

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly
FORTY-SIXTH SESSION
Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
31st meeting
hold on
Thursday, 9 November 1991
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 31st MEETING

Chairman:

Mr. MROZIEWICZ

(Poland)

CONTENTS

Consideration of and action on draft resolutions under all
disarmament agenda items (continued)

Organization of work

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 DC-250,
2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.
91-61712 7258V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/46/PV.31
15 November 1991

ENGLISH

Best Copy Available

359

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

AGENDA ITEMS 47 TO 65 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Germany who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27.

Mr. RITTER VON WAGNER (Germany): Mr. Chairman, as this is the first time that I take the floor, I should like to extend my sincere congratulations upon your assumption of your very responsible and important task. You may rest assured that you have the full cooperation and support of the German delegation in this regard. We wish you luck and all success.

In 1989, the last time this Committee dealt with the subject of military budgets, there were still two draft resolutions on this item. One draft resolution was introduced by Romania with the title "Reduction of military budgets"] the other was introduced by my delegation and entitled "Military budgets".

We are happy to state today that this year the two delegations successfully undertook to develop a joint text, which you have in front of you as draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27. We are particularly proud of this result for two reasons: firstly, we regard the merger of the two draft resolutions as a contribution to the rationalisation of work in the Committee. Whenever there are draft resolutions of a similar content on our agenda every effort should be made to come to a joint text. Only significant, substantial and insurmountable differences of opinion on the respective subjects can, in our view, justify parallel draft resolutions.

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

Secondly, we are proud of the merger **because** it **represents one** of the many small, seemingly **insignificant steps**, that now clearly **show that** Europa **has overcome** political separation and confrontation.

The major idea in one of the former draft resolutions, **to reduce defence** budgets in order to promote disarmament, has proved to **be too simplistic**. **Progress** in **arms** control and disarmament is always the **result** of a wider political process and military budgets would only follow and than **refloat such a development**. That in being **proved** in Europa today **where** **defence budgets** are in the **process** of adaptation to a new political climate,

If this European development, however, had been **the sole background** for our draft **resolution**, we would have refrained from putting forward a new draft **resolution** on the issue. However, having listened carefully **to** the statements during the general debate of this Committee, we have been delighted to learn that the **concept** of confidence-building **measures** has found almost world-wide support.

For example, the representative from **Kenya** **said** during the **general** debate: **"The concept** of confidence building is to **create** mutual trust **and** favourable conditions to **enhance** world disarmament, peace and stability. The **enhancement** and application of confidence-building **measures** on the subregional level is, therefore, an integral part of our global **disarmament** endeavour. " (A/C.1/46/PV.15, p. 33)

The **representative** from Sri Lanka **stated**:

"We have to take urgent steps to **intensify** our **efforts** by **strengthening** **confidence-building** activities **so as** to prevent misunderstanding and **miscalculations** that might **lead** to **irreversible** military confrontation.
... If information on military **capabilities** and predictability and

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

openness in military affairs are available, that will provide the opportunity to reduce military confrontation, thereby achieving a realistic reduction in military budgets." (A/C.1/46/PV.6, p. 9)

Openness, transparency and confidence-building measures clearly have gained global significance.

It is the primary goal of the joint Romanian-German draft resolution to promote this process of carrying the issue of confidence-building measures even further, focusing upon two areas. Since General Assembly resolution 35/142 B of 12 December 1980 the United Nations has introduced a standardised reporting system on military expenditures. About one third of all States represented here are taking part in it.

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

Thee, one **purpose** of this draft resolution **is to commend those** States **that** are already **reporting their** military expenditures and to express our **appreciation** to the **Secretary-General** for providing the **reports** on this issue. Above all, however, we would like to **encourage** all **States** that have up to now refrained from reporting military expenditures to the Secretary-General to report them in the future. We believe that, in **view** of the end of the East-West **confrontation** and the earring of tensions in many regions as a **result of this development**, it is time for **those** States not yet participating **in** the reporting **system** to reconsider their **position**.

Openness and transparency in military matters should be striven for not only in **the** field of military expenditures but **in** other areas of military **relevances** well. Working **Group** I of the United **Nations** Disarmament **Commission** is dealing with **this** issue in a wider context. Much useful work has already been accomplished, but to finalise the **deliberations** of Working **Group** I in 1992 **as** foreseen will **still** require major **efforts** by all States. **Therefore**, we would like to ask all **States** participating in the Disarmament Commission to support it actively in its endeavours to complete **its** work on the issue **of** objective information on military **matters** in 1992.

Finally, I would like to thank the **Romanian** delegation for its excellent cooperation in this matter, and all the sponsors of this resolution for their **support**. Furthermore, I should like to ask all **other** States **present** at this Committee meeting to vote in favour of this draft resolution, which supports two important activities in the field of confidence-building **in** military **matters**.

~~Ms. NEAGU~~ (Romania) taking the floor for the first time in this Committee, it is my great pleasure to join other speakers in **congratulating you, Sir**, on your election to preside over our deliberations. My congratulations also go to the other officers of the Bureau.

From the outset, I would like to **stress** that my delegation **fully** shares the considerations just presented by our German colleague, Ambassador Pitter von Wagner, while he introduced draft resolution **A/C.1/46/L.27** on transparency of military expenditures. I would also like in turn to thank the **German** delegation and the other sponsors for their understanding in the process of elaborating and promoting this proposal.

Draft resolution **A/C.1/46/L.27** reflects the developments that have **occurred in** the world and at the United Nations in **the last** few years. With respect to the United Nations, I have in mind, **among** other things, the concern **for** a more realistic and constructive approach to the problems **under** discussion, on the one hand, and for a reduction of the number of resolutions, on the other. The draft resolution covers both sub-item (a) and sub-item (b) of **agenda** item 47.

A consensus is emerging among the countries of the world that increased transparency in the military field can significantly contribute to strengthening international security and stability. **As** my delegation had occasion to underline during the Committee's general debate, a wider participation in the annual reporting of military expenditures offers elements for strengthening mutual confidence.

In the meantime, transparency paves the way for adopting effective measures to reduce military activities, **armaments**, troops and budgets. In this respect, the experience of the European States within the framework of

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

the **Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) deserves** to be mentioned. One **could** hardly **conceive** of the possibility of **concluding** the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe without the effort that went into many **years** of **preparatory** work to draft and implement various confidence-building measures, beginning with those provided in the Helsinki Final Act itself.

Last year in Vienna, another decision **was** adopted providing for, inter alia, the annual exchange of information among CSCE countries on their military **budgets** on the **basis** of the **categories** of the United Nations standardised reporting system on military expenditures. Thus, measures taken at the regional level intertwine with the efforts made in the framework of the United Nations at the **world** level. We hope that this approach, and the draft resolution itself, will meet with the general support of the participating delegations, so that the draft resolution can be adopted by **consensus**.

Mr. RITTER VON WAGNER (Germany): I will now speak on agenda **item** 59, "**Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons**". I would like to express the **German Government's** support for the three draft resolutions **A/C.1/46/L.36, A/C.1/46/L.16, and A/C.1/46/L.9**, which have all been co-sponsored by Germany.

In particular, I would like to focus on the subject-matter **of draft** resolution **A/C.1/46/L.36**, which addresses the negotiations of the Conference on Disarmament on a global ban on chemical weapons. The Geneva negotiations **on a** multilateral convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling **and** use of **chemical** weapons and on **their**

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

destruction have been going on for a number of years. For a number of years, too, **this Committee has** regularly adopted **resolutions** calling on the **Conference** on Disarmament to **intensify its** work. In **this respect**, this year's draft **resolution A/C.1/46/L.36** is not **new**. However, its **significance** for the global dialogue **on arms control and disarmament** has **dramatically increased**.

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

Having had the opportunity to listen in this room yesterday to the report of Ambassador **Batsanov**, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, we know that **negotiations in Geneva have reached** a watershed. The final breakthrough is in sight and draft resolution **A/C.1/46/L.36** therefore states **that the General Assembly:**

"Strongly urges the Conference on Disarmament, as a matter of the highest priority, to resolve in the forthcoming months outstanding issues so as to achieve a final agreement during its 1992 session".

If the Conference on **Disarmament** failed to live up to **this task**, the **consequences** for the dialogue on global arms control might be **grave**, as the positive **ramifications of success** would go far beyond **chemical** disarmament.

Let me elaborate on the **crucial** importance of a **convention** banning chemical **weapons, on the** need for it, and on the opportunities it offers.

Chemical weapons are not only a particularly **cruel and** repugnant means of warfare their military value **is** very dubious at best and their continued legitimate existence poses a grave threat to international peace and security. The **Gulf War** and its antecedents have **confirmed three** conclusions. First, **chemical** weapons may be suitable for terrorising unprotected civilians they **are** apparently not suitable for deciding the outcome of a modern war, nor do they provide a useful deterrent to the outbreak of such a war. **Secondly**, despite their limited military utility, **chemical** weapons do have very harmful political properties: in the hands of **unscrupulous** aggressors they **can** foster political and military adventurism. Thirdly, non-proliferation efforts are insufficient to control the dangers that chemical weapons constitute for the international community.

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

Looking at the lessons of the Gulf War, one might wonder why it seems so difficult to bring the Geneva negotiations to a close. The security benefits which a global ban on chemical weapons would bring about seem so obvious that it is hard to understand any hesitation. Such security benefits would accrue to all countries, although some might have a particular interest in the chemical weapons convention. A Chinese scholar of the Research Institute of Chemical Defence in Beijing recently observed:

"... Developing countries face a more dangerous threat from chemical weapons than do developed countries. It is not surprising that all the uses of chemical weapons after the First World War were against developing countries.

". . . the statement 'Chemical weapons are the poor man's nuclear bomb' is wrong. The right statement is 'Chemical weapons are the sword of Damoclea hanging over the poor man's head.'"

The immediate security benefits which would flow from a global ban on chemical weapons already provide a compelling reason for strongly urging the Conference on Disarmament to conclude negotiations in Geneva. But there are further compelling reasons - reasons going beyond chemical weapons.

It may well be that the future of multilateral arms control and disarmament is at stake. It is very difficult to maintain the momentum of a complex, long-term endeavour such as multilateral arms control without any visible, tangible results. Success in this field requires treaties. The Conference on Disarmament in its present form has not produced a single text for an international treaty. The environmental modification Convention of 18 May 1977 is the latest achievement of global arms control to date.

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

Whereas disarmament treaties between the former cold war opponents proliferate, arms control on a global scale seems to have come to a **standstill**.

This somewhat gloomy picture would change dramatically if the Conference on Disarmament finally **came to terms** with the few remaining **issues** of the chemical weapons convention. The convention would provide invaluable fresh impetus for the endeavour **of** global arms control. The liberation of mankind from the threat **of** chemical weapons would have positive implications that would go far beyond the matter under negotiation.

In addition to the direct **security** benefits, States parties to the convention would discover a completely new experience in applying an unprecedented body of **provisions** for global disarmament and **verification**. Experience in applying the instruments of the convention would help people to understand that reliable **disarmament does** not imply **risk**, but rather opportunity; not a danger **for** national sovereignty, but a singular opportunity to build on the foundations of a new, cooperative concept of international security.

Looking at the problems that remain to be negotiated for the chemical weapons convention in this broader context, their relative significance, having been put into perspective, should have become clearer. The remaining obstacles, although reflecting serious questions such as **verification**, must be surmountable. Having **a vision of** the larger **issues at** stake, we will overcome them.

The success of the chemical **weapons** convention will **depend largely** on its **universal** acceptance. In this **respect**, the general debate in this Committee has been very encouraging. Most delegations have clearly pronounced their strong support and interest in the success of the Geneva negotiations. The

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

attractiveness of the convention will also play a key role with **regard to universality**. But more will be needed, in particular demonstrations of **responsibility on the regional level**. In some **regions, long-standing** political conflicts might **seem** to require prior solution before accession to the chemical **weapons** convention **is** considered. **However, there** could be a fallacy in such thinking: recent history has **shown us** that arms control treaties are not only luxury items that follow peace; they are vital instruments in bringing about and strengthening peace.

The **time has** come for a global ban **on chemical weapons**. **After long** periods of contentious debate and **stagnation, we** are facing a singular opportunity. Let **us** grasp it **so** that, **one** year from **now**, the First **Committee** may adopt by **consensus** the text of a chemical weapons convention.

Mr. STANKOV (Bulgaria) t The Bulgarian delegation would like to offer **some** brief **comments** on agenda item 60 **(d)**, "**Conversion** of military **resources** to civilian **purposes**", which **is** included in this **session's** agenda in compliance with resolution **44/116** J. We should like to note, with due appreciation, the report of the Secretary-General, which reflects the views of a number of Member States on various aspects of **this** complex issue.

We highly appreciate also the work carried out in recent **years** by the United Nations Secretariat, notably by the Department for **Disarmament** Affairs, in **assisting** the efforts of Member States in seeking the best **ways** to make **use**, on a mutual **basis**, of their experience in **conversion** for the needs of economic development.

Bulgaria **is** among the countries striving to react adequately to the radical changes in the security domain on both the European and the global plane by, **inter alia**, taking serious steps for the practical implementation of this kind of **conversion**. Probably, one of the major features of Bulgaria's national programme for the conversion of military **industries** is the fact that it is paralleled by a transition from a centrally planned towards a free-market economy which **is** being carried out in conditions of grave economic **crisis**.

In fulfilling **this** programme, we have already accumulated **some** experience. Between 1988 and 1991, Bulgaria converted effectively 40 per cent of **its** military production capacity, while the civilian output of military industries increased by a factor **of** four and a half. During the present year alone, military-industrial **plants** launched over 100 new productr for civilian **use**. Implementing these and other similar **measures** is made **more** difficult by the need to take into account the technological specificities and **capabilities**

(Mr. Stankov, Bulgaria)

of the existing military-industrial plants, and to **sustain** a high level of cost efficiency while converting them to civilian uses.

Bulgaria needs substantial assistance in **this** field, and, for that **purpose**, has established business contacts with companies in **Germany**, Austria, the United **States**, Japan and Greece for joint research and development, manufacture and marketing of conversion-related products, **inter alia**, by investment in new production and by setting up joint ventures.

At the same time, we try to be realistic by pursuing a truly pragmatic approach in this field. Thus, the views exchanged so far within the United Nations on the role of the **Organization** in addressing the conversion issue, combined with the experience that Bulgaria **already** has in this area, prompt us to conclude that at this stage there are no serious grounds for expecting it to be **possible** to adopt a uniform and universal approach towards conversion which would produce optimum results in all circumstances and for every country involved.

We **are** now becoming increasingly aware that, especially in matters of **conversion**, the chief motivating factors for any **State's** policy are of an economic rather than a political nature. The obvious obstacles to the adoption of a common code of conversion-related behaviour acceptable to and binding on all States, particularly in such a broadly representative forum as the United Nations, prompt us to believe that the most appropriate way for each country to address the issue of military conversion would be by adopting individually-tailored, well-balanced and generally pragmatic approaches fully attuned to countries' specific conditions.

(Mr. Stankov, Bulgaria)

Naturally, in **doing** this we should not ignore possibilities for a multilateral exchange of views and experience on matters of military **conversion, inter alia**, within the **framework** and with the **assistance** of the United Nations and **other relevant** multilateral forum.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the **representative** of Yugoalavia, who will introduce **draft** resolution **A/C.1/46/L.21**.

Mr. ZUGIC (Yugoslavia) t I have the honour of introducing draft resolution **A/C.1/46/L.21**, entitled "**Report** to the Conference on Disarmament", on behalf **of** the group of sponsors, consisting **of** Algeria, **Brazil**, Cambodia, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, **India**, Indonesia, the **Islamic** Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, **Myanmar**, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Sri Lanka, **Venezuela**, Viet **Nam** and Yugoslavia.

The draft resolution **before** us testifies to the importance we attach to the work of the Conference on Disarmament. We are convinced that in the present international **climate**, when substantive **progress is** being made in **bilateral** and regional areas, the **Conference** has acquired even greater importance **as** the single multilateral disarmament negotiating body. At the same time, in a situation where the bilateral negotiations are gaining momentum, we feel obliged to stress once again that multilateral efforts and bilateral negotiations should complement each other.

The particular emphasis in the draft we propose **concerns** the breakthroughs achieved in the negotiations on the elaboration of a draft of a comprehensive, global convention on chemical weapons. Therefore we welcome these positive developments and urge the **Conference** to intensify **its** work with a view to completing negotiations in 1992.

(Mr. Zugic, Yugoslavia)

We are convinced that the Conference on Disarmament, **as** the single multilateral **disarmament** negotiating body, should be **the** organ most directly involved in negotiating all the priority issues in disarmament, and **particularly** those **concerning** nuclear disarmament. However, we regret that this year again this **has** not been **realized**. As a result, the sponsors of the draft resolution **are** sorry that the **Conference was** not able to **commence** negotiations on the nuclear issues on its **agenda**.

As was the **case** last year, special attention is paid to the efforts made to improve the functioning of the Conference which, in our view, would **contribute to** the **efficiency** of its work. At the **same** time, **we propose** that the General Assembly should **call** upon the Conference to **strengthen** its **work**, further its mandate in respect of substantive negotiations, and adopt **concrete measures** on the **specific** priority **issues** of **disarmament** on its **agenda**; and should urge the Conference to provide negotiating mandates to **ad hoc** **committees** on all **agenda items**.

Before concluding, I should like to express our appreciation to all the delegations I mentioned for their constructive cooperation **as** joint sponsors of draft resolution **A/C.1/46/L.21**, and to the other delegations which offered their views. At the **same** time, my delegation, together with the other sponsors, expresses **its** readiness to pursue **further** negotiation⁶ with all **interested** delegations in the hope that the **draft** resolution, once put to the vote, will receive the widest support.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call **upon the representative of** India, who will **introduce** draft resolutions **A/C.1/46/L.19** and **A/C.1/46/L.20**.

Mr. SHAH (India): Over the last couple of **weeks** we have heard many statements welcoming the many **positive changes** that have **occurred** in the politico-military and security situation in the world. The **dramatically** changed scenario in the Union of Soviet **Socialist Republics** and **Eastern Europe**, **the** end of cold **war** and **East-West** confrontation and its impact on **prospects** for peace and disarmament, the unilateral **announcements** of decisions to **dismantle** and **destroy** some portions of the **awesome** nuclear **arsenals** of **some** nuclear-weapon countries, and the improved political climate for further **cuts**, are all indeed **very** positive changes.

(Mr. Shah, India)

We believe **it** is a welcome, though belated, change in the approach to nuclear disarmament. We listen carefully **when** the non-nuclear **weapon countries** are asked to respond to these changes in their approach to disarmament, but we also believe that **welcome** as these changes **are**, they must not blind **us** to the other reality. And that relates to changes that have not **taken place**.

There is no change in the thinking that nuclear weapons are **necessary for** security. The existing nuclear **arsenals** can still destroy the world several **times** over. Despite the end of East-West confrontation, there is no change in approach as regards the doctrine of **deterrence**. There is no change in the policy **of reserving** the right to conduct nuclear explosions for armaments purposes. The production of nuclear weapons, the qualitative enhancement of nuclear weaponry through scientific and technological improvements, the production of fissionable materials, the manufacture of delivery systems for nuclear weapons, and nuclear **weapon** testing still continue. And there is no change in the policies that **no** want **to** renounce the right to use nuclear weapons or to threaten to use them, despite the welcome assertion that a **nuclear** war must not be fought and cannot be won, and despite the innumerable expert opinions about the "nuclear winter" and end of all kinds **of** living organism if nuclear weapons are used either by design **or** by accident.

The overwhelming majority of humanity wants a nuclear-weapon-free world. They want complete nuclear disarmament. They want the elimination of all nuclear weapons from this Earth and from outer space. These are our goals and objectives. And they **must** remain humanity's **immutable** objectives, which **should** not be changed **or** diluted regardless of improvement⁸ in the international climate, which we welcome.

(Mr. Shah, India)

My delegation believes that these areaahievable **objectives despite** the difference of perceptions on their realisation. My delegation **is** optimistic that just as the international community **is** now negotiating a total ban on the use of chemical and toxic weapons in addition to a ban on their production **and** stockpiling, we will **one** day negotiate a convention on banning the use of nuclear weapons, on the cessation of all nualear-weapons tests, on production of nuclear weapons and on their complete elimination. But we believe that it is necessary to **reiterate** these goals and to pursue propoaala to achieve them. Those proposals do **not become irrelevant or unnecessary, as some** might think, just because the political climate has changed. In fact, the **changed** political climate is conducive to implementation **of** the ideas contained in the **draft** reaolutions **we are presenting.**

It is in this spirit that my delegation **wishes** to **introduce** two draft resolutiona. The first **of** these **is** draft resolution **A/C.1/46/L.19**, on a **nuclear-arms freeze**, which is sponsored by **Indonesia, Mexico, Myanmar and Sudan** as well **as by** India, **representing** the three most populous non-nuclear regions of the world. The thrust of draft resolution **A/C.1/46/L.19 is** the **same** as in **previous** years. It **calls** upon all nuclear-weapon **States** to agree to a comprehensive nuclear-arms **freeze**, which would go far beyond the unilateral cuts in **some** categories of weapons announced by two nualear-weapon Powers. The comprehensive **freeze** will embrace a comprehensive nuclear-weapons-test ban, **complete cessation** of manufacturing of all nuclear weapons and their delivery **vehicles**, and complete **cessation** of the production **of fissionable** material, among other things.

The **second** is draft resolution **A/C.1/46/L.20**, on a convention on the prohibition **of** the use **of** nuclear weapons. This draft **resolution is**

(Mr. Shah, India)

sponsored by Afghanistan, Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia as well as by India. The draft resolution reiterates the conviction that the complete elimination of nuclear weapons remains the goal and it calls upon the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations in order to reach agreement on an international convention prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances.

My delegation is privileged to introduce the two draft resolutions on behalf of all the sponsors, to whom we extend our thanks. We urge all Member States to contribute positively to the changed international climate by supporting these resolutions, and subsequently to take action to implement them.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Mexico is a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19, entitled "Nuclear-arms freeze", which has just been introduced by the representative of India. The objectives of the draft resolution have frequently been misunderstood. As is stated in the preamble, a nuclear-weapons freeze is not an end in itself but rather an effective step towards preventing the qualitative improvement of existing nuclear weaponry. Such a measure is much more effective when it takes place during periods of negotiation as it helps build confidence between States.

Thus, we are not trying to freeze nuclear arsenals at their present levels in terms of numbers but rather to prevent them from continuing to increase in destructive power, which does not mean they should not be reduced in number. Failure to stop the upgrading of armaments would make nonsense of any limitation measure. What would be the point of scrapping certain types

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

of weapons and removing them from a region if the region continued to be threatened by more powerful weapons, possibly even controlled from space.

With the new international climate and the announcement of significant unilateral disarmament measures on the part of the nuclear-arms Powers, there can hardly be a better time to propose a comprehensive nuclear-arms freeze as proposed in the draft resolution. We wonder why new nuclear weapons and fissionable materials continue to be produced when it has not yet been decided what to do with existing arms. We urgently appeal to the nuclear-weapon States to reach an agreement on a comprehensive nuclear-arms freeze, which would embrace first, a comprehensive test ban on nuclear weapons and on their delivery systems; secondly, the complete cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons and of their delivery vehicles; thirdly, a ban on all further deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles, and finally the complete curtailment of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes.

As can be seen, our aim is to close the door to the production of nuclear-weapon systems. Only in this way would there be any sense in the measures proposed for the reduction of nuclear arsenals. It would be absurd to reduce some nuclear weapons while continuing to produce others.

Mr. SHOUKRY (Egypt): It is an honour for the delegation of Egypt to be presenting draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, on behalf of its sponsors: Argentina, Brazil, China, Ethiopia, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ireland, Jordan, Mexico, Myanmar, Nigeria, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and my own country. I would also like to state that the delegation of India has conveyed its decision to sponsor this text.

(Mr. Shoukry, Egypt)

The **rapid** developments that **are** continuing to unfold in the field of space **science** and technology **have** kindled the imagination **of** mankind as to the **vast** prospects that may lie ahead. The tangible **benefits that** the peaceful **use of outer** space **has** already provided have consolidated the overwhelming desire of the **vast** majority of the international community that no effort **be** spared in trying to maintain **this vast** domain **as** an exclusive area of international cooperation, to be **used** exclusively for **peaceful purposes for the benefit** of all countries, irrespective of their degree of **economic** and scientific development.

(Mr. Shoukry, Egypt)

The current welcome developments in international relations that herald the **prospects** of a new era of international cooperation, peace and security and constructive efforts to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control cannot but have a dramatic impact on our common **efforts** to prevent an arms race in outer space. Since the one complements the other, the delegations sponsoring the draft resolution are convinced that both bilateral and multilateral efforts in this regard must continue and **make effective progress** if we are to achieve **our** objectives. We are committed to contributing to the prevention of an **arms** race in outer space with all the **resources** at our disposal, especially within the appropriate international forums. This is a necessary element to strengthen international peace and security **and** to eliminate the dangers **posed** by any escalation in the arms race, through practical and concrete measures that can be taken to implement decisions to prevent the militarisation of outer space.

We also note the outcome of the work on this topic done by the Ad Hoc Committee on the prevention of an **arms** race in outer space during this year's session of the Conference on Disarmament, and we hope that during the 1992 session the Ad Hoc Committee will **make** further progress in examining and identifying the issues relevant to the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

Draft resolution **A/C.1/46/L.25**, now before the First Committee, **follows** closely the lines of last year's resolution, which was a compromise resolution. **There** are **some** minor changes - in many **instances** of **either** a technical or an editorial nature, and in other instances aimed at achieving **more** clarity while maintaining the essential substance which commanded wide-range support last year.

(Mr. Shoukry, Egypt)

Following what has now **become** a custom, the delegations of Egypt, Sri Lanka and **Venezuela** collaborated this year in conducting **consultations** with the **various groups** in an effort to **accommodate** the various suggestions made **concerning this** draft resolution, I might add that **there** was a limited number of suggestions **this year** because of the substantial achievement in formulating last year's resolution - an **achievement** that must be credited to **Ambassador Rasaputram** of Sri Lanka.

In **conclusion**, I should like to express the hope that draft **resolution A/C.1/46/L.25** will receive the **same** overwhelming support that the draft resolution on this item **received** last year.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (interpretation from **Spanish**): The representative of Egypt has just introduced draft resolution **A/C.1/46/L.25**, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space".

In our opinion, this draft resolution is a **major** contribution to **the activities** just carried out by the Conference on Disarmament, because the **Ad Hoc Committee established** by the Conference six years ago **has** been working towards identifying areas **of convergence**. Since my **delegation** chaired that Committee at the 1991 session, I wish to **emphasize** certain **parts of** the report **of the Conference** on Disarmament that make **it** clear that **the Ad Hoc Committee** worked hard to **find common** ground in **a field where this** has not always been easy.

The report points out that this year the Ad **Hoc** Committee adopted a more **dynamic** and practical methodology, enabling it to give more detailed consideration to **the items before it**. **The** Chairman prepared a series of **lists of topics** with a view to structuring the discussion in an orderly way, focusing on the **questions of** greatest interest to delegations **and** leaving

**(Mr. Garcia Moritan,
Argentina)**

aside **those** that **seemed** to be of **less** interest. These **lists** are annexed to the report (A/46/27, **para.** 91) of the Ad **Hoc** Committee of the Conference on **Disarmament** and can **serve as** a guide for future deliberation.

For the **first** time **since its** establishment in 1965 the Ad Hoc Committee had **the assistance** of "Friends of the Chairman" in dealing, respectively, with three **specific topics**: terminological **aspects** related to the prevention of an **arms race in outer space issues** related to verification of anti-satellite **weapons**; and confidence-building measures, including improvement of existing and future databases **relating to space activities.**

The prevention of an **arms race in outer space is of fundamental** importance for the **security of all States, whether** or not they **are space Powers.** The **Conference on Disarmament** has **reflected** this interest and, in accordance with the Ad Hoc Committee's **programme** of work, has been **seeking to identify areas of convergence.**

In this **respect**, we **trust** that draft resolution **A/C.1/46/L.25**, which was negotiated by the representative **of Egypt** and Sri Lanka, will give new impetus to the work of the Conference on Disarmament. That is why we fully **support** it.

Mr. SALAZAR (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish) : The **delegation of Venezuela** is particularly interested in draft resolution **A/C.1/46/L.25**, on the prevention of an arms race in outer **space**, introduced by the representative of Egypt.

While reaffirming the importance and urgency preventing an **arms race in outer space**, the **Assembly**, under **this draft resolution**, would **recognize, inter alia, that** the legal **regime** applicable to outer space by itself does not guarantee the prevention of an **arms race in outer space.**

(Mr. Salazar, Venezuela)

The 1967 Treaty on **Principles Governing the Activities of States** in the Exploration and Use of Outer **Space, including** the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, **is in force**. We have all **acknowledged that it** plays a **significant** role in governing **activities** pertaining to outer space. However, when this Treaty **was negotiated** and entered into force we did not foresee the **possibility of** the development of **strategic weapons** and **defence systems** that **could** operate in outer **space, from outer space and toward** outer space. That **is** why we have reaffirmed that the legal regime **applicable** to outer space cannot by **itself prevent an arms race there**.

It **is** well **known** that the Conference on Disarmament plays the primary role in the negotiation of various multilateral agreements, **as** appropriate, on **the prevention of an arms race** in outer **space** in all its **aspects**. For **some years** now, the Ad **Hoc** Committee **of** the Conference **has** been doing useful work in identifying and **assessing** various aspects of this complicated subject. It has **before** it many proposals **designed** to improve the **current** legal regime. The Ad **Hoc** Committee's **work** this year **was** particularly valuable since its **deliberations**, under **the** wise **guidance of** Ambassador Garcia Moritan of Argentina, took place in a **more** orderly and systematic way.

In our opinion, the **Conference** should prepare new legal instruments to **deal in a comprehensive**, multilateral manner with the **question of** the **non-militarisation of** outer space.

(Mr. Salazar, Venezuela)

It is **necessary** to **focus on identifying and crafting specific measures**, taking advantage of existing **areas of common ground** and proposals. The present international climate should **contribute to the attainment** of these important **objectives**, and we urge the United **States** and the Soviet Union to press forward **intensively** with their **bilateral negotiations in a constructive spirit in order** to prevent outer **space from becoming** a new arena for the **arms race**.

We are **convinced** that by **including** fundamental, **unquestionably** important elements, draft **resolution A/C.1/46/L.25** constitutes a **step in the right direction** and we hope it will enjoy the **fullest support**.

We **also** take **this** opportunity to **express** our **pleasure** at the **statement** made yesterday by the **representative** of *France* in which he **announced** that his **Government** was giving **positive consideration** to **possible ratification** of **Additional Protocol I** of the Treaty **for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons** in Latin **America** and the Caribbean, **We hope** that possibility **will soon** become reality, **marking the end** of a **significant phase** in the **history of the Additional Protocols** to the Treaty of Tlatelolco. **This would make** an important **contribution** to regional and international **security**.

Mr. NEGROTTI CAMBIASO (Italy): I would like to make **some comments** on the **issues** dealt with in draft **resolution A/C.1/46/L.4** on a **comprehensive** test-ban treaty and in draft **resolution A/C.1/46/L.37** on **bilateral nuclear negotiations**, as some important **indications can** be drawn from the **most recent** developments in the **context** of nuclear disarmament.

Last **July**, we all welcomed the **positive conclusion** of the **first** round of the negotiations on a strategic **arms reduction** treaty (START) as a **substantive**

(M r .)

result in the **process** of the reduction of **nuclear arsenals**. I do not think that the **announcement subsequently** made by President Bush on **23 September 1991**, followed by that of **President Qorbaahev**, would **possibly** have been **envisaged** at that time. **Those announcements** challenge our very ability to adapt our **assessments** to such a **rapidly evolving political and strategic environment**.

Both an optimistic and a **pessimistic** interpretation of **these** developments can be made. We would in fact consider with dismay the existing gaps between the **announced** nuclear reductions and the **size** of nuclear arsenals still present in the world, and draw the **conclusion** that in reality nothing has changed. On the other hand, we could **compare the quick** pace at which new **opportunities** are being created to the lagging mood which had pervaded disarmament negotiations in the **past**, and make the assessment that realism appears to be more on the side of those who incline toward **optimism**.

The **North Atlantic Alliance**, although reaffirming the **necessity** of continuing to **rely** in the **present circumstances** on nuclear deterrence, has **decided** to adapt **its strategic policies**, including **their nuclear component**, to the profoundly modified **needs of European security**.

In that **context**, I wish to recall that **Defence** Ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty **Organization (NATO)**, gathered in Taormina on **18 October**, underlined that, **as far as Europe is concerned**, there **is** no longer any **requirement** for nuclear ground-launched **short-range** ballistic missiles and artillery. At the **same time**, they **announced** a total **reduction** of 80 per cent of the **sub-strategic weapons** currently present in Europe. The entire set of proposals for a drastically reduced and **restructured** NATO nuclear posture

(Mr. Negrotto Cambiasso, Italy)

reflects the dramatic changes in the speed of transformation: as the security situation evolves, nuclear policy and posture will continue to be reviewed.

The NATO summit being held today in Rome has just adopted a new strategic concept for the Alliance, which further reduces the reliance on its nuclear component. Other encouraging signs can be noted in the multilateral context, such as the declarations by China and France on their intention to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), as well as the recent accession to that Treaty of South Africa, Zambia and Tanzania. It is Italy's hope that in 1995 the NPT will become a permanent and universal pillar of international security and stability.

The question of nuclear testing remains a controversial problem indeed: nevertheless, encouraging signs can be noted even on this matter, such as for instance the drastic reduction of approximately 60 per cent in the number of nuclear explosions which, according to reliable sources, has occurred in the last five years.

At the same time, it is now generally acknowledged that the thresholds set by the partial nuclear-test-ban Treaty and the threshold nuclear-test-ban Treaty no longer reflect today's needs and realities in nuclear testing. As a consequence, the question of the verifiability of underground explosions is acquiring an increasing importance. In that respect, we hope that the future proceedings of the Conference on Disarmament, with the participation of the Ad Hoc Group of seismological experts, will tackle such problem by means of updated guidelines.

The widespread hope for a dramatic reduction of all nuclear arsenals in the world seems no longer to be at odds with our analysis of what could be considered today as a realistic goal to be pursued.

(Mr. Negrotto Cambiaso, Italy)

At the same time, concerns regarding the danger of proliferation still dwell in our minds, while new issues emerge, such as the crucial question of nuclear-arms control in the Soviet Union and the technical and financial problems relating to the destruction of nuclear weapons, especially when disarmament measures shift from strategic delivery systems to tactical nuclear munitions.

Also, the technical implications of ideas concerning the utilization and control of fissionable materials made available as a result of the reduction of nuclear arsenals deserve, in our view, in-depth analysis.

As stated today in Rome by Prime Minister Andreotti, a further huge effort towards new disarmament achievements is necessary, and should include nuclear disarmament as a priority. The possibility of achieving an international security system less characterized by nuclear armaments seems to be within reach. The moment has come to strive for a less confrontational debate on nuclear disarmament, through a more constructive and factual approach.

On the basis of that positive evaluation of what has been achieved thus far and of the prospects before us, Italy intends to support draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.4 and A/C.1/46/L.37. Although not necessarily endorsing all their implications, we are convinced that the time is ripe for trying to focus our attention much more on what we commonly assess as positive developments and prospects, rather than on remaining differences.

Mr. COLLINS (Ireland) : Mr. Chairman, **in a statement** made earlier this week I made some **remarks** of a **complimentary** nature **directed** to you and to your remarkable aountry. **Secure in the faith that they were conveyed** to you, I forbear **from** repeating them this afternoon.

I am **speaking** as **one of the sponsors** in support of draft **resolution A/C.1/46/L.13, "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May De Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects.** The **draft** resolution was **introduced** yesterday by the representative of Sweden.

The Convention, **as has** been remarked, is an **indication** of the **commitment** of the international **community** to **develop** international humanitarian law in the field of **conventional** weaponry.

It is, obviously, of **major importance** that more **States** adhere to the Convention so that it can become genuinely universal. In that **context** I should like to **recall my** delegation's well-known position, namely, that we maintain the **suggestion** of establishing a **consultative committee of experts to** investigate alleged violations **of the** Protoaols to the Convention. We believe that such a consultative committee would help to **increase** the **trust** and confidence of States in the implementation of the Convention and **could,** accordingly, help to strengthen it and to promote universal adherence to it. **We** note the possibility provided for in **article 8 of the** Convention for renewing the **scope** and operation **of the** Convention and its Protoaols and for setting further international atandarda relating to other categories of conventional weapons not already **covered.**

The representative **of Sweden has** identified a number **of** categories of weapons that might be made **subject** to further **specific** reatruations. My delegation would like in partiaular to draw attention to **Sweden's comments** on

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

laser technology. My delegation would like to support the suggestion that consideration be given to how to deal with the laser weapons referred to by the representative of Sweden.

Mr. ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil): I wish to make a brief statement in connection with agenda item 50 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 Delegation of Brazil listened with great interest to the statement made yesterday afternoon in the Committee by the representative of France, in which he announced that:

"France is positively studying the possibility of ratifying Additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco." (A/C.1/46/PV.29, p. 18)

Brazil takes note with satisfaction of this announcement by the French Government.

When Brazil ratified the Treaty of Tlatelolco in 1968 it did not choose to waive the requirements laid down in the Treaty for its entry into force. Among these requirements, which are spelt out in article 28, paragraph 1, is the ratification of Additional Protocol I by all of the four States that are internationally responsible for territories situated in the zone of application of the Treaty.

Last November the Presidents of Brazil and Argentina signed at Foz do Iguacu a Joint Declaration (A/45/809) in which they announced their decision to adopt the Joint Accounting and Control System, applied to all the nuclear activities of the two countries, and to negotiate with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) a joint safeguards agreement based on this System. They also announced their decision that, after the conclusion

(~~Mr. Araujo Castro, Brazil~~)

of the **safeguards** agreement with the **IAEA**, they would take appropriate action to permit the full entry **into force** for the two **countries** of the Treaty of **Tlatelolco**, including action to update **and** improve its wording.

The announcement **made** yeaterday by the **French** delegation is, in our opinion, a very positive **step** in **the** **promos** of **creating** **conditions** for the full entry **into force** of the Treaty for the Prohibition of **Nuclear** Weapons in Latin **America**.

Before **aonaluding**, **I** should like to **reserve** the right **of** my delegation to examine and, if **necessary**, to comment on the draft **decision concerning** the **possible inclusion** of a new item **on** the agenda of the next **session** of the **General Assembly**, which **was announced** in the **statement** made yesterday in the **Committee** by the **representative** of **Mexico**.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the **representative** of the United States, who will introduce draft resolution **A/C.1/46/L.26**.

Mr. BRECKON (United States of America): Today, the **United States** delegation is introducing a draft resolution under agenda item 48, • entitled "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements," document **A/C.1/46/L.26**, dated 1 November 1991.

The draft resolution is very similar to the **resolution** adopted by the **General Assembly** in 1989 as resolution 44/122. In the **current** draft there is a now **operative** paragraph that **welcomes** the **role** that the **United Nations** has played in **restoring** the integrity of **certain** **arms** limitation and **disarmament** **agreements** and in the removal of **threats** to **peace**. The new paragraph has been **added** to take into account the **crucial** **role** the **United Nations** has **played** this **year**, by **decision** of the **Security Council**, in seeking to **address** non-compliance **concerns**. A few other **changes** have **been** **introduced** into the **text** to **enhance** and update the resolution.

(Mr. Brackon, United States)

During **the past two years** we have **seen** develop in the First **Committee** a much-improved atmosphere and a broad recognition of the vital importance **compliance** plays in the arms control and disarmament **process**. Resolutions similar to the one we are introducing today have been adopted by consensus at the **forty-first, forty-second, forty-third and forty-fourth session** of the **General Assembly**. This year the improved atmosphere is further demonstrated by the long list of the sponsors of draft **resolution L.26**, a list that **transcends geopolitical** boundaries and includes Australia, Austria, **Belarus**, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cameroon, **Canada**, Colombia, Costa Rica, **Czechoslovakia**, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, **France**, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the **Netherlands**, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, **Romania**, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, the Union of **Soviet Socialist Republics**, the United Kingdom and Zaire.

The United States is gratified that compliance with arms limitation and disarmament **agreements** is now firmly established as a **matter of concern** to the **community of nations**. **It** is important for each party to ensure that it is in compliance, but **it** is equally important to **remove** my doubts that others may have regarding a party's **compliance**. Confidence in **existing** agreements is a significant part of the **foundation** for future agreements. Non-compliance, on the other hand, cannot but have **an adverse** effect on the prospects for future agreements and on efforts to **enhance** international peace **and** security. **Compliance** with **existing** agreements is essential, therefore, to the fundamental objectives **and** purposes of the United Nations.

(Mr. Breckon, United States)

The United States believes that the adoption of **this** draft reolution, again by **consensus**, would constitute a **strong** reaffirmation by the world community of the **crucial importance** of compliance with **arms** limitation and disarmament agreements. We are grateful to the numerous **sponsors** of this draft reolution, and we invite all members of the Committee to give it their full support.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions; **A/C.1/46/L.14**, Democratic People's Republic of Korea; **A/C.1/46/L.33**, Hungary.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to remind members that, in accordance with the programme of work, the Committee will proceed to take action on the first **cluster** of draft **resolutions** tomorrow morning, Friday, 8 November 1991.

The Committee will then proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 2. In following this procedure, we shall nevertheless maintain a desirable degree of flexibility.

It is my intention to move, in so far as possible, from one **cluster** to another sequentially upon the conclusion of action on each cluster.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.