United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
FORTY-FIRST SESSION
Official Records*

FIRST COMMITTEE
15th meeting
held on
6 November 1986
at 10.10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 35th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/41/PV.35
18 November 1986
ENGLISH

86-63208 2915V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: As I informed the Committee yesterday, an informal paper setting out a list of all the draft resolutions on disarmament agenda items arranged in 13 different clusters has been prepared. It is now being distributed to the Committee.

AS far as the item on disarmament and development is concerned, members will recall the statement I made at the Committee's 28th meeting, OR 31 October, in which I referred to the situation concerning the subject-matter and the ongoing consultations thereon. It is my intention to inform the Committee in the near future concerning the outcome of those consultations and regarding the action to be taken OR this issue.

The clusters, as I explained in my earlier statement, were devised by the Bureau on the basis of the pattern that has evolved during the past several years. In the process of grouping the various draft resolutions, the Bureau took into account the most logical and practical criteria available and endeavoured at the same time to group them according to related subject-matter to the extent possible.

In this connection I should like to stress that no other motivation should be attached to the efforts of the Bureau in this respect than their desire to facilitate and expedite the work of the Committee with a view to utilizing the time allocated for this phase of the Committee's work in the most effective manner possible.

With respect to any timetable for action on the draft resolutions, it is my intention to move, as far as possible, from one cluster to another in sequence at the conclusion of action on each cluster. At the same time, in applying this procedure an attempt will be made to maintain the required degree of flexibility. I hope that I shall have the Committee's understanding when I say that I shall not be in a position to give any precise indication of the days on which any particular

(The Chairman)

clusters will be taken up. Nevertheless, to the extent possible, I shall try to provide advance information as to how we shall proceed at successive meetings.

As for action on each individual cluster, delegations will first of all have the opportunity to make any statements, other than explanations of vote, which they regard as necessary with respect to the draft resolutions in that cluster. Subsequently, delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes on any or all of the draft resolutions in a particular cluster before a decision is taken will be able to do so. Then, after the Committee has taken a decision on the draft resolutions contained in a given cluster, delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes after the decision is taken will be able to do so.

I would therefore again urge delegations, to the extent feasible, to make a consolidated statement on the draft resolutions contained in an individual cluster with respect to the statements and explanations of positions or the vote concerned.

Before proceeding to the question of the Committee's proceedings on Monday, 10 November, when the Committee will embark upon action on the draft resolutions, may I take it that the suggested programme of work and the procedures I have outlined are acceptable to the Committee?

If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with our programme, the Committee will commence action on the draft resolutions contained in the first cluster, and thereafter proceed, within the time available, to the other clusters in sequence, taking into account the proviso that I have already mentioned concerning the due degree of flexibility that may need to be maintained. I am confident that I shall have the Committee's fullest co-operation in adhering to this procedure, especially

(The Chairman)

since the clusters have been distributed well in advance and several days are available to delegationa to engage in the necessary consultations and to seek instructions, as appropropriate, from their rsxpective capitals.

I should like to refer to one other point. In view of the action that we xhall need to take on such a large number of draft resolutions and the I imited time available for that purpoxe, it ix my intention to start our morning meetings at LO a.m. during the period 10 to 17 November. In this connection I wish to appeal to all delegations kindly to be present at meetings punctually in order to enable the Committee to begin itx work promptly..

AGENDA ITEMS 46 TO 65 AND 144 (continued)

CONS IDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) : I am speaking today to introduce briefly for the Committee's consideration draft rexolution A/C.1/41/L.19, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free xone in the Middle East", under item 49 of the General. Assembly 's agenda.

Egypt'8 preoccupatio with the perilx that nuclear weaponc and nuclear-weapon systems poxe for the world in of long standing. Our concern hae baen manifested in different formx and in a w ide range of endeavour a. Over a number of years we have played an active role in the establ ishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency, in the negotiation8 culminating in the Non-Proliferation Treaty and its adoption by the First Committee at a special session and, most recently, during the Third Review Conferonce of the Parties to the Trenty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Geneva, in September 1986.

Egypt firmly believes that tho dangers caused by nuclear weapons can be alleviated permanently only through a comprehensive and global solution. We have, however, complemented our global ef forts with concerted regional endeavours aimed at establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones. Cairo hosted in 1964 the African summit Conferenco calling for a nuclear-weapon-free Af r iaa.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

At the United Nations Egypt has also traditionally sponsored, jointly and independently, the call for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. We remain as committed to these regional goals as we are to global efforts to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world. We shall spare no effort in this regard) *nor* shall we be put off by the complexities of the problems or obstacles which may arise. We cannot but persevere, for the very existence of nuclear weapons entails a risk to the security of the world community as a whole, and a rampaging nuclear-arms race cannot but endanger us all.

On the regional level, we must once more caution against any intrusion of nuclear weapons into the Middle East - a situation which would have grave consequences, immensely exacerbating an already tense situation. Egypt calls upon States of the region and beyond to refrain from taking any steps or action which might lead to a nuclear-arms race in the Middle East.

Since 1974 Egypt has submitted for the Committee's consideration draft resolutions calling for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. This year, too, we have put before members a draft resolution in this regard. The relevant document, A/C.1/41/L.19, is self-explanatory and for all practical purposes identical with resolution 40/82, which was adopted by consensus during the fortieth session of the General Assembly. The changes made are simply of an editorial nature and were necessary to accommodate references to new documents presented this year, such as the reports called for from the Secretary-General in implementation of last year's resolution. We should like to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General for those reports.

We acknowledge that some delegations might have preferred to see this year a draft resolution which could expedite the process leading to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. We share this position and would even

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

aubmlt that no delegation here is more anxious to have thie process pursued with promptness and dispatch and to see 'he political pronouncements of the General Assembly tranmlated into practical measures, permanently freeing the Middle East from the dangers of nuclear weapons. However, recognizing the complexity of the problem and all its interrelated elements, we felt it would be helpful to accord more opportunity to the differant parties concerned fully to convey their opinions on this issue to the Secretary-General. We are convinced that thia will enhance our ability in the future to take all the different anpecte fully into account and enable us to consider a more ambitious effort next year.

In conclusion, Egypt would like to urge all parties concerned, particularly those that have not yet done so, fully to convey their views to the Secretary-General as soon as poeeible in order to enable us all to give them the appropriate consideration. We should also like to emphasize the importance of the adoption af draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.19, in accordance with tradition, by consensus. We are confident that delegations will continue to lend us their support in this regard.

Mr. IPPORI (Israel): I should like to take a few minutes of the Committee's time to urge all its members to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.40, "General and complete disarmament: prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons", introduced yesterday by Iraq.

This draft resolution is redundant) there is another draft resolution on the same subject, A/C.1/41/L.7, on the lines of those which in the past have been adopted by consensus, as it is hoped this year's draft resolution will. be. The only new element in the Iraqi draft is operative paragraph 1, which is equally redundant, as well as being inaccurate. The whole question of the Israeli attack

(Iraq/Ippori)

against the Iraqi reactor five years ago has been exhaustively discussed both in this Organization - again only a week ago - and in the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). There is absolutely no justification for raising the matter once again.

Moreover, anyone with the most elementary knowledge of the facts of the bombing of the Osirak reactor knows that it was attacked before it had become operative. This was done in order to avoid any possible radioactive fall-out, and in fact there was none. The inaccuracy of this paragraph in itself is more than enough to justify rejection of the draft resolution before us. It is, I believe, clear to all members that it was introduced for no other reason than to launch another spiteful attack upon my country. My delegation will, of course, vote against draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.40 and I hope that all members will do likewise.

Mr. STRULAK (Poland): I have the honour and the privilege to introduce today the draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.56, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". The draft resolution in question is being introduced on behalf of the delegations of Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Mongolia, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Viet Nam and, of course, Poland.

The debates in the First Committee this year have demonstrated, as has been the case in previous years, that the general concern over the ever threatening presence of chemical weapons has certainly not diminished. That concern has been compounded by the fact that the work of the Conference on Disarmament has this year again fallen short of achieving the expected ultimate goal -- the final elaboration of a draft convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction.

(Mr. Strulak, Poland)

On the other hand, wide positive references have been made to the considerable progress achieved by the Conference in bringing closer solutions to a number of major problems concerning the draft convention, thanks to the otrenuoue efforts of the Conference, it8 Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons in particular, and the goodwill aemonstrated by member States.

On this basis, pressing calls have been formulated in this Hall *for* a decisive effort towards finalizing the draft convention with the time. factor being stressed more than ever before.

The draft resolution that the co-sponsors are preeenting today to the Firer: Committee reflects theae main lines of the debate here. As the draft resolution otherwise largely follows the pattern of previoua traditional or conuensus resolutions on chemical weapons, I shall spare the Committee a detailed reintroduction of paragraphs that are identical with those of last year and limit my comments to a few changes or, to be more precise, addition6 made.

The first addition is the third preambular paragraph, which takes note of the Final Lkxument of the Second Review Conference of! the Parties to the Convention on the prohibition of bacteriological weapone, of 1972, and in particular of article IX of the consensus Final Declaration of that Conference, which, inter alia, urged the Conference on Diaarmamentr

*to exert all possible efforts to conclude an agreement *on a* total ban of chemical weapons with effective verification by the earliest possible date."

This addition, we believe, is self-explanatory.

(Mr. Strulak, Poland)

The second addition occurs in the second part of the fourth preambular paragraph, which notes the holding by the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, since 1984, of intersessional consultations, which increased the time devoted to negotiations. We believe that this supplementary effort, which has brought fruitful results, deserves to be duly acknowledged.

The third addition concerns the words "and use" in the third line of the fifth preambular paragraph and in the third line of paragraph 1. The words are introduced to make the name of the future convention in the text of the draft resolution correspond fully to the actual wording used in the so-called rolling text of the draft convention being elaborated by the Conference on Disarmament, in particular in paragraph 3 of chapter I of the appendix.

The fourth and last addition is the insertion of the words "nonetheless" and "notwithstanding the progress made in 1986" in the first and second lines, respectively, of paragraph 2. The sponsors believe that the addition of those words would constitute an appropriate reflection of the increamed concern that the convention in question has still not been elaborated, even though there has been progress in that direction.

The sponsors wish to express their hope that draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.56 will be adopted by consensus, as well as their profound conviction that it will provide the necessary support to the Conference on Disarmament for the finalization as early as possible of its work on the global and total ban on chemical weapons.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the representative of Poland to submit the amendments he has just proposed to the Secretariat in writing, so that the draft resolution, as amended, can be circulated.

I now call upon Ambassador Wijewardane of Sri Lanka, who will speak in his capacity as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference.

Mr. WIJEWARDANE (Sri Lanka, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference): I have the honour, as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, to introduce its report, document A/41/28, as well as a draft resolution entitled "World Disarmament Conference", A/C.1/41/L.63.

The mandate of the Ad Aoc Committee was renewed by General Assembly raaolution 40/15/ of 16 December 1985. In that mandate, the Ad Hoc Commi ttee was requested, inter alia,

> "to continue to maintain close contact with the representatives of the nuclesr-weapon States in order to remain currently informed of their positions, as well as with all other States" (General Assembly resolution 40/154).

The Ad Hoc Committee was also asked

> "to consider any relevant comments and observations which might be made to the Commi t tee, especially bear in; in mind paragraph 122 of the Final Document of tile tenth special session of the General Assembly" (resolution 40/154).

The Ad Hoc Committee was also requested to submit a report to the forty-first session of the General Assembly, and document A/41/28 fulfils that mandate.

The format of the report follows the usual three-tier arrangement, Part I being an intrc iction. That introduction reproduces a substantial part of resolution 40/154, which constituted guidelines for the work of the Ad Hoc Commi ttea in 1986. In addition, it contains general information concerning pa. ticipation and organization of work, as well as a list of the elected officers of the Ad Hoc Committee. Part II covers the work of the Ad Hoc Commi ttce and incorporates the updated indications of the positions of the nuclear-weapon States presented to the Ad Hoc Committee in the cour se of the close contacts maintained through its Chairman with the repreaentativea of those States pursuant to paragraph 3 of resolution 40/154. Part III contains the conclusions and recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee and states, inter alia:

(Mr. Wijewardane, Chairman, Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference)

"The Ad Hoc Committee reiterated that the idea of a world disarmament conference has received wide support by the membership of the United Nations, however, with varying degrees of emphasis on and differences concerning conditions and certain aspects related to the question of the convening of such a conference, including aspects related to the deteriorating international situation." (A/41/28, para. 13)

The report also concluded, as evident from the updated positions of the nuclear-weapon States, that

"no consensus with respect to the convening of a world disarmament conference under the present conditions has yet been reached among the nuclear-weapon States, whose participation in such a conference has been deemed essential by most States Members of the Organization: (A/41/28, para. 13)

Having in mind the important requirements of a world disarmament conference to be convened at the earliest appropriate time, with universal participation and with adequate preparation, the Ad Hoc Committee recommended that the General Assembly renew the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee and request it to continue to maintain close contact with the representatives of the nuclear-weapon States in order to remain currently informed of their attitudes, as well as with all other States, and to consider any relevant comments and observations which might be made to the Ad Hoc Committee.

In concluding my introduction of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, I wish to thank the members of the Ad Hoc Committee, particularly those who participated in the Working Group, for their co-operation in preparing the draft report. The Rapporteur of the Ad Hoc Committee, the representative of Spain, Mr. Pablo Barrios, must in particular be mentioned for having discharged his responsibilities in a commendable manner in preparing the report.

(Mr. Wijewardane, Chairman, Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference)

I would also like to extend my sincere thanks to the Counnellor of the Polish Mission, Mr. Kazimierz Tomaszewski, the Vice-Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, who assisted me greatly in advancing the work of the Ad Hoc Committee.

I also have the privilege to introduce, on behalf of Peru, Poland, Spain and Sri Lanka, draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.63, "World Disarmament Conference," which proceeds from the aforementioned recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Paragraph 2 of that draft resolution provides for the renewal of the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee. Paragraph 3 wntains a recommendation that the Chairman of the Ad Hw Committee undertake conaultationa with the representatives of the nuclear-weapon States, as well as with all other States, in order to remain currently informed of their positions on the question of convening & world disarmament conference. Paragraph 4 contains a request to the Secretary-General to report on the results of my consultations to the General Assembly at its forty-•ewnd ● eeaion. In paragraph 5, there is a decision to include in the provisional agenda of the forty-second ● eaaion of the General Assembly an item entitled "World Disarmament Conference."

Hence, should this draft resolution be adopted, the question of convening the meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee would be deferred to the forty-eecond session of the General Assembly and wuld be further considered, with due account taken of the developments concerning the situation.

In ● ubaitting this draft resolution, the sponsors also proceeded from the premise that the suggested order of actions for the current etage of the proceedings of the Ad Hoc Committee would contribute to the measures that could help in easing the present financial situation of the United Nations. On their behalf, I Would like to recommend draft reaolution A/C.1/41/L.63 for adoption by consensus.

(Mr. Wijewardane, Chairman, Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference)

In conclusion, I wish to extend to the Secretary of the Ad Hoc Committee, Mr. Sohrab Kheradi, nnd him asaiatanta the appreciation and thank8 of the members of the Ad Hoc Committee for a job well *done* durinq the year under review. I hope that their continuing assistance will be made availahle to me in the *year* shred.

Mr. ROCHE (Canada) : I am pleaaed to announce that Canada is a sponsor, under agenda item 46, of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.72, entitled "Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty".

As Canada's Prime Minister, the Right Honourahle Brian Mulroney, and the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Right Honourable Joe Clark, have consistently emphasized, Canada nupporta a negotiated and verif iahle comprehensive test-ban reaty which will and all nuclear testing, including so-called *peaceful* nuclear explosiona, by all countries in all environment8 and for all time as a fundamental arms control objective. Mr. Clark recently reiterated this point. He said:

> "It is my firm belief that a comprehensive teat han can be verifiable. The implementation of a comprehensive test ban will, however, in the final analysis, depend upon political vill, particularly on the pait of the nuclear-weapon States."

Unfortunately, there are no ● irrple panaceas or ● hort cuts to the achievement of our objective. The process is necessarily a deliberative and difficult one. There is, however, legitimate cause for optimism that, through perseverance and c-operation, we can take *concrete* and significant steps toward the achievement of this important goal.

The purpose of the draft resolution before us is to accelerate progress, generate political will, and ensure that the process leading to a test-ban treaty is directed in a constructive fashion. we are gratified to note that the draft

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

resolution urges the Conference on Disarmament to commence practical work on a nuclear test-ban treaty at tho beginning of its 1987 session. As the sole multilateral forum mandated to negotiate disarmament aqreements, the Conference, in Canada's view, should play a substantive and practical role in working towards the realization of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The work of the Conference should supplement, complement and, if necessary, stimulate discussions amonq the nuclear States, most particularly the super-Powers.

Canada is encouraq d by the progress made hy the United Staten and the Soviet Union in Reyk javik. We are especially gratified hy their mutual acceptance of a step-by-step process for reducinq nuclear tests, leading to the complete cessation of teats. There was also a broad convergence of views on the aueation of verification procedures. Canada will continue to encourage them to make special efforts to reach agreement on reductions in nuclear arsenals and testing in tandem with confidence-b! ildinq and verification measures.

We would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the special efforts currently directed towards eeeking an end to nuclear-weapon testing. We refer in particular to the five-continent peace initiative formulated in Mexico last August. This initiative will contribute to ensuring that the attention of the euper-Powers remains focused on the vital stake *of* the world community *in* increasing public awareness of the dangers posed by nuclear proliferation.

we cannot speak on the subject of a teat-ban treaty without stressing the importance which Canada attaches to verification. For any test han, tent limitation or moratorium to be successful an a confidence-buildinq meaaure or as a means of endinq competitions in arms, arqumenta over non-compliance must he avoided by ensuring that an adeouate verification régime is in place. This can he achieved only through private neqot iat ions, not through publ ic declarations.

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

In this regard, Canada is an active supporter of and contributor to the work of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts within the Conference on Disarmament. The Group of Experts has made considerable progress in recent years on the refinement of methods of seismic verification and the conununication of seismic data.

We are particularly pleased at the inclusion of language in operative paragraph 3 (a) of our draft reaolution which urges the Conference on Disarmament:

"To take immediate steps for the establishment, with the widest possible part ic ipat ion, of an international seismic monitoring network with a view to the further development of its potential to monitor and verify compliance with a comprehensive nuclear-test-han treaty".

Canada helieven that the work of the Group of Scientific Experts offers an excellent means of co-ordinatinq international efforts to promote test han verification.

For its part, Canada is supporting a number of private sector research projects relatinq to various aspects of test-ban verification. Through the upgradinq of the Yellowknife seismic array in our Northern Territories, we are also expanding the capahilitiee of an already extensive network of more than 100 seismic Inonitorinq stations across the country. Althouqh the primary purpose of the existinq Canadian seismic network is to monitor earthquakes, the data generated could form an integral part of an international seismic monitoring system which would have to he established to monitor an eventuai test-ban treaty. The Canadian Government currently devotee $2.5 million per year to these activities.

In October, an international workshop on the processing of waveform data was held in Ottawa and attended by experts from 17 countries. The exchange of waveform data is likely to he an important aspect of the verification of a test ban by seismic means.

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

Canada's approach to a test ban is actively supported by a vocal and concerned Canadian public. Canadians expect their representatives to express support for and make an active contribution to international efforts leading to the realization of a coat-ban treaty and, ultimately, to the [illegible] of all nuclear weapons.

Returning to the draft resolution before us, Canada believes that it steers a correct course. On the one hand it is responsive to the realities of the nuclear age as we know them today; it does not make sweeping promises or present unrealistic palliatives. On the other hand it does not neglect to set out the broad arms control and disarmament objectives towards which the global community must strive. The draft resolution provides realistic, concrete proposals for the achievement of these goals. We wish to thank the Australian and New Zealand delegations, as well as the other sponsors, for their work in preparing this forward-looking draft resolution. It is our hope that the draft resolution will find unanimous support from all members of this Committee.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): On behalf of the delegations of France, *Iceland*, the Netherlands, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Sweden and the United Kingdom and of my own delegation, I introduce now into the First Committee draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.71.

This is a simple and, we believe, important draft resolution relevant to the work of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Earlier this year the Secretary-General of the United Nations spoke publicly about - and thue brought to the attention of the world community - the fact that the Director of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) had been abeent from his post for several months. That absence, which began in December 1985, ham continued to the present time. The Seoretmry-General and the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies have reported on the serious effect that Mr. Bota's absence from him post ham had an the Institute's work.

Our draft resolution in document A/C.1/41/L.71 expresse our deep concern at that effect on the Institute's work and we believe it is a concern that should be shared throughout the United Nations. Th a fundamental objective of the draft reeolution is to see that the work of tho United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research is restored to good health.

We know what ham happened mince December 1985. A full account of the events from that time to the present was given a few days ago in the Committee in a statement aade by the United Nation8 Under-Secretary-General Mr. Jan Martenson. That etatenmnt wa8 clear and very informative.

what we do not know is why this has happened. There orn be only one clear source of an answer to that question, that is the authorities who have retained Mr. Bota in Bucharest and prevonted him from returning to him post at Geneva. We hoard a statement two daye ago by a representative of those authorities - that made by Ambassador Marinescu. Regrettably, hi8 statement did not answer the basic question of why Mr. Bota is being prevented from resuming him post. Instead the statement made a series of contradictory assertions about Mr. Bota's value to Romanian government adminietration, even though in the same tmtement it was alleged that he had involved himself in espionage activities; and then the extraordinary assertion was made that, nevertheless, ha continues to run the affairs of UNIDIR from Bucharest.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

UNIDIR's affairs should be run by its Director from Geneva and, as the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies have reported, that is not being done and that in damaging the Institute.

Some might say that this draft resolution has motivations other than those I have just described. Some might even speculate that there is more to it than appears on the printed page of document A/C.1/41/L.71. I want to address that point directly. This draft resolution is not directed against Romania or the Romanian authorities, and any suggestion to the contrary is utterly misconceived.

All of us who have sponsored this draft resolution want to maintain and continue good relations with Romania and certainly want to co-operate with it as fully as possible in the field of disarmament. What this draft resolution seeks to do - in addition to ensuring that Mr. Bota returns to his post in Geneva and that the Institute's health is restored - is to reaffirm and protect principles that are of vital importance to all of us with respect to the integrity and independence of the United Nations Secretariat.

The Secretariat is one of the Charter organs *of* the United Nations, and the rules under which United Nations staff are employed and to which they must conform, if they are to do their job without fear or favour, are rules of fundamental importance - *and* we must see that they are observed. Thus, this draft resolution is not only about calling for Mr. Bota's return to his post in Geneva but is also about seeking to protect those rules and the integrity of the United Nations Secretariat.

We trust that this draft resolution will receive the full support of the Committee and earnestly hope that, when adopted, it will be implemented in all respects without delay.

MK. SOB (Cameroon): At the 17th meeting of the First Committee on 22 October 1986, the Permanent Representative of Cameroon had the honour to outline the views of the Government of the Republic of Cameroon on the review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, which appears as item 60 (j) on the Committee's current agenda. At that time we stressed the view that the item deals with the core of the role - indeed, the very raison d'être - of the United Nations under the Charter, namely, the maintenance of international peace and security. We also expressed the hope that, at its 1987 substantive session, the Disarmament Commission will successfully conclude its consideration of the subject and submit a final report to the forty-second session of the General Assembly in 1987.

In this connection, Cameroon continues to believe that the United Nations provides the most appropriate forum for the harmonization and co-ordination of our collective endeavours in this field. Cameroon therefore once again calls upon the General Assembly to take the necessary measures to enable the world body to discharge more effectively its central role and primary responsibility in this sphere, taking into account, inter alia, the consensus resolutions of the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth and fortieth sessions - resolutions 39/151 G and 40/94 O, respectively - the views of Member States and the work already accomplished by the Disarmament Commission on the review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, as reflected in the Commission's reports to the fortieth and forty-first sessions of the General Assembly in documents A/40/42 and A/41/42. We think it is time for this Assembly of sovereign States to take a bold and urgent decision to breathe new life into the United Nations multilateral diearmament effort and rouse it from its debilitating slumber. We will give this important item a careful review against the backdrop of the current structural reform of the United Nations.

(Mr. Sob, Cameroon)

I have ● mkmd to mpemk today to introduce the draft resolution oontained in document A/C.1/41/L.70, entitled "General and complete disarmament: Review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament". Its ● ponmorm are Antigua and Barbuda, Aumtralia, Austria, the Bahamas, Barbados, Bmlgiun, B. lime, Bolivia, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Comtm Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Gabon, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Greece. Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Panama, Papua New Guinea, the Phil ippinem, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Chrimtophar and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Surinam, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Uruguay, Vanuatu, and Zambia.

Our draft resolution is ● mmrntially procedural. It does not meek to take sides on any of the ● pecific problems in the disarmament field) rather, its aim is to review the role of the United Nation8 in thim entire field with a view to rendering it more effective. we believe that disarmament is of global relevance and of interest to all countries and peoples. The United Nations, an Organization committed to the universality of itm membership and charged with the solemn remponmibility of maintaining international peace and secur ity, therefore appears am the most appropriate forum for building a univormally-applicable process of peace, including disarmament. This Organiaatton mumt therefore strive ta reconcile the various and sometimes different pomitionm of States on various specific disarmament problomm with a view to arriving at conmenmum agreements.

A more effective United Nationm role in thim field is parti ularly important for small countries like mine which have neither the means or the inclination to join the arnm race, nor adequate means for credible protection against the weapons of mass destruction possessed by the militarily ● ignificant States.

(Mr. Sob, Cameroon)

Over the past four decades, especially with the traumatic dawn of the nuclear age, Governments and peoples the world over have increasingly recognized that diearmament, and especially nuclear disarmament, in an essential component of efforts not only to achieve international peace and security, but above all to remove the ghastly threat posed to the very survival of the human race by nuclear weapons. No issue is more compelling and more universal than the quest for nuclear disarmament. And no forum provides a more ideal framework for global negotiations in the interest of our collective security than the universal forum of the united Nations. What is required is to enhance, in a concrete manner, the effectiveness and credibility of this universal forum to enable it to play its central role and discharge fully its primary responsibility in this field.

From the statements of representatives in this Committee, it would seem clear that, despite many efforts over many years, progress in the disarmament field has, regrettably, been extremely limited, and the role of the United Nations has appeared increasingly marginal. A comprehensive review of the role of the United Nations in this field would provide an opportunity for the international community to identify new ways and means of making that role more effective with a view to promoting substantial progress in diearmament.

Forty years since the establishment of the United Natione "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war", sane stock-taking would appear necessary to enable us all to re-examine collectively what the international community is doing in this critically important field. We recognize that a number of important and commendable structural and institutional improvements have been made within the context of enhancing the United Nations role in the dinarmament field. Many of those improvements cam about an a result of the first review undertaken by the General Assembly in this field a decade ago.

(Mr. Sob, Cameroon)

The present regrettable situation and the lack of vubetantive progress in the First Committee, the Conference on Disarmament and the united Nations Disarmament Commission demonstrates, in our view, that it is not the proliferation of resolutions, meetings, studies and other programmee ok activities that will bring about disarmament. Surely, the various programmoo and activities are important and relevant and have been carried out efficiently. My delegation beliavea, nevertheless, that it is not just a question of doing things right but, perhaps, more impx tant, of doing the right things. We urgently need concrete, practical political agr n'e among States, as well as institutional arrangements, in which Member States can have confidence. In our view, the United Nations has adequate facilities and resources at its disposal to play a more eff :tive role in the field of disarmament. The central issue now is to make better use of those resources.

It is our conviction that the immediate focus in our collective endeavouc at 's strge must be on the fullest and most constructive use of the resources and structures of the United Nations system in the field of disarmament. If the regrettable deadlock in disarmament efforts, including that in the Disarmament Commiaeion itself, has demonstrated anything, it is perhaps that, notwithstanding the importance that may be attached to the institutional arrangements made and reforms carried out, tney shruld neither be confused with nor made to replace concrete, substantive results.

Our primary concern is not so much the quantity as the quality of the work done. We have no doubt that so Ear th' United Nations has efficiently carried out its various activities in the field of disarmament. But has the United Nations been effective in thir field?

Some of the reasons why t ie Organization's role has not always been fully effective in this field lie well beyond the institutional context of the united

(Mr. Sob, Cameroon)

Nations. There has all too of ten been a regrettable absence of the appropriate political will. And, in several instances, for whatever reaeone, letermined efforts have been made to bypass the world body completely, even on universally relevant disarmament lnl tiat ives.

A review of the Unlted Nations role in the field of disarmament is neither a panacea for the lack of progress in this field, nor meant to replace substantive deliberations and negotiations. Rather, it is meant to assist and enhance those effort6 by identifying wavs and means by which the Organization's role in this field can be more effectively discharged. The review ehould provide an opportunity for giving meaning and substance to the notion that the United Nations has a central role and primary responsibility in the field of disarmament. Otherwise, the notion will remain an empty concept. which will serve only to erode further the already fragile credibility of the Organization in the eyes of the public.

The United Nations can and should be more active in the field of disarmament, not in termti of additional programmes and activities, but in terms of its approaches and the ways in which it uses the means already available to it in this field. That calls for a cleat and precise identification anc definition of the practical ways and means of discharging the role of the United Nations in disarmament.

As hae frequently been stressed in the statements of representatives in this Committee, we believe that disarmament. is a queetion of security and is, therefore, of intereet to all countries. Progress in thie domain requires the co-operation and participation of all. The process of democratization and equal participation has already begun and has been most actively encouraged. A more effective United Nations role in this field would help to ensure that opportunities are provided for accommodating the concerns and intereets of all Member States in all relevant

(Mr. Bob, Cameroon)

disarmament discussions and negotiations. It would also ensure that the role and contribution of the Secretariat is in accordance with the requirements of Member States for substantive support. The world forum of the United Nations, with its objective of universality, should therefore be utilized more fully and constructively in this field.

In our view, it is essential, in defining the United Nations role in this field in concrete terms to be guided above all by a greater sense of realism, pragmatism and priority. We believe that public confidence in the United Nations as a whole, as well as its credibility, would be further enhanced if the Organization successfully accomplished a few important tasks instead of over-extending its limited resources to cover too many inconclusive undertakings. In our view, the credibility problem from which international organizations seem to suffer is the result not so much of any significant public drift from internationalism, but of a growing sense of disappointment with their performance and achievements in articulating and concretizing this internationalism. In fact, we feel that there is growing world-wide recognition of internationalism as an increasingly inevitable way of life.

As I stated earlier, draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.70 is essentially procedural. It follows on the recommendation of the Disarmament Commission as reflected in paragraph 30 of the Commission's report to the current session of the General Assembly (A/41/42). Most of the provisions of the draft resolution are based on General Assembly consensus decisions and resolutions, including General Assembly resolutions 39/151 G and 40/94 O on the review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, which were adopted by consensus at the Assembly's thirty-ninth and fortieth sessions.

(Mr. Sob, Cameroon)

In the draft resolution's operative part, the most important element is the request to the Disar ament Commission to continue, as a matter of priority, it consideration of the item on the review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, with a view to ● ubaitting its report on the subject including conclusions, findings and recommendations, as appropriate, to the General Assembly's forty-second session.

As the Permanent Representative of Cameroon pointed out in his statement on this item at the 17th meeting of this Committee on 22 October, we have taken note of all the valuable comments and views put forward by Member States on the subject in question during the Disarmament Commission's 1986 ● brtantive session.

We hope that, ● apacially with the agreement reached on that programme of work, the Disarmament Commission will proceed to a substantive and comprehensive review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and produce coneensue rec(endations for the consideration of the General Assembly at its forty-second session.

The seemingly increasing marginalization of the role of the United Nations in this internationally and universally critical domain is a source of major concern. An urgent reappraisal of the situation would appear to be in order. Concrete practical measures of reform are urgently required to prevent the Organization f: »m laming into permanent paralysis, indeed irrelevance, in this crucial field.

(Mr. Soh, Cameroon)

The results of the work of the Disarmament Commission on the question Of the review of the role of the United Nations will, in our view, surely have a bearing one way or another on the judgement of Members States nnd of the international public as a whole regarding the role and credibilit not only of the Commission hut also of the United Nations au a whole.

Let us rise collectively to the occasion to ennure that, in future, the United Nations truly exercises its central role and primary responsibility in the field of disarmament.

On behalf of the sponsors I commend draft resolution L.70 to the attention of all Member States and express our hope that it will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. TINCA (Romania) : The subject of this short intervention is draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.39, which I sha now introduce.

As representatives will recall, laat year the General Aaaemhly adopted resolution 40/150, by which the Secretary-General waa reaueated to bring up to date, with the aseiatance of a group of qualified consultant experts appointed by him, the report entitled "The economic and social consequences of the arms race and military expenditures".

Under t terms of last year's reaolution, the report, in its updated versi on, was reaueeted for the forty-second session of the General Assembly. It is not my intention today to elaborate on the need and value of the report, since we did so last year. I ahould only like to remind members that resolution 40/150 was adopted by 139 votes in favour, one against and 7 ahetentione.

Thie year, due to the financial difficulties of the United Nations, which are well known to all of us, the Secretary-General has had to defer the elaborat ion of the report. The debates that have already taken place in the General Assembly and here in this Committee have highlighted the grave concern of an overwhelming majority of States regarding the arms race and military spending and their

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

consequences for the economic and social development of peoples in the developed and developing countries alike.

It is true that, in deciding on their military budgets individual Governments are simply exercising their right to take into account their security interests and are fully aware of all the consequences of their decision for their economic, financial and social situation. Although we believe there is no point in ensuring security through a steadily increasing accumulation of weapons, one cannot in any way challenge the sovereign right of a State to set the level of its military spending. All we ask - and this is particularly valid if the request is addressed to those countries which are responsible for the bulk of military expenditures - is that Member States, while deciding on their military budgets, take into account not only their interests but also the effects of their decision on the economic and social situation of other countries and on international peace and security as a whole.

From that point of view we are fully convinced that the report, the purpose of which is to examine the economic and social consequences of the arms race and military expenditures on a global scale and to inform all Member States accordingly, is today needed more than ever before.

This is precisely the need that draft resolution L.39 addresses. It requests the Secretary-General to bring up to date the report on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and military expenditures in accordance with paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of last year's resolution, 40/150. The Secretary-General is also requested to present the report in its updated version to the General Assembly at its forty-third session.

The draft resolution is of a procedural nature and is, in fact, meant to bring about the implementation of a resolution that has already been adopted. My

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

delegation hopes that all delegations that voted in favour of last year's resolution, 40/150, will do the same at the present session.

With your permission, I shall take this opportunity to present some comments on the statement made by the representative of Australia when he introduced draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.71.

The position of my country on this particular subject has already been explained by the Permanent Representative of Romania to the United Nations, Ambassador Marinescu, in his statement of 4 November in this Committee. I do not intend to go back over what he said as we consider that we have stated our position in very clear terms, and that we have presented all the information this Committee needs to reach a judgement on the subject that the representative of Australia introduced today.

If additional information is needed, I should like to declare in this Cormnittee that my delegation is prepared to provide it.

As to the draft resolution itself, I should like to draw the attention of delegations to the fact that it apparently expresses concern over the situation around the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR). This is understandable, for as we have already said, the Romanian delegation, Romania as a State and the Romanian Government are also concerned about the situation in IJNIDIR. We also share the concern of other delegations, and we cannot - and do not have even the slightest intention to - challenge the right of any delegation participating in this Committee to express its concern over the situation of IJNIDIR. As we have already stated, Romania has supported the activities of IJNIDIR from the very beginning, and is ready to co-operate in remedying the situation.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

That is the alleged intention of draft resolution L.71. But the real intention is to draw this Committee into discussing a problem that belongs to another Committee, namely, the Fifth Committee, if we approach the matter as the draft resolution invites the Committee to do, from the administrative and personnel standpoint.

As a matter of fact the draft resolution begins by selectively mentioning some articles from various international legal instruments, starting with the Charter - articles that deal with a matter that is not within the competence of this Committee.

(Mr. Tinoa, Romania)

It is not within the competence of this Committee to discuss Article 100 Of the United Nations Charter. Nhat we have to do here is discuss disarmament and international security. It is the Fifth Committee which deals with this kind of problem that Calls under the heading of administrative and personnel matters.

Secondly, this draft resolution is also intended to draw this Committee into an operation which is related to the so-called rescue of one person. We have explained the situation with regard to the Direator of UNIDIR, Mr. Bota, and all the delegation8 here should keep this fact in mind. As a matter of fact, draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.71 invites the Committee to take a position on a matter which perta ine to Romania. It is an internal matter now. Yet we have maintained and continue to maintain that the Romanian authorities are ready to discuss thie matter, in spite of the fact that it is cur lnternal affair. We want to keep the channel open in order to discuss the matter in the proper place, namely, in the Fifth Committee, and also to discuss it with the Secretary-General with a view to finding a satisfactory solution for all parties concerned.

The real aim of thin draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.71 is tc block - really to block - a satisfactory solution to this tragic cane. The draft resolution is not aimed at remedying the situation of UNIDIR. On the contrary, it will be unproductive and is perhaps meant to perpetuate the present situation of UNIDlR. It is very eaey to understand that the Romanian authorities will not negotiate under an ultimatum, or under terms which are humiliating. Thie draft resolution is a hostile act directed against the Government of a Member State of the United Nations.

I have said that thie is an issue for the Fifth Committee. In this Commi ttee we do not have the expertise to take a decision on it, for it is of an administrative nature and relates to personnel matters.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

The draft resolution is trying to mislead this Committee by focusing attention only on the privileges of an international civil servant. In this respect, I will quote - selectively of course, because the draft resolution is selective in quoting and making references to various legal instruments - from what has been adopted as the law for international civil servanta, namely, the Staff Regulations. Article I of the Staff Regulations is entitled "Duties, obligations and privileges.. I should like to stress the fact that the privileges ate included in the same article with duties and obligations. There is a very intimate link between immunities, pt ivilegea, duties and obligations. What I should like to quote from article I is the following;

> "By accepting appointment, they" - the international civil servants - "pledge themselves to discharge their functions and to regulate their conduct with the interests of the United Nations only in view."

Regulation 1.3 reads:

> "members of the Secretariat shall neither seek nor accept instructions from any Government or from any other authority external to the Organization."

Regulation 1.4 reads:

> "They' - the international civil servants - "shall not engage in any activity that is incompatible with the proper discharge of their duties with the United Nations.*

and further on:

> "While they are not expected to give up their national sentiments or their political and religious convictions, they shall at all times bear in mind the reserve and tact incumbent upon them by reason of their international status."

Regulation 1.5 reads:

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

"They shall not communicate to any person any information known to them by reason of their official position which has not been made public . . . nor shall they at any time use such information to private abantage. .

Regulation 1.6 reads:

• No staff member shall accept any honour, deooration, Cavour, gift or remuneration from any Government excepting for war service" - maybe we have to add "for cold war service" - "nor shall a staff member accept any honour, decoration, favour, gift or remuneration from any source external to the Organization, without first obtaining the approval of the Secretary-General."

I am not aware that the Secretary-General gave Mr. Bota apprwal to do such things.

Regulation 1.7 reads:

"Staff members may exercise the right to vote but shall not *engage* in any political activity which is inconsistent with or night reflect upon the independence and impartiality required by their status as international civil servants."

Regulation 1.8 reads:

"These privileges and immunities furnish no excuse to the staff members who enjoy then for non-performance of their private obligations or failure to observe laws and police regulations."

And now, what is included *in* the oath of the international civil servant? The international civil servant solemnly swears that he will notr

"seek ok accept instructions in regard to the performance of my duties from any Goverhment or other authority external to the Organization."

The draft resolution mentions only privileges and immunities. Where is there a reference to the duties of an international civil servant - to his duty to perform him activities independently and to be exolumively responsible to the Secretary-General and to the Organization?

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

This draft resolution reflects three basic sins: first, the draft resolution is biased; so much is evident. Secondly, the draft resolution is based on a double standard. It is directed against Romania; it treats an Eastern European country in one way, while other cases like this are treated in another way. Thirdly, this draft resolution also suffers from the grave sin of name-calling. These sins were fought for a long time in the United Nations, and I now see that the same countries which were fighting against them are enjoying with satisfaction their use against one country.

Finally, I should like to express the hope, the humble hope, that the financial implications of thin draft resolution will not be borne by the united Nations.

Mr. ABDULSATAR (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to speak to agenda item 49 and draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.19, which was introduced this morning by the representative of Egypt. My delegation supports the draft resolution, and I would add that the agenda item, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East," has been under cnneideration by the General Assembly for a number of years. Various resolutions have been adopted calling for the establishment of a nuclaar-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. Most of them were adopted by consensus but have never been implemented owing to the position taken by Israel.

Iraq has demonstrated its deep conviction that it was neceaeary to establish a a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East by wholeheartedly supporting United Nations resolutions on the subject, by ratifying the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and by placing its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards.

Many reaolutions have been adopted at the international level inviting countries to accede to tbe Non-Proliferation Treaty and to IAEA's safeguards system, since such action would repreaent an important step towards the goal of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free rone *In* the Middle East.

In this context, I would mention the following facts: First, 111 the nuclear installations in the Middle Eaet are subject to the IAEA safeguards system and the non-proliferation régime, with the exception of the nuclear installations of Israel, whose nuclear military capability hae been proved by United Nations eports in documents A/36/431 and A/40/530. Secondly, the Middle East region is not today free from nuclear weapons because of the lack of verification procedures with regard to the Israeli nuclear installationa whose existence has been pointed out by various international sources. Israel's illegal nuclear military capability has

(Mr. Abdulsatar, Iraq)

increased fear of the theft of nuclear material and equipment, proving that there has been complicity in that process on the part of other States.

The region must therefore first be freed from nuclear weapons as a first step towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. To accomplish that end, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards must be accepted and the Non-Proliferation Treaty ratified. Refusal to take these steps means that Israel has acquired nuclear weapons, and this is prejudicial to the very principle of creating a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East as set forth in the Final Document of the Third Review Conference on the NPT.

For these reasons, the only way to achieve the objective of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone is for Israel to renounce the nuclear option, accede the Non-Proliferation Treaty and place its nuclear facilities under international safeguards. Refusal to do so would nullify the positive efforts being made to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.59 on agenda item 46, "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 40/79 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)." The draft resolution is sponsored by the delegations of the following 18 countries: Bahamas, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela and Mexico.

The preambular portion of the draft resolution takes into account, as has been done in previous years, the fact that, within the zone of application of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, to which 23 sovereign States are already parties, there are some

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

Terrttoriea which, in spite of not being sovereign political entities, are nevertheless in a position to receive the benefits deriving from the Treaty through its Additional Protocol X, to which the four State8 that de jure or de facto are internationally responsible for those Territories ray become parties. The next preambular paragraph states that it would not be fair that the peoples Of some Of those Territories were deprived of such benefits without being given the opportunity to express their opinion in this connection.

The three operative paragraphs of the draft rerolution are very similar to those in ladt year's resclution On this subject. Paragraph 3 provides for the inclusion of the item in the provisional agenda of the forty-second session Of the General Assembly. Psraqraphs 1 and 2 faithfully reflect the feelings of the whole of Latin America, in terms similar to those used last year, and thoy read as follows:

"1. Deplores that the rignature of Additional Protocol I by France, which took place on 2 March 1979, has not yet been followed by the corresponding ratification, notwithstanding the time already elapsed and the pressing invitations which the General Assembly has addressed to it;

'2. Once more urgee Prance not to delay any further suc' ratification, which hau been requested 80 many times and which appears all the more advisable, since France is the only one of the four States to which the Protocol is open that is not yet party to it".

AR an epilogue, it seems appropriate to review certain facts that should be borne in mind with regard to this particul r aspect.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The first fact is that next year we shall commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the opening for signature of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and its two Additional Protocols. The second is that already 25 States are parties to this Treaty. The third is that Additional Protocol II, as we all know, is in force for the five States to which it is open for signature. The fourth is that Additional Protocol I, as is stated in the penultimate preambular paragraph of the draft resolution I am now introducing, is already in effect for three of the four States for which it is open for signature. The fifth is that France is the only one of those State which is not yet party to that instrument, despite the fact that it acceded to the Treaty on 2 March 1979, already over seven years ago; and the sixth is that, as has been said on several occasions by the United Nations, it would not be fair to the peoples of those territories within the zone of application of the Treaty of Tlatelolco - to quote the language of Additional Protocol I - "for which, de jure or de facto they" - meaning the States to which that Protocol is open for signature - "are internationally responsible" if those peoples were deprived of the benefits of the Treaty without, as the draft resolution says "being given the opportunity to express their opinion in this connection".

Now this brief summary should lead us to consider whether, contrary to what we expect, if the situation continues to be the same next year, it would be appropriate for the General Assembly to consider what type of measures could be adopted so that the peoples of the territories for which France has international responsibility within the zone of application of the Tlatelolco Treaty could be consulted on a matter of this nature which, without any doubt, can be regarded as vital.

Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): At this stage of the work of the First Committee, my delegation wishes to comment on the draft resolutions which have been submitted.

The general picture which emerges from these texts is not uniformly satisfactory.

On the one hand - as we note with great satisfaction - the overwhelming majority of draft resolutions are devoted to major problems: the prevention of nuclear war; the renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons; the complete prohibition of their use; nuclear disarmament; the cessation and prohibition of nuclear tests; the freezing of nuclear capacities; the creation of nuclear-free zones) and the implementation of a stage-by-stage programme for the complete and universal elimination of nuclear arms. We attach great significance to draft resolutions that would prevent the spread of nuclear arms to outer space; they all unambiguously reject Star Wars plans, and stress that outer space must be an arena for peaceful co-operation, not confrontation; they propose the banning of attack weapons in space, and insist on the observance of international agreements on questions connected with outer space. We also note the draft resolutions on the elimination of chemical weapons, the reduction of conventional armaments and the strengthening of existing agreements to call a halt to the arms race and to prevent its spread to new areas. There are a number of other draft resolutions which are quite properly directed towards the organization of the work of organs dealing with matters of disarmament which could facilitate success in negotiations now under way. These draft resolutions mobilize all anti-war forces in their struggle for disarmament and for a comprehensive system of international peace and security. Most of the draft resolutions are dictated by a feeling of responsibility for the serious work falling within the competence of the First Committee. The Byelorussian delegation supports these draft resolutions.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

On the other hand, some of the draft resolutions are clearly based merely on considerations of expediency, and are directed to aims that are far removed from those enshrined in early documents of the United Nations, including the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Here I should like to make the following point.. Certain Western delegations, both at this session and at previous sessions of the General Assembly, have clamoured in this Committee for a reduction in the number of draft resolutions, for a halt to the submission of highly controversial draft resolutions, and for an effort to arrive at consensus texts, It might naturally be expected that those countries would be the first to heed their own appeals and act on them. Not at all: once aqain there has been a qap hetween words and deeds.

While calling for a reduction in the number of draft resolutions and a halt to the submission of controversial draft raeolutione, certain Western States have actually increased the number of draft resolutions, and have even put forward texts of a clearly provocative nature. While calling for co-operation in producing consensus draft resolutions in texts wherever possible, the same States have persisted in refueiny to adopt any of the proposals aimed precisely at achieving balanced texts. They are reluctant to consider and adopt compromise versions proposed to them that take into account the positions of the Western countries. Furthermore, in a number of cases some Western countries have even refused to discuss with other interested delegations the very idea of merging the various texts of draft resolutions on a single subject, and or to consider specific proposals to that effect.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

Thus, the picture which emerges legitimately gives rise to the question: is this just rampant hypocrisy, or is the assumption that the idea of reducing draft resolutions and amending them, making concessions and showing readiness for co-operation, is something that should be done only by other delegation@?

(Mr. Gurlinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

It is difficult to say which of those motives is the most unsavoury. It is easy to preach one kind of behaviour while yourself acting in a completely different way. As the First Committee begins a very responsible stage of its work - action on draft resolutions - it is important that delegations consider their position most scrupulously, as regards both procedural and substantive matters, with due regard for their responsibility to the world community.

We must engage in a joint effort to create political, material, organizational and other machinery for the preservation of peace with a view to excluding even the possibility of the outbreak of war. We muet not put a spoke in the wheel of existing international machinery, much less think of new spokes to put in that wheel. Mankind needs a world without war and without weapons.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the First Committee, Mr. Sohrab Kheradi.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) : I wish to inform members of the Committee that additional countries have become sponsors of draft resolutions, as follows: A/C. 1/41/L. 3, Greece and Liber la; P/C. 1/41/L.9, Bhutan, Canada, Denmark, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Mongolia, the Ne therlanda and the United States; A/C.1/41/L.10, Botswana and Samoa; A/C.1/41/L.11, Cameroon, Denmark and the Federal Republic of Germany; A/C.1/41/L.24, Cameroon and Peru; A/C.1/41/L.26, Bahamas, Colombia, Ireland, Portugal and Spain; A/C.1/41/L. 34, Ecuador; A/C, 1/41/L. 35, Ireland; A/C.1/41/L.51, Ecuador and Kenya; A/C.1/41/L.53, Ecuador; A/C.1/41/L.54, Ecuador; A/C.1/41/L.55, the Philippinea; A/C. 1/41/L.56, Ireland and Italy; A/C.1/41/L.57, Ireland; A/C.1/41/L.58, T eland; A/C.1/41/L.59, Bahamas; A/C.1/41/L.60, Greece and Viet Nam; A/C.1/41/L.67, Ireland and Austria; A/C.1/41/L.68, the Bahamas and Ecuador; A/C.1/41/L.69, Japan and Portugal; A/C.1/41/L.70, Bahamas, Barbados, Fiji, Japan, Portugal and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines; and A/C.1/41/L.72, Greece, Kenya and Malaysia.

(Mr. Kher adi)

I wish also to inform members of the Committee that Cuba is an original sponsor of draft reeolution A/C.1/41/L.65.

The CHAIRMAN: The following delegations are scheduled to speak at this afternoon's meeting: Czechoslovakia, Pakistan, the German Democratic Republic, Peru, India, Mexico, Argentine and Yugoelavia.

The meeting coat at 12.35 p.m.