review conferences, be conducive to a strengthening and extension of the non-proliferation Treaty.

The Soviet Government takes into account the financial difficulties of the United Nations and the difficulties in financing the Conference to which reference has been made and intends to pay our contribution in advance in the amount \$100,000 into the account for the preparation and holding of the NPT Review Conference.

We wish to express our confidence that draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.45 will be given the widest possible support.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.45. The programme budget statement on the draft resolution was read out by the Secretary of the First Committee earlier at this meeting.

(The Chairman)

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland at the 28th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November. It has the following sponsors: Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Columbia, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Ghana, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela and Yemen.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: None

Abstaining: Angola, Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Guyana, India, Israel, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.45 was adopted by 119 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolution just adopted.

* The delegation of France stated that it had not participated in the vote.

Mr. CHOHAN (Pakistan): On earlier occasions my delegation has declared in the First Committee the unwavering commitment of Pakistan to nuclear non-proliferation. We believe that the spread of nuclear weapons to more than the current five nuclear-weapon States will only make our world more insecure. It is therefore important to preserve and strengthen the existing non-proliferation régime.

It was to that end that my delegation cast a positive vote.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to cluster 6 and within it to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.11/Rev.1 and Corr.1. The programme budget implications of this draft resolution are set out in document A/C.1/43/L.76. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee, held on 10 November. The sponsor of the draft resolution has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.11/Rev.1 and Corr.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I call now on delegations wishing to explain their positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. ZIPFORI (Israel): Israel has joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.11/Rev.1 and Corr.1, pertaining to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. As in past years, Israel joined the consensus in order to emphasize the vital importance which it attaches to the establishment of such a zone. This year, in addition, Israel views with favour the Egyptian initiative to elucidate what can and should be done in order to move forward towards the common goal.

Having said this much, I should draw the attention of the Committee, as we have done in the past, to the modalities which we consider to be fundamental to the establishment of a credible nuclear-weapon-free zone. These are free and direct negotiations between the States of the region and mutual reassurances. We have explained to the Committee that the absence of these fundamentals would empty the nuclear-weapon-free zone of its very essence. We can do no better than cite the statement made by the representative of Egypt in introducing the draft resolution. He said,

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

"In requesting this study we are not - I repeat, we are not - attempting to establish the called for zone using the [good] offices of the Secretary-General. We are not establishing modalities for negotiation, nor are we attempting to prejudice any of the often conflicting opinions as to what modalities should be used to establish such a zone".

(A/C.1/43/PV.33, p. 8)

The fundamental importance which attaches to the modalities, irrespective of the characteristics of a region, has been repeatedly stated. We are fully in accord with this and wish to recall them to the Committee. In 1975 the group of experts from 21 nations who studied all the aspects of nuclear-weapon-free zones submitted a report reproduced in document A/10027/Add.1. In paragraph 90 of that report the experts listed several principles governing the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, one of them being "the initiatives for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, which should come from the States within the region concerned; and participation must be voluntary".

That principle also represents one of the leitmotifs of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, also known as the Palme Commission. In the recommendations and proposals in its report, the Commission stated as follows:

"The Commission believes that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region or sub-region concerned, constitutes an important step towards non-proliferation, common security and disarmament."

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

A similar approach was also advocated by the non-aligned countries. In a working paper submitted by them under agenda item 4 of the 1983 session of the Disarmament Commission, it was stated, as cited in document A/38/42, that:

"The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world on the basis of agreements and/or arrangements freely arrived at among States of the region concerned should be encouraged with the ultimate objective of achieving a world entirely free of nuclear weapons".

In its report to the General Assembly at its fifteenth special session, the Disarmament Commission sets out guidelines, adopted by consensus, for confidence-building measures, which are of principal import for our area. One paragraph of these guidelines reads as follows:

"The appropriate mixture of different types of concrete measures should be determined for each region, depending on the perception of security and of the nature and levels of existing threats, by the countries of the regions themselves". (A/S-15/3, para 41 (6 [1.3.2.5]))

That injunction tells us, as Israel has insisted time and again, that a nuclear-weapon-free zone must be seen in a broad security context in order to be credible, and it lends weight to Israel's stance, repeatedly supported at this morning's meeting, that a nuclear-weapon-free zone must be freely and directly negotiated among the States of the region.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): The United States delegation has joined in support of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.11/Rev.1 and Corr.1 concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. With regard to the fifth preambular paragraph, addressing the need for appropriate measures for the protection of nuclear facilities, this issue, as we noted earlier in explaining our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.25, is currently under

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

consideration in the Conference on Disarmament, and the United States has not determined that additional measures are required. Moreover, nuclear facilities are already protected by provisions of the United Nations Charter and the laws and customs of armed conflict, including those prohibiting attacks against facilities that are not legitimate military objectives and attacks that would cause disproportionate civilian casualties.

Mr. GEVERS (Netherlands): The Netherlands believes that under certain conditions nuclear-weapon-free zones can make a significant contribution to preventing the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. My delegation therefore went along with the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.11/Rev.1 and Corr.1 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, notwithstanding the fact that not all the necessary conditions for the establishment of such a zone, inter alia, the need for arrangements directly and freely arrived at between States of the region, have been clearly brought into focus in the draft resolution before us.

We are, however, particularly pleased with the request in the draft resolution for a study by the Secretary-General, which would we hope take into account all views expressed on the matter by all the countries concerned. Such a study could constitute a first step towards the implementation of the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Mr. MASHHADI-GHAHVEHCHI (Islamic Republic of Iran): In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.11/Rev.1, which has just been adopted by consensus, I wish to state that our position regarding the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East has been clearly manifested on various occasions. We regard the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world as a positive step towards nuclear disarmament. That is why my country initiated this movement and sponsored a draft resolution on the subject in 1974, and we are pleased to see that the present draft resolution has now been adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded our consideration of draft resolutions in cluster 6. The Committee will now take up consideration of draft resolutions under cluster 10, A/C.1/43/L.10/Rev.1 and L.15. I shall first call upon representatives who wish to make statements on draft resolutions in cluster 10.

Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): I would like to express the Mongolian delegation's support of draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.10/Rev.1 and L.15. on conventional disarmament. Mongolia attaches great importance to disarmament, not only in the field of nuclear weapons but in the field of conventional weapons as well, which pose a threat to international peace and security, particularly because recent achievements in science and technology are being used to create ever-more sophisticated types of conventional weapons. The boundaries between conventional and nuclear weapons are becoming increasingly blurred.

We also support the limitation and gradual reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons, and the efforts now being made in that regard, particularly on the European continent. We note the progress that has been achieved at Vienna in this respect, and we hope that those efforts will be successful. The search for an agreement on the limitation and gradual reduction of conventional weapons should also be undertaken in other regions, and in Asia in particular.

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

We note with satisfaction that China, one of the five permanent members of the Security Council and a nuclear-weapon State with major armed forces, has sponsored an important draft resolution, A/C.1/43/L.15. We shall not mention all the provisions of that draft resolution, but we would like to emphasize that we attach particular importance to operative paragraph 2, which states the belief that the military forces of all countries should not be used other than for the purpose of self-defence. My country, along with many other countries, supports that belief, and, as we do that in the present-day world situation, focusing the military doctrines and policies of countries primarily on self-defence is a major forward step in the area of confidence-building and security.

Mr. OBEIDAT (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): On behalf of the Group of Arab States, I should like to point out the Group's continuing interest in the priorities defined by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. With regard to conventional disarmament, attention should first be focused on those States with vast military arsenals. The supply of conventional weapons to the racist régimes must be halted. Those régimes must not be allowed to acquire the technical capability to increase their arsenals and thereby to continue to pursue a policy contrary to the will of the international community. I am referring to all States with a racist system.

When speaking of conventional disarmament we must also emphasize non-belligerence and the end of all occupation. We must also emphasize the right to self-determination of all colonized peoples and the attainment of the goals set forth in the United Nations Charter, towards which we are all striving. That is the position of the Group of Arab States on this question.

Mr. CHACON (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): Someone once said that politics is the art of the possible, and we could hardly have given a better

(Mr. Chacon, Costa Rica)

demonstration of that dictum than we have in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.22/Rev.1, which is the result of the merging of the political will of various countries, all eager to submit to the Committee a clear, coherent and realistic draft resolution on international arms transfers. The representative of Italy, who introduced draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.28, and the delegations, including my own, who originally sponsored and submitted draft resolution L.22, have all made a considerable effort to combine two texts that, from the outset, shared a common purpose, namely, to initiate a discussion of international arms transfers, with all the lack of control, distrust and insecurity they bring about, and perhaps to take action on a question fraught with great dangers to all. The revised text embodies the concerns of a large group of delegations that shared their concerns with us and suggested amendments to our text.

(Mr. Chacon, Costa Rica)

We are well aware that it does not cover all the very numerous points made in the First Committee on the subject, but we also see in it a significant first step to shed light on a subject on which, at the regional, national and multilateral levels, practically nothing is being done.

The preamble of the draft resolution refers to the declarations made at various times by Heads of State and of Government, by Foreign Ministers and other representatives of States members of the United Nations, both at the special sessions of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and in the general debates in the General Assembly.

In the preamble, the draft resolution takes into account the principles contained in paragraph 22 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly and it uses them as an underpinning for the proposal that there be "negotiations on the limitation of international transfer of conventional weapons".

It also draws on the conclusions arrived at in various studies sponsored by the United Nations on regional disarmament and the economic and social consequences of the arms race and military expenditures, the relationship between disarmament and development, the reduction of military budgets, the relationship between disarmament and international security and confidence-building measures.

Lastly, it takes account of the Programme of Action set forth in the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development in 1987.

In the operative section, the draft resolution expresses the conviction that international transfers of weapons deserve serious consideration by the international community because it is becoming increasingly clear with each passing day that such transfers affect all nations, whether in the North, South, East or West, whether they are rich or poor. We make this point because arms transfers

(Mr. Chacon, Costa Rica)

should not be left in the hands of irresponsible persons out of indifference or lack of concern for the negative effect of such transfers on the international community.

Arms trafficking has a detrimental effect on development in various ways and contributes to international insecurity.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.22/Rev.1 requests all Member States to reinforce their national systems of control and vigilance concerning production and transport of arms, to examine ways and means of refraining from acquiring arms additional to those needed for legitimate national security requirements and to seek agreements between producing and consuming countries that provide the greatest possible openness and transparency with regard to world-wide arms transfers.

The paragraph in which Member States are invited to take those measures does not overlook legitimate needs of self-defence, and that was done because the sponsors are aware of the great complexities of arms transfers. But we do not want to waste time, and these matters can be covered by appropriate national and international regulations.

However, in addition to these provisions, an important element of the draft resolution is the request that the Secretary-General collect the opinions and suggestions of Member States on the issues raised in the draft resolution, with a view to submitting to the General Assembly at its forty-fourth session a complete picture of the thinking of all Member States and a synthesis of the relevant information on the problem.

But the sponsors of the draft to which I am referring felt that, having asked Member States for their views and proposals, it was essential to go further, so that the Secretary-General, with the assistance of governmental experts, could carry out a study on ways and means of promoting transparency in international transfers of conventional arms on a universal and non-discriminatory basis.

(Mr. Chacon, Costa Rica)

It is essential to take an objective view not only of Member States' views but also of carefully and systematically arranged information, so that by its forty-sixth session the General Assembly will be able to have a more thorough understanding of the problem of arms trafficking and take decisions in order to solve those problems.

The last point we make is the need for sustained attention to the problem over the next few years. It would be pointless for us to introduce the measure in the First Committee now only to have it drift into oblivion. The studies and other proposals we have made are designed to prevent that from happening, so that the international community will be thoroughly aware of a problem which it needs to resolve.

In conclusion, I wish to draw attention to the prominent role played by Ambassador Butler and other members of the Australian delegation in the preparation of the draft resolution. His constant support and inspiration were invaluable to us.

I should like to take this opportunity also to thank all the sponsors of the draft resolution for being so helpful.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call for statements in explanation of vote before the voting. If there are none, the Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.10/Rev.1 as orally amended.

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Denmark at the 38th meeting of the First Committee on 15 November. The sponsor has expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.10/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.15.

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of China at the thirtieth meeting of the First Committee on 8 November. The sponsor of the draft resolution has expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote.

If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.15 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): The United States delegation has long advocated greater attention by the First Committee to conventional disarmament, and we have supported the commendable work in this field of the Danish delegation, which introduced draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.10/Rev.1 as orally revised. We were pleased to join in the adoption of that draft resolution without a vote. Our delegation welcomes the revision inasmuch as it does not prejudice the effect of quantitative and qualitative improvements in armaments. Clearly, the effect of such improvements has to be assessed in the light of a number of factors, such as needs of legitimate self-defence, impact on regional and world stability, manpower versus technological capacities of the countries concerned, and so forth. It is also evident, therefore, that one cannot view qualitative characteristics of armaments in isolation from such factors. To do so would be simplistic and totally unrealistic.

Mr. HOULLEZ (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I wish to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.10/Rev.1, as orally revised. My delegation is happy that consensus was reached on that text. We wish in that connection to recall the view of the Belgian and many other delegations, reaffirmed during the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, that it is necessary to proceed to substantial reductions of conventional weapons and armed forces throughout the world, taking account of the special characteristics of each region. We welcome the convergence of views in Europe on the need to limit the capacity to launch surprise attacks and large-scale offensive action.

We hope that at its 1989 session the Disarmament Commission will continue to work actively on problems related to conventional weapons.

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to state its position on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.15, with respect to the emphasis it places on certain aspects of conventional disarmament. The draft resolution recalls the high priority accorded to nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war, and expresses awareness of the fact that with the advance in science and technology, weapons tend to become increasingly destructive. The draft resolution also recalls the special responsibility of States with the largest military arsenals and other militarily significant States and expresses the belief that the resources released through disarmament can be used for development. We should remember that those States account for more than 80 per cent of world military spending.

The draft resolution points out objectively that conventional disarmament efforts must duly take into account the need of States to protect their security and maintain their defensive capacities.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to cluster 11: to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.49 as orally revised by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee, held on 9 November, and is sponsored by the delegations of Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Belgium, the Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom. The sponsors have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the First Committee without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.49, as orally revised, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I call now on the representative of the United States, who wishes to explain his delegation's position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States): The United States joined in the adoption, without a vote, of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.49, as orally revised, in view of the important role confidence-building measures can play in reducing tensions and enhancing security. It finds it necessary to note, however, that the revisions introduced orally by the main sponsor of the draft resolution do not necessarily improve the text. While we appreciate the value of having a draft resolution on this important subject enjoy the support of all members of this Committee, a number of the revisions are highly selective quotations from the guidelines for confidence-building measures adopted by consensus in the Disarmament Commission last spring. As such, they not only do not faithfully reflect the totality of those guidelines, but also disturb the balance of the draft resolution.

It is our view, therefore, that the draft resolution should not be construed as a special endorsement of certain guidelines at the expense of others.

The CHAIRMAN: At our meeting tomorrow morning, we shall begin with draft resolutions in clusters 8 and 13 and shall then return to cluster 4 to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.26/Rev.1. We shall then take action, in cluster 6, on draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.31 A and A/C.1/43/L.31 B.

I am pleased at the progress made in mergers and discussions of draft resolutions. I just learned, for example, that important progress has been made by those participating in the consultations on verification. With a view to facilitating an appropriate decision on that matter, the Secretariat will issue the text of the merged draft resolution as document A/C.1/43/L.75.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.