UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
23rd meeting
held on
Tuesday, 30 October 1990
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 23rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. RANA (Nepal)

later: Mr. MORRIS (Australia)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

Statement by the Chairman

General debate on all disarmament agenda items

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/45/PV.23
6 November 1990
ENGLISH

90-63142 2631V (E)

62 p.

The meeting was called to order at 3.50 p.m.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: As members are aware, and as stipulated in the Committee's progranune of work and timetable, the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions under the disarmament agenda items was set for 6 p.m. today. However, I now have to inform the Committee that a number of delegations have approached me with the request that,-in view of the ongoing intensive negotiations, the deadline be extended by 24 hours. Pursuant to further consultations on this matter, from which I understand that this request is made in the context of the further rationalization of the work of the Committee, I propose that the Committee decide to extend the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions under disarmament agenda items 45 to 66 and 155 until 6 p.m. tomorrow, 31 October 1990.

If I hear no opinion to the contrary, I shall take it that the Committee is in agreement with this procedure and it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEMS 45 TO 66 AND 155 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. BANGALI (Sierra Leone): Permit me at the outset, Sir, to join those representatives who have preceded me in congratulating you on your well-deserved election to the chairmanship of this very important Committee. In you we have an experienced and knowledgeable leader, a skilled diplomat and the distinguished representative of a friendly country. The delegation of Sierra Leone pledges its full support and co-operation as you preside over the deliberations of the First Committee. We also wish to congratulate the other officers of the Committee upon their election.

As our Committee meets this year to consider disarmament and related security issues, our deliberations take place at a particularly historic period, In the

(Mr. Bangali, Sierra Leone)

past year dramatic developments have taken place in Europe and in East-West relations in general that could significantly alter the course of modern history for a long time to come. Key among these developments is the apparent end of the cold war, which for over four decades stymied the international community's efforts to evolve a system of collective security based on the principles of the United Nations Charter. The world is now at a historic crossroads, euphoric about the positive and important changes that have taken place but conscious of the dangers and risks of complacency, especially as peace remains a distant dream to millions of people in several areas of conflict around the world.

Our Organization also finds itself at a crossroads; the end of the cold war and the growing interest in multilateralism as the most viable approach in resolving the world's increasingly common problems has thrust the United Nations finally onto centre-stage in international affairs. Yet we all realise that this new, positive international consensus could still unravel unless lasting solutions are found to outstanding problems, especially those concerning war and poverty.

(Mr. Banuali, Sierra Leone)

The new international climate offers both opportunities and challenges. In this Committee we are dealing with problems that are fundamental to the very raison d'être of the United Nations. The maintenance of international peace and security is the Organization's primary objective. Yet, since its establishment 45 years ago this month, the United Nations has witnessed both a proliferation of armaments and a proliferation of conflicts. And, while most of the weapons were produced in the developed world, most of the conflicts, resulting in millions of deaths and major destruction and economic dislocation, took place in the developing world. We see a clear link between the arms race and the prevalence of conflict, and thus between disarmament and the maintenance of international peace and security. The end of the cold war now offers our Organization a valuable opportunity to address the critical challenge: how to achieve general and complete disarmament and implement the collective security provisions of the Charter.

In its discussion of world crises the international community seems to have side-stepped the tragic situation prevailing in our sister State, Liberia. The carnage and destruction of property and the suffering and misery of the Liberian people engendered by the conflict in that once peaceful and stable nation have few parallels in modern African history. Yet, the international community has relegated this sad situation to the lower rungs of priority. Indeed, Liberia is not an oil-producing country and has little or nothing to do with oil prices; it has not been overrun by a powerful neighbouring country. But a crisis exists in that country, and a crisis in any part of the world is an assault on world peace. We cannot talk about disarmament and conflict resolution in the world on a selective regional basis alone. It should be a comprehensive package encompassing every part of the world, important or unimportant.

(Mr. Bangali, Sierra Leone)

Some may feel that the tragedy in Liberia has no relevance to the issues being discussed in this Committee. This could not be more wrong. For the level of violence which has brought untold misery to thousands of Liberians could not have been possible without a continuous flow of arms and ammunition to the different factions. Such a flow has contributed to the atrocities which have been committed. This bears out our initial assertion regarding the grave consequences suffered by non-arms-producing developing countries which still find themselves resting grounds for conventional weapons. Those who, contrary to all ethical considerations, still fuel this fire must bear the blame for the outcome.

Families and whole communities have been displaced in Liberia and this has created a massive refugee problem that has imposed tremendous stresses on the fragile economies of neighbouring countries, my country included. Much of this, as our Foreign Minister stated when he addressed the General Assembly earlier this month, may be unknown to the international community and, consequently, not on the conscience of many. We, therefore, urge the United Nations to support the plan of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS).

Sierra Leone reaffirms its view that the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction - nuclear, chemical and biological - should continue to command the highest priority in all disarmament efforts, whether at the bilateral, regional or international level. Since nuclear weapons threaten the very survival of mankind, and since all weapons of mass destruction endanger the sanctity of human life in a most indiscriminate manner, we believe that these weapons not only should be banned but indeed should be destroyed. In this connection, my delegation regrets the rather dismal outcome of the recent Fourth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Ron-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the failure so far to conclude a comprehensive chemical weapons convention.

(Mr. Banuali, Sierra Leone)

Sierra Leone is not only a party to the non-proliferation Treaty but, as a member State of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), it also strongly supports the OAU Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. We therefore believe that, since the great majority of the world's States - about 140 countries - have forsworn the nuclear option by acceding to the non-proliferation Treaty, the five nuclear-weapon States should join the international consensus against these horrible weapons and begin to take concrete measures towards the elimination of nuclear weapons. In the first place, they should agree to a comprehensive test ban and, as proposed by the Nigerian delegation, take vigorous new initiatives on negative security assurances.

We also believe that the nuclear-weapon States and other major Powers should take concrete measures against the nuclear threat that the apartheid South African régime poses to regional and international peace and security. As a first step in this direction, South Africa should be compelled to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty without any conditions, to submit all its nuclear activities to International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards and to practise transparency and openness in its nuclear and military programmes.

In contrast with South Africa's continuing ambitions for nucleariaation and militarization, we, the independent African States members of the OAU, are firmly committed to turning our continent into a nuclear-weapon-free zone and to promoting the peaceful resolution of conflicts in our region, in accordance with the provisions of the charter of the OAU and that of the United Nations. Sierra Leone, therefore, calls for strong United Nations support for African initiatives to bring about the implementation of the OAU Declaration on the Denuclesriaatiou of Africa and to promote confidence-building measures in the region, which would help to prevent an arms race or resort to force in the settlement of inter-State disputes,

(Mr. Bangali, Sierra Leone)

In this connection, my delegation commends the Department for Disarmament Affairs for the programmes it has organised in Africa, including the recent Arusha Workshop for senior African military and civilian officials on conflict resolution and confideuce-building among African States. We hope that the results of such meetings or conferences will be published so that the discussions and conclusions can be preserved for easy reference. We propose the convening, on a regular basis, of such programmes, which should also examine such concrete problems as the transfer of armaments to areas of conflict in our continent. On the question of arms transfers, my delegation hopes that weapons rejected as a result of disarmament agreements in Europe will be destroyed and will not be transferred to other countries or regions. We also support the idea of an international arms register under United Nations auspices to keep track of all arms sales and transfers.

We believe that disarmament initiatives and efforts aimed at controlling or eliminating weapons already stockpiled in the arsenals of States should proceed alongside efforts to prevent the emergence of new types of weapons or the emergence of an arms race in regions from which such a race has hitherto been absent. My delegation therefore supports careful examination of the issue of scientific and technological developments in the field of international peace and security. But, at the same time, we wish to underline our view that control of the qualitative aspect of the arms race should not be used as an excuse for curbing or otherwise interfering with the free flow of scientific knowledge and expertise, which all couutries, in particular the developing countries, need for their development.

We see confidence-building measure8 a8 a particularly effective way of preventing the emergence of an arms race, especially in regions which, like ours in

(Mr. Bangali, Sierra Leone)

Africa, do not manufacture weapons+ A continuous and all-embracing long-term process of confidence-building would make the acquisition of arms unnecessary and thus allow the countries involved to concentrate on their priority interest, which is to promote socio-economic development.

(Mr. Bangali, Sierra Leone)

Sierra Leone commends the process of confidence- and security-building measures in Europe and the positive movement towards the signing of an agreement on the reduction of conventional armed forces in Europe in Paris later this year. As the continent with the largest concentration of armaments and armed forces in the world, Europe has been at the centre of world concern over the arms race and now stands also at the epicentre of progress towards disarmament. Developments on that continent are therefore of international significance and relevance. Indeed, my delegation believes that the European experience can serve as a useful lesson for other parts of the world. Perhaps the United Nations can serve as the forum for the comparative examination of various regional confidence-building initiatives and processes,

Despite its obvious importance and relevance for international peace and security and also for the promotion of economic development, disarmament would be -undermined and relegated to a low priority among national and international policies unless all States abide by the rule of law. It is therefore vital that in considering the various disarmament items on our agenda we should not lose sight of the wider political context. Disarmament issues must be linked to concrete issues of war and peace and to the question of respect for the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. If not, any resolutions or treaties we may support in the field of disarmament could be compromised or become meaningless in the event of a war. We should therefore, while seeking disarmament, also endeavour simultaneously to resolve existing disputes and prevent the emergence of new ones+ This aspect deserves greater attention in our collective efforts to promote disarmament and international security.

Mr. AL-DOSARI (Bahrain) (interpretation from Arabic): I take great pleasure in extending to you, on behalf of the delegation of Bahrain, our warmest congratulations on your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee and on

(Mr. Al-Dosari, Bahrain)

the well-deserved confidence in your diplomatic skills, which will enable you to steer our work successfully. I also wish to congratulate your colleagues in the Bureau on being elected. We trust that the work of the First Committee will be crowned with success.

In the atmosphere of optimism that has begun to mark the closing years of the 20th century, we witness the dawning of a new era in international relations. Owing to the spectacular improvement in East-West relations, which has brought about major changes in the climate of international security, the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union are now based on co-operation and co-ordination instead of the competition and confrontation which used to characterize those relations. The orientation towards peaceful coexistence is being strengthened with each passing day by the signing of arms agreements on the reduction of conventional and nuclear weapons and a joint striving towards the resolution of international conflicts through the United Nations. The new situation of international security has made obsolete many a military doctrine that had obsessed military planners since 1945. Those theories have now lost their validity and are no longer applicable.*

The most remarkable result of the negotiations between the two super-Powers which have led to the path of peaceful co-existence was the signing in 1937 by the United States and the Soviet Union of the Treaty on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles. That INF Treaty included, for the first time, clauses on the total elimination of a whole category of nuclear missiles, in addition to unprecedented stipulations on internal verification procedures,

---

* Mr. Morris (Australia), Vice-Chairman, toak the Chair.

(Mr. Al-Dosari, Bahrain)

Although certain nuclear-weapon States think that the possession of nuclear weapons contributes to their national security, there is a different school of thought in the international community to which other countries subscribe and which favours other modes of action in maintaining and promoting international peace and security, such as nuclear-weapon-free zones and accession to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The State of Bahrain supports the Declaration adopted in 1971 with a view to transforming the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. We hope that the obstacles to negotiations on the Indian Ocean Conference will be overcome so that the 1991 Conference on the Indian Ocean will take place to achieve the goals of the Declaration.

We also endorse the idea of a nuclear-weapon-free sone in the Middle East adopted, inter alia, in resolutions 43/65 and 44/108. The Foreign Minister of Bahrain, who addressed the General Assembly on 1 October 1990, reiterated Bahrain's belief in the need to turn the Middle East into an area that is free of nuclear, chemical, biological and other weapons of mass destruction. That would be a major step towards guaranteeing the peace and security of all the peace-loving countries in the region and removing the spectre of nuclear and chemical warfare from the region. This posture is based on the legitimate right of those countries to self-defense and their right to deter any attempt to encroach on their inalienable rights. It is also consonant with the thinking, values and main trends of our age.

The increasing nuclear capabilities of Israel and its refusal to place its nuclear facilities under the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) pose a threat to the whole region. Concern over this was voiced by the International Atomic Energy Agency GC(XXXIV)RES/526.

The battle af arms reduction is the concern of the international community as a whole. Consequently, co-operation and détente have become indispensable. It is

(Mr. Al-Dosari, Bahrain)

no longer acceptable to spend vast sums of money on armaments at the expense of the world economy and the well-being of the world's nations.

The militariaation of outer space is unpalatable in the age of international détente. This makes it imperative for the countries that possess technological capabilities to refrain from turning outer space into an arena for a space age arms race. Efforts in space should be devoted not to armaments but to exploration and research for the benefit of mankind as a whole.

Respect for international conventions is the sound approach to safeguarding the security and stability of peoples and states. The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait is a very serious precedent and a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter. It threatens international peace and security. The unilateral annexation of Kuwait by Iraq is a flagrant violation of international law, not to mention the wholesale terror that has been inflicted on the population and the residents of the country, the dispersion of the people, the plunder of property and the destruction of the Kuwaiti infrastructure at the hands of the Iraqi occupation forces.

The era of détente is the harbinger of a new international order that gives prominence to the principles of collective security and multilateral co-operation. This calls for the acquisition by the United Nations of the mechanisms which would enable it to maintain peace, rid the world of injustice and tyranny and ensure security, justice and freedom for all.

Mr. ALMUAKKAF (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): e sister delegation of Algeria has already spoken on behalf of the Arab Maghreb Union, which comprises the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco and Mauritania. I should like to add the following.

First, I wish to congratulate Ambassador Pratap Rana on his election as Chairman of the First Committee for the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly. I am convinced that he will ensure the success of the Committee's work thanks to his experience, skill and knowledge in the field of disarmament. I wish to assure him of my delegation's full co-operation as he discharges his important task. I should like also to thank his predecessor, Mr. Taylhardat, who presided over the work of the Committee at the last session in an exemplary fashion. May I also congratulate the other members of the Bureau on their election.

An unprecedented atmosphere of détente and understanding now prevails in international relations, There have been positive developments in those relations: the cold war is ended and understanding and co-operation have taken the place of confrontation and rivalry. My delegation welcomes East-West rapprochement and the developments now taking place through bilateral and multilateral negotiations aimed at the conclusion of conventions on the total elimination of nuclear weapons and the halting of the-nuclear-arms race between the nuclear-weapon States.

My delegation also welcomes the reunification of the two parts of Yemen, the reunification of Germany, the independence of Namibia after a long struggle and the release of Nelson Mandela and his colleagues, We welcome the newly found stability in South America and the Caribbean as well as the movement towards the resolution of the problem of Cambodia and the reunification of Korea.

Nuclear disarmament is in the forefront of disarmament issues. My country attaches special importance to this matter as nuclear weapons pose the greatest

(Mr. Almuakkaf, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

threat to mankind. The development and improvement of those weapons increases the feelings of fear and insecurity which stem from the expectation of a nuclear disaster which may annihilate mankind. This is a matter of grave concern to the whole world, and particularly to the non-nuclear-weapon States. Until such time as complete universal disarmament has been achieved, effective measures must be taken to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States.

Despite the hopes borne of effective and bold steps taken by the two super-Powers to restructure international security and engage in nuclear-arms reduction talks, it must be admitted that the stockpiles of nuclear weapons that remain in their possession are more than enough to destroy the world many times over. For that reason, those Powers should seriously review the gravity of the threat this situation poses to international peace and security and consider the need for the political will to eliminate such weapons completely. We support all proposals aimed at bringing about the total and complete elimination of nuclear weapons and halting the nuclear-arms race.

My country also supports the efforts made by several Member States of the international Organization, particularly the non-aligned countries, to have the partial test-ban treaty amended into a complete test-ban treaty, as such a move would be a serious and truly effective contribution to the halting of the development and proliferation of nuclear weapons and a decisive step towards their final elimination. My delegation will spare no effort in contributing to the success of the amendment conference that is scheduled to take place next January.

My delegation regrets the fact that the Fourth Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty which took place recently in Geneva was unable to adopt a final document, However, my delegation hopes that all countries will be able to

(Mr. Almuakkaf, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

make further efforts to give new impetus to the next conference so that it may be successful.

My country joins the other countries which have called for the setting up of nuclear-weapon-free zones in several regions of the world in order for the world to become totally free of nuclear weapons so that peace and security may be established in those regions with due attention to the circumstances of every region. In this connection, we reaffirm the Declaration of the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity adopted in 1964 in Cairo, which called for the denuclearization of Africa. That declaration, however, in the view of my delegation, cannot be implemented as long as the racist regime of South Africa continues to carry out its nuclear tests and programmes, continues to develop its nuclear capability and continues to refuse to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or to place its nuclear facilities under the safeguards régime of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). This has been confirmed by the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/45/569. The racist régime of South Africa prevents the African continent from freeing itself completely of the nightmare created by the existence of nuclear weapons. The destruction of the nuclear weapons of the South African regime and putting a halt to the development and improvement of those weapons are prerequisites to the denuclearization of Africa. While my delegation hopes that the whole world may adopt and firmly adhere to non-proliferation measures, it must be said that there are nuclear countries that persist in violating that régime by providing direct or indirect assistance to the South African regime in question and to the racist régime in occupied Palestine. The transfer of nuclear technology to those two régimes, in addition to their close collaboration with each other have enabled them to develop their nuclear capability and their delivery systems.

(Mr. Almuakkaf, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

The Washington Post, in its 27 September 1990 edition, discussed the co-operation between South Africa and the Zionist entity in developing intermediate-range missiles that are capable of delivering nuclear warheads. This is a matter of concern. Those two régimes are actively seeking to terrorise and intimidate neigbbouring countries. The proof, if proof is needed, is there for all to see in the Zionist entity's act of aggression against the sister country, Tunisia, its military attack against the sister country, Iraq and its test run of its intermediate-range missiles that are capable of nuclear warhead delivery close to the west coast of my country. That incident involved a great threat to the Peace and security of my country and threatened the peace and security of the region as a whole.

The possession of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction by those two régimes does not threaten the peace and security of Africa and the Middle East alone, it is a threat to the whole world, especially since those two régimes jointly refuse to comply with general Assembly resolutions which call upon them to place their nuclear facilities under the safeguards régime of the IAEA.

(Mr. Almuakkaf, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

This has heightened tension in the two regions and obstructed the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones therein.

Since the end of the Second World War, the world has witnessed several armed conflicts in which conventional weapons were used on a wide scale. This led to the deaths of millions of people and absorbed tremendous sums of money. My delegation is of the view that it is high time that we looked seriously into this problem and we call on all States to make greater efforts to put an end to this hectic race. In this connection, my delegation has welcomed the recent agreement between the two super-Powers to reduce their conventional forces in Europe. We also welcome the efforts made at the Vienna and Stockholm Conferences in the context of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) and also in the context of the forthcoming Paris Summit.

My country is of the view that it is essential to consolidate international peace and security and that mankind should be protected from chemical and biological warfare. For this reason, my country signed the 1925 Geneva Protocol prohibiting the stockpiling and the military and non-military use of chemical weapons and prohibiting the use of poison gas, asphixiating gas and similar weapons. My country also participated in the recent Paris Conference and my delegation reiterates its full commitment to comply with the Convention banning the acquisition and use of bacteriological and toxin weapons and the need for their destruction.

We are of the view that paragraph 45 of the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament should be reaffirmed. That paragraph calls for a linkage to be established between nuclear and chemical weapons while giving

(Mr. Almuakkaf, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

priority to destruction of nuclear weapons. Similarly, the principle of disarmament and the setting up of nuclear-weapon-free zones should not be applied selectively.

While some countries call for chemical disarmament, we find that they continue to transfer nuclear technology to Israel and persist in supplying it with weapons of mass destruction. While some countries are being taken to task because they allegedly Possess chemical and biological weapons, Israel, which refuses to sign any international agreement in that connection, continues to be the recipient of all that it needs to develop its nuclear weapons.

My delegation calls for declaring the Mediterranean region a zone free of weapons of mass destruction. All the States of the region should place all their facilities under international control without discrimination or distinction. All the States of the region should undertake to adhere to international agreements in this regard. We welcome the proposal by President Hosni Mubarek to make this region a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction.

On several occasions, the international community has declared its opposition to the extension of the arms race into outer space which it considers to be the common heritage of mankind. My country is of the view that man's conquest of outer space and its exploration should be used for the benefit of mankind a8 a whole. Outer space should be used solely for peaceful purposes. Consequently, my country calls for the prohibition of the militarization of outer space so that it may be used solely for Peaceful, humanitarian and scientific purposes. Militarisatioa of outer space is the more dangerous because of the possibility of launching acts of aggression from outer space that would threaten international peace end security and step up the arms race. Everyone is aware that the Zionist entity ha8 recently launched spy roekats and satellites into outer space for spying on the Arab and African countries.

(Mr. Almuakkaf, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

My country attaches special importance to the question of naval disarmament. The seas and oceans of the world have been turned into arsenal8 of weapons of mass destruction borne by ships and submarines. Therefore, my country has consistently supported regional and international naval disarmament efforts, either within the context of the United Nations or in the framework of other international or regional organizations.

The continued presence of the navies of certain major Powers outside their own territorial waters destabilises and threatens international peace and security. Those navies must be withdrawn. In this connection, my delegation reiterates its support for United Nations resolutions calling for peace and security in the Mediterranean region which should become a lake of tranguillity and peace. We also welcome other proposals calling for the withdrawal of military fleets from all seas until such time as they become lakes of peace and security.

Our world has the capacity to provide a better life for all mankind. It also has the means to annihilate all life on Earth. If the world manages to achieve complete disarmament, this will no doubt create the climate that is necessary for the prosperity and well-being of all peoples.

It is truly regrettable that States of the world, particularly developing countries, devote their human and natural resources to the stockpiling of weapons and leave their peoples to suffer the banes of ignorance, disease and hunger. My country is one of the countries of the world and despite the fact that we allocate the major part of our national income to economic and social projects, the military manoeuvres by major Power8 in close proximity to our shores throughout the year and the policy of threat of use of force against my country, have compelled us to allocate more funds to the protection of our peace and security. This, of course, is done at the expense of our economic and social development programmes.

(Mr. Almuakkaf, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

We attach particular importance to the issue of verification which is a vital requirement of progress in the field of disarmament. We here wish to pay tribute to the Secretary-General's report On the study submitted by the group Of governmental experts on the role of the United Nations in the area of verification. We would stress the importance of the recommendations contained in that report.

We also support and highlight the urgent need for a central mechanism in the area of verification and also the need for a data bank for verification. We also stress the need for an organization or mechanism that would focus on issues of verification and keep records in this respect. We call for the exchange of information, publication of statistic8 and other measures that could provide additional data in this area.

My delegation is aware Of the dangers arising from the dumping Of nuclear wastes and their harmful effects on mankind and the environment. We are aware of the threat that this poses to regional and international peace and security and, particularly, to the peace and security of the developing countries.

(Mr. Almuakkaf, Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah)

Therefore my country calls on the international community to adopt global international safeguards that prohibit the transport of dangerous toxic and radioactive waste from the industrialized countries and their corporations to developing countries. My country supports all General Assembly resolutions to that end, including the most recent, resolution A/44/116 R, on prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes. We call on the industrialised States to bury or destroy radioactive and toxic wastes in their own territories. We also call on developing countries to promulgate legislation prohibiting the entry of such wastes into their own territories.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to stress the role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security; it commends the Organization's continued efforts in the field of disarmament. My delegation pays a tribute to the role played by the Secretary-General and to his efforts and general contribution to our work in that connection. We also extend our appreciation to Mr. Akashi, Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, for the major part he plays. We welcome the report in which he calls on the international community to increase its participation in the Organiaation's disarmament activities so a8 to ensure their success. The research centres and the expansion Of the special programme of disarmament studies will undoubtedly contribute to the success of th8 disarmament programmes and help to bring about international peace and security.

Mr. SAVUA (Fiji): My delegation would like to extend its warm congratulations to Mr. Rana on his unanimous election to the chairmanship of the Pirst Committee at such a Critical point is the Organization's 45-year history, My country regards it as of welcome Significance that a representative of a small nation not dissimilar from mine can assume such an office. His capabilities have

(Mr. Savua, Fiji)

been amply demonstrated. We can only echo those who have already stated that the Committee is fortunate to have someone of his calibre and experience presiding over its deliberations. We assure him and the other members of the Bureau of our co-operation at all times.

The cold war, as has often been said during the course of our debate, is over. We hop8 that it will never be reincarnated in some other form. Old alliances have been restructured and replaced by new arrangements characterized by more openness, perestroika and democratization. The capital required for the transition is enormous but can be obtained from the rechannelling of funds formerly dedicated to the purchase of weaponry. The new understanding between the two super-Powers could help breach old problems that up to now have appeared intractable. This is seen very vividly in the attempts to find a solution to the Gulf crisis. The present Gulf problem will, we hope, be solved as a first step in the wider context of finding a durable Middle-East peace formula.

While we are heartened by the pace snd direction of the peace process, we cannot but feel disquiet at the continuing, albeit reduced, nuclear stockpiles, the threatened us8 of chemical weapons, and the seemingly close link between nuclear capability and political clout. If nuclear possession, or indeed military might, is regarded as the acceptable norm of international politics, then our world is the poorer for it, as the way of life of the many will be at the whim and fancy of the mighty few.

My delegation views with alarm the invasion of Kuwait by a Stat8 with 50 times its military might. It is an ominous phenomenon and a dangerous signal to smaller nations, We hope that the unity with which Member States of the Organisation have acted to condemn the aggression and apply sanctions also conveys the message that this kind of action cannot be tolerated or condoned by the world community. We

(Mr. Savua, Fiji)

trust that a just conclusion will be found to the present Gulf crisis which can also act as a deterrent to would-be future aggressors.

The reduction of nuclear stockpiles may not be significant if the remainder are kept at a higher qualitative level, thereby nullifying any benefits the reduction might bring. This ambivalence on the part of some nuclear Powers, w8 believe, caused the inconclusive ending of the Fourth Review Conference Of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We share the view of many delegations that the conclusion of a treaty on a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing should be given top priority. My country attach86 great importance to the conclusion of such a treaty. Being a signatory to the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty - the Treaty Of Raratonga - we cannot accept the continued US8 Of our region by France as a testing ground. Nuclear tests, despite the scientific findings anyone may provide, pose a very real threat to the health of the people in the region and place the environment at risk. This concern has been expressed repeatedly by all of us in the South Pacific. It is fuelled by an underlying conviction that by the time the threat manifests itself it will be too late to take remedial action. At the risk of seeming naive let me ask this: if those tests are as safe as they are professed to be, why can they not b8 conducted in the backyards of those conducting them, instead of being detonated thousands of miles away where their sounds are mere whispers on the wind and the cries for cessation are muted in pseudo-scientific jargon? My delegation will fully support all initiatives to make a comprehensive test-ban treaty a reality.

While the likelihood Of a nuclear War between the super-Powers has been almost eliminated, there remains a substantial amount of conventional weapons, enough to destroy mankind a few times over. The proliferation Of these weapons and their easy availability retard development, as nations choose to over-arm, to the detriment Of other pressing development needs. Transparency of conventional arms

(Mr. Savua, Fiji)

transfers, as mentioned in the report of the Florence symposium, is a problem that needs to be pursued urgently by Governments and by the international community as a whole, with the growing awareness of its inherent dangers.

The threat Of us8 Of chemical weapons in the Gulf is viewed with a great deal of concern by the people of Fiji. Our concern is not only general but also because we have soldiers carrying out United Nations peace-keeping duties in the Middle East. In that last two months frantic efforts to acquire the necessary gear have been made by nations whose contingents are not equipped to cope with the effects of chemical warfare. At the present time the provision of these items is still under negotiation. The nations that do not possess these items are all developing countries, They do not include chemical-warfare training in their syllabus, let alone provide the equipment. Yet, if used, the weapon is indiscriminate. In the aftermath Of its us8 the majority Of the casualties will be those who are ill equipped. If this is a portent of the battlefield of the future there can be no unaffected bystanders. The Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons must have the support of all of us to introduce rapidly a global agreement totally banning that abhorrent weapon.

To this end, my delegation is encouraged by the leading role which the super-Powers have taken for the systematic reduction of their stocks of chemical weapons. We are especially gratified by the personal initiative of President Bush, who met with the Heads of Government of 11 independent Pacific island nations in Honolulu on 27 October - only last weekend. Among other matters, he allayed their concerns about the Johnston Atoll chemical agents disposal system. President Bush emphasized to the leaders that the facilities would be used for the disposal of chemical weapon6 already there and the small quantities now en rout8 from Germany, and that the United States has no plans to use the atoll for any other chemical munitions purpose or as a site for the disposal of hazardous waste.

(Mr. Savua, Fiji)

The battlefields Of the First World War were confined to the European theatre; the South Pacific was left relatively untouched. The Second World War saw the best part of our region embroiled in conflict. Fiji was only 500 miles from the nearest point of combat. We share the hope, expressed by most, that as our world moves farther away from the likelihood of global confrontation we shall mind the lessons of the past and not fall into the trap of complacency. If werefuse to pay heed we all surely will be touched - by choice or otherwise. Peace, it has been said, is more than just the absence of war. Avoiding war must be a preoccupation of us all.

Mr. EIPPORI (Israel): Permit me, on this first substantial intervention in the work of the Committee, to offer our sincerest congratulations to the Chairman and all the other officers of the Committee and to express our intention to co-operate with them to make this a fruitful session.

The general debate of the First Committee offers an excellent opportunity to review and take stock of the progress in the field of disarmament and arms control. Fortunately we have in the last year seen considerable evidence Of such movement - the most recent evidence being the progress towards a treaty on conventional arms in Europe, which will result in a major reduction and redistribution of all conventional forces in Europe. Together With the progress made in negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union in the reduction of nuclear weapons, this would seem to herald an entirely new - and, it is to be hoped, lasting - period Of peace and Stability on the continent.

The European example has been followed in many other parts of the world, where long-standing disputes and Situations of tension and conflict have begun to move towards peaceful resolution.

Ths one region of the world where, unfortunately, no progress has been made in this direction is the Middle East. Long a fertile breeding-ground for intolerance,

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

hatred and unbridled violence, the region is now once again in the throes of a major crisis, following a naked act of armed aggression by one of its States - Iraq - against a small neighbour. A world that had previously been engaged in a newly conceived and highly promising pursuit of international co-operation, security and peace suddenly found itself compelled to muster its energies and its forces to face this open challenge to international order and world peace.

In fact, the Middle East is the only region in which tensions and war-like rhetoric are still rife. Iraq is setting the accelerated pace at which arms are being acquired by most States of the region, and it has set dangerous precedents by flouting its international undertakings under the Charter of the United Nations and the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and, more recently, its obligations as a signatory to the non-proliferation Treaty (NPT).

Israel's warnings, throughout the years, that existential threats permeated the region were largely disregarded so long as Israel appeared to be the only prospective victim. It is regrettable #at the international community was alerted to this danger only in recent months, and it is to be hoped that the situation will be convincingly redressed.

Israel has offered several proposals in the context of disarmament. As long ago as 1989 Israel presented a draft resolution regarding the establishment, in the Middle East, of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Since then, Israel has been supporting the consensus on this issue that has been reached in the United Nations General Assembly and, in addition, has detailed the modalities it deems appropriate for the creation of such a zone.

Israel wishes to renew its call for implementation of this proposal, to be based upon the following guiding principles: that there zhould be free and direct

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

negotiations between the States concerned; that such mutual arrangements as will promote mutual trust between the States concerned should be introduced; that the initiative for such implementation should emanate from the States in the region; and that the proposed convention should eventually be signed and ratified by all the States of the region.

Israel is prepared to enter into negotiations with each and every Arab State in order to elaborate the ways and means required to put into effect the idea of regional disarmament. Israel wishes to reaffirm, just as it has been doing since the 1960s, that it will not be the first country to introduce nuclear weapons into the Middle East.

In the course of his address to the United Nations General Assembly at its special session in 1988 Prime Minister Yitznak Shamir already called for the establishment of the Middle East as a region free from chemical weapons. That call was reiterated by the then Foreign Minister, Moshe Arens, at the Paris Conference in January 1989. This intention was restated once again by Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs David Levy in his address to the General Assembly on 1 October 1990.

Israel is a signatory to the 1925 Geneva Protocol. It fully and meticulously complies with the provisions of that Protocol. Recently it has participated in the work of the Conference on Disarmament, especially the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Warfare, as a non-member State. Thus Israel has joined the international effort to draft a universal convention relating to the use of chemical weapons - one that should be acceptable to all States. Israel supports the goals of the propose& convention. Israel will examine in a positive spirit the possibility of adhering to the convention, in the light of its possible contribution to the solution of Middle East problems, and subject to the seaurity requirements of the State. While

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

we are convinced that the regional approach, With direct negotiations And mutual assurances, is the best road to follow in the chemical field, as well as the nuclear field, we envisage the possibility of grafting into the chemical-weapons convention provisions that would confer some of the advantages of a regional approach.

It seems entirely appropriate to reiterate our warnings about the terrible dangers likely to flow from the proliferation of non-conventional arms.

We wish to renew our appeal to Governments, as well as to private organizations and companies, to join forces in a supreme effort with a view to preventing the spread, to countries such as Iraq and Libya, of the technology that might risk the production and use of non-conventional weaponry - weaponry that, as is well known, is liable to inflict a horrendous catastrophe upon mankind as a whole.

We have before us this year the Secretary-General's report on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East - document A/45/435. We wish to commend Under-Secretary-General Akashi, the staff of the Department of Disarmament Affairs an%, of course, the three independent experts who wrote the report for providing such a thoughtful and useful study. We shall comment upon it later in the Committee deliberations.

In that report the ezperts reach the conclusion that the nuclear threat can be effectively end permanently eliminated only as a pattern of sound regional-security relationships is developed - relationships based on unequivocal, unambiguous, legally binding arrangements, among which must be an equal commitment by all States to renounce the nuclear-weapons option. That pattern will have to be radically different from the dangerous and unstable relationships that exist today, with sophisticated weapons, including weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, proliferating, an% with political tensions remaining unresolved. The

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

experts also emphasise that this can be achieved only as the result of a long process.

In his speech to the General Assembly, Foreign Minister Levy, referring to the general peace process, remarked:

> "To advance this process, it would be appropriate to initiate and encourage mutual confidence-building measures. Such measures could induce a gradual reduction in hostilities and tensions and the cessation of hostile rhetoric, belligerence and terrorism." (A/45/PV.14, p. 86)

The same confidence-building measures can apply equally to making progress in the field of disarmament.

Israel's security position is graphically clarified by the authors of the report to which I have just referred, in which they state:

> "Against this background, it is appropriate to point out that Israel's security position is characterized by three features that cannot but play a part in determining its attitude towards the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone: the relatively small sise of its territory; the sustained hostility between itself and the great majority of States in the region; end the fact that it has no military allies in the region and that the one State that might support it in a conflict is geographically remote.*' (A/45/435, para. 98)

This situation becomes even more graphic when one considers some figures taken from the "Military Balance 1989-90" of the London Institute for Strategic Studies, comparing Israel against six Arab countries with which we are still in a state of war. In the case of soldiers in active service, the ratio is 12.8 to 1; reserves, 2.9 to 1; tanks, 3.8 to 1; combat aircraft, 3.1 to 1. And in 1987 the defence-budget ratio - amounts stated in United States dollars - was 5 to 1.*

---

* The Chairman returned to ths Chair,

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

We are speaking here of conventional weapons only. To that we must add the stockpiles of chemical weapons. biological weapons and ballistic missiles. In addition, there is an overwhelming indication that, in spite of its signature of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Iraq is engaged in a frantic effort to create modern nuclear weapons. Just as Iraq has shown no respect for its signature of the Geneva Convention, it disregards its commitments under that Treaty as well. At a time when the United States and the USSR are actively involved in reducing and eliminating their stocks of chemical weapons, Iraq is actively involved in increasing its stock and threatening to attack Israel and other areas of the Middle East with those forbidden armaments.

We can only express our fervent hope that the spirit of accommodation, dialogue and détente, evidenced in other parts of the world, will in the coming years also penetrate the walls of hate that have been erected in the Middle East.

Mr. OSMAN (Somalia): Mr. Chairman, since this is my first statement in this Committee, let me at the outset offer you, on behalf of my delegation, profound congratulations on your unanimous election to guide our deliberations. Your election is a recognition of your well-known diplomatic skills and your rich experience in the affairs of the United Nations. We also offer our congratulations to the other officers of the Committee.

We are meeting against a backdrop of momentous global developments which have heightened the expectations of the international community for a better, peaceful and prosperous world. The beginning of the decade of the 1990s has witnessed a dramatic and significant transformation of the all-too-familiar cold war and confrontation of the past between the two super-Powers into a new era of co-operation and compromise. The coming down of the Berlin Wall and the

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

reunification of Germany, which followed earlier in the month, aptly symbolized the end of the ideological rivalry and military confrontation between the East end the west.

It is indeed gratifying to see this spirit of understanding and accommodation permeate to some other region8 of the world where long-standing conflicts either have been settled amicably or show hopeful signs of being settled by dialogue and negotiation. while the world ha8 witnessed the emergence of Namibia as a free and independent State after a long and arduous liberation struggle, the two Yemens also have voluntarily reunited into a single State in response to the aspiration8 of their peoples. In South Africa, following the release of Nelson Mandela end other political leader8 and the unbanning of the political partfe8, a process of dialogue between the African National Congress and the Government is in progress. We hope that the negotiations which have just begun will before long lead to the dismantling of the abhorrent system of apartheid and the introduction of a truly non-racial multiparty democracy in the country, based on "one man, one vote".

In recent months, in another part of Africa, positive development8 have also been taking place towards subregional co-operation. In January 1990 Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda, member8 of the Intergovernmental Authority on Drought and Development (IGADD) resolved to co-operate among themselves for eocio-economic development end restoration of peace end harmony in their countries. Somalia firmly supports the role of IGADD in combating drought and promoting the socio-economic development and security of countries in the Horn of Africa subregion.

While the resolution oi the long-drawn-out armed conflict in Cambodia appear8 to be within reach, in the cwo Koreas for the first time there have been contact8 at the level of the Prime Ministers, which may eventually lead to, among other

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

things, the fulfilment of the shared aspirations of the peoples of the two countries for their reunification. It is our fervent hope that the ongoing process of negotiations among the concerned parties in Western Sahara and Cyprus and efforts towards the return of lasting peace in Afghanistan through national reconciliation will bear fruitful results in those countries.

If anyone were to consider these positive trends, welcome as they are, as a panacea for the intractable problems which confront mankind today, it would be an exercise in wishful thinking; for, while conflict situations have ceased to be so in some parts of the world, they are raising their ugly heads in other areas. They have an incalculable capability of throwing our planet into the flames of a global conflagration, thereby undermining whatever limited gains we have been able to achieve in the sphere of disarmament. The current potentially explosive situation in the Middle East is one such case in point.

In the course of his annual report the Secretary-General has pointed out that the Middle East as a whole continues to be the most explosive region of the world today. He states:

> "Long-standing grievances, which have festered for years, have been aggravated by an escalating arms race throughout the area, which has spawned a deadly arsenal Of weapons Of mass destruction. In the long run, lasting peace will come to the Middle East only when the principles of international law govern the relations between States, when disputes are resolved through peaceful means, when the aspirations of those deprived of their rights have been fulfilled, and regional security and economic arrangements - which take into account the concerns of all the parties in the area - have been established." (A/45/1, p. 10)

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

In this context, we welcomed the Secretary-General's report on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free tone in the region of the Middle East (A/45/435), containing the study on effective and verifiable measures which would facilitate the establishment of such a zone in the region. In this connection, I refer to the relevant paragraphs of the report, namely, paragraphs 104 and 105, which bring into sharp focus the existence of powder kegs in some parts of the world, notwithstanding the progress towards the reversal of the arms race.

When we consider the future of disarmament, arms control and security in the 1990s, we take note of the fact that the thaw in the relations between the two super-Powers has made a significant contribution toward8 the breakthrough in the efforts to reverse the arms race. The signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles two years ago, which was the first-ever encouraging step in that direction, was followed by the summit meetings in Malta at the beginning of the year and at Washington later, in June. The bilateral agreement for the destruction of their chemical weapons, which was signed by the United States and the Soviet Union during the Washington summit meeting, further demonstrated their desire to rid the world of these deadly weapons.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

We are encouraged by the progress made in Vienna in recent days in the negotiations under the aegis of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe for the reduction of conventional forces in Europe. We consider this positive development a manifestation of the realization by the countries in Europe that arms control has to match the important and far-reaching changes which have taken place on the Continent.

In the light of these positive trends in the sphere of disarmament we find it difficult, however, to understand why the major nuclear Powers, in spite of their professed commitment to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. are dragging their feet when it comes to the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, thereby making their intentions appear suspect and dubious. We firmly believe tbat the only practical course to halt and de-escalate nuclear proliferation, and, indeed, to avoid the risk of a nuclear war, is to conclude the comprehensive nuclear-test-baa treaty without further delay.

It is therefore regrettable that the Fourth Review Conference of the Parties to the non-proliferation Treaty, held in Geneva last month, failed to agree on the final document, primarily because of its inability to reach consensus on the question of a comprehensive test ban. However, we join other delegations in welcoming the re-establishment by the Conference on Disarmament during its 1990 session of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban and hope that the Committee's resumed deliberation8 during its 1991 session will lead to substantive progress toward8 a test ban,

In the context of the global effort8 for nuclear disarmament through the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the different regions of the world, the question of the denuclearizatrion of Africa attains special importance. The realization of this goal, which the Organization of African Unity set in Cairo 26 years ago, will be impossible until such time as South Africa's reported nuclear

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

capability, which has serious implications, especially for the security of the African States, is reversed. We therefore welcome the recommendations of the Disarmament Commission at its 1990 session, which, inter alia, call on South Africa to adhere to the non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) and place all its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards.

We have given careful consideration to the Secretary-General's report on South Africa's nuclear-tipped ballistic missile capability, and have noted the optimistic note in this regard in paragraph 142 as follows:

> "Today as a result of changes under way over the past few months, there is a sense of palpable movement and opportunity, tinged with hope and trepidation. There is a realization that politics in the region are at a watershed, that the policy of reliance on superior force could be replaced by oae based on regional consensus. In this setting, the possibility of fully implementing past Organization of African Unity (OAU) and General Assembly resolutions on the denuclearization of Africa, by the adherence of South Africa to the NPT becomes a live one." (A/45/571, para. 142)

We believe, however, that any complacency on our part in this vital matter will be dangerous and detrimental to the peace and security not only of the countries of Africa, but also of the entire world. It is therefore imperative for the international community to keep a close and constant watch on South Africa's reported development of its nuclear capability.

Let me now turn to another important, but unresolved, issue which has the potential of affecting global peace and security, and on which the easing of East-West tension appears to have made no appreciable impact, I refer to the 1971 Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, whore implementation has eluded us for nearly two decades, in spite of our persistent efforts. Even the convening

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

of en international conference for the implementation of this important Declaration has not been possible, because of the negative attitude adopted by some major Powers. The withdrawal of these countries from the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean has been most regrettable and constitutes a setback to the Committee's work. In view of current serious developments in the area, we need not overemphasize the imperative need to implement the Declaration.

Somalia, which is a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, joins other delegations in welcoming the adoption and signing in Arusha, Tanzania, last month of the Agreement on the Establishment of the Organization of Indian Ocean Marine Affairs Co-operation. We consider this a positive development towards, among other things, peaceful co-operation between States in the region.

Somalia continues to support the peaceful uses of outer space. We therefore join other delegations in opposing, in conformity with the United Nations resolutions on the subject, the extension of any military competition or activity into outer space.

It is hardly necessary for my delegation to overemphasize the important role played by the United Nations in the field of disarmament. I should like to take this opportunity to pay a special tribute to the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Akashi, and his staff for their part in continuing to play and strengthen #is role.

While we have reason to derive some satisfaction from the limited gains we have been able to achieve in recent months in the sphere of disarmament, we should not ignore the non-military threat to global peace and security which exists today in the shape of serious socio-economic imbalances. Our world today suffers from yawning disparities in the living standards of its people. While we have on the one hand the affluent few, the vast majority of the world's population in the

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

developing, and particularly the least developed, countries live in abject poverty. For a large number of these people, chronic hunger, malnutrition and disease have become a normal fact of life.

Unless the benefits of the improved international political climate percolate to this significant segment of mankind, in the form of solid foundations for its socio-economic development at the national, regional and global levels, we shall continue to be plagued by insurmountable problems. The international community, more than ever before, recognizes the paramount need for international co-operation to avert famine and poverty as a positive factor for global socio-economic development. We therefore call upon all countries represented here to join together in a spirit of co-operation and understanding to work towards the total elimination of disparities in international economic relations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, thereby leading to a better end happier world.

Mr. DE VENECIA (Philippines): On the north lawn of the United Nations grounds stands a new, striking addition to the New York landscape. Silhouetted against the sky by the East River, the sculpture, entitled "Dobro uobeshdaiet zlo", or "The victory of good over evil", by Soviet people's artist Zurab Tsereteli, is a gift of the Soviet Union on the forty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations.

(Mr. De Venecia, Philippines)

It is difficult not to be stirred by the symbolism of this modern icon and by the new legend behind it, for it depicts St. George slaying the dragon of nuclear war, a beast whose metal entrails are made out of nuclear missiles - Soviet SS-20s and United States Pershing8 - destroyed by mandate of the USSR-United States Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - INF Treaty. We thus have in our midst this sculpture to remind us every day of the long-sought goal of disarmament, development and conversion. Indeed, weapons of war are now being transformed into symbols of peace, into new units of productivity - technology turned into art.

Events in the sphere of disarmament end international peace and security have considerably accelerated since 1985, the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and the International Year of Peace.

In this period, several important activities were undertaken by the United Nations in the framework of what was called the Second International Disarmament Decade, In 1987 the United Nations hosted the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. In 1988 the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament took place in New York.

The Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development, adopted by consensus by the 150 countries in attendance, declared:

> "Disarmament and development are two of the most urgent challenges facing the world today."

It further declared:

> *'Disarmament and development are two pillars on which international peace and security can be built." (A/CONF.130/39, p. 14, para. 2)

(Mr. De Venecia, Philippines)

In the Action programme of the Conference, it was stated, inter alia, that "The United Nations should facilitate an international exchange of views and experience in the field of conversion (ibid., v. 22, para. (ix) (f)

This carried forward the recommendation made by the Panel of Eminent Personalities on Disarmament and Development in 1986 that one of the courses of action which States could take was

*'Promotion of . . . conversion whenever possible within national context as well as internationally for the benefit of socio-economic development, particularly in developing countries." (United Nations Publication. Sales No. E.86 IX.5, p. 9 (k))

Unlike the International Conference on Disarmament and Development, the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament did not produce a final document. However, those two meetings could be said to be the fertile seed-bed of ideas whose flowering we see today.

At the third special session on disarmament the Philippines formally proposed that the United Nations could be tapped to serve as an active advisory body or as an exchange centre for ideas in the field of conversion. The proposal stated that bodies such as the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs, the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the United Nations Development Programme could include in their yearly programme a provision on conversion, in terms of either research or studies or active expert advice,

At the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly, resolution 44/116 J, entitled "Conversion of Military Resources", was adopted by consensus. It alludes in its preamble to the General Assembly's desire to promote an exchange of experience, within the United Nations framework, on the conversion of military resources to civilian purposes.

(Mr. De Venecia, Philivvines)

In the operative paragraphs the General Assembly invites Member States to submit to the Secretary-General by April 1991 their views on various aspects of conversion of military resources to civilian purposes and decides to include in the provisional agenda of its forty-sixth session an item on the subject.

In August 1990 a conference co-hosted by the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs and the Soviet Peace Fund was held in Moscow on the topic, "Conversion: Economic Adjustments in an Era of Arms Reduction". The meeting, in which there were about 140 international participants, welcomed a message from President Gorbachev which stated that

> "Conversion of military production is on8 of the basic guidelines that renders the disarmament process irreversible and clears the way for demilitarized politics and improved international relations."

Speaking for the United States, Senator John McCain stated that the United States Government was making plans to reduce military forces by close to 25 per cent over the next five years and that military spending as a percentage of gross national product and of total government spending should be at the lowest level in 50 years.

The meeting provided other examples of national experiences and examined concepts and approaches as well as specific issues. One can only conclude that, if the momentum towards disarmament continues and intensifies conversion will be at the top of the agenda in the 1990s.

The Philippines has also been quietly but intensely pursuing its own programme of conversion, in connection with the expiring Philippine-United States Military Bases Agreement and negotiations towards a possible new treaty that could provide a transition and final phase-out of the United States military facilities before the arrival of the new century.

(Mr. De Venecia. Philippines)

In 1989 I had the privilege of writing a good number of conversion options and authored Joint Resolution No. I, which President Coraaon Aquino signed into law, creating a Legislative-Executive Bases Council to formulate a comprehensive programme for the alternative economic, social and security uses of the bases in the event of partial or total United States withdrawal.

In May 1990 the Philippines served notice of the termination of the Republic of the Philippines-United States Military Bases Agreement by 16 September 1991, and in her address to the Filipino people on 17 September 1990 President Aquino signalled the beginning of discussions on new arrangements between the Philippines and the United States for the 1990s. She declared:

> "The time has come for our two nations to craft a new relationship - one more equitable, mutually beneficial and respectful of each other's sovereignty. In a world where the cold war has ended and events in Eastern Europe and the Middle East have altered the traditional geopolitical order, the decades-old parameters of the Republic of the Philippines-united States relationship no longer hold. The old cannot continue, the new must now be born. This new relationship shall be the subject of the talks that begin tomorrow.**

President Aquino mentioned that among many and varied preparations undertaken by the Philippine Government for the talks were the plans for the conversion of the bases by the Legislative-Executive Bases Council.

As a member of the Philippine Legislative-Executive Bases Council, let me share today some of the experiences and conclusions of that body. Beaded by the President of the University of the Philippines, Mr. Jose V. Abueva, the body is composed of 17 members, nine appointed by the President from the Executive and the private sector and sight chosen by Congress, four from the Senate and four from the House.

(Mr. De Venecia, Philivvines)

One of the two major conversion programmes which the Council devised and submitted to President Aquino and leaders of Congress for approval and implementation was the conversion of the Clark Air Base and its surrounding baselands - the latter long vacated by the United States - into a civil aviation complex, including an air cargo terminal and trans-shipment facility in the Asia-Pacific region; transfer of the Ninoy Aquino (Manila) International Airport to Clark and the conversion of the present Manila airport into a domestic airport; transfer of units of the Philippine Air Force to Clark proper and relocation of some of the major Philippine military camps in the Metro Manila area to the vacated Clark baselands; establishment of an industrial estate and export zone, a tourist complex, mass housing, an agricultural complex for high-value export crops, agro-processing units, designation of a land-reform area; and establishment of agro-forestry parks in the upland areas.

For the Subic Naval Base complex on the South China Sea, not far from Clark, the Council approved its conversion into a maritime industrial complex, including a major ship repair and shipbuilding facility; transfer of the main elements of the Philippine Navy to Subic; a fuel depot and refuelling station; an industrial support complex that will assist five industries related to ship, port and repair operations - namely, the production of industrial gases, a light steel industry, a welding electrode rod industry, a cutting-tool-bit and machine-tool industry and the manufacture of container vans; operation of a container terminal and cargo port - in view of Subic's strategic location in Asia's sea lanes? a University of the Philippines Training Center, including agricultural, fishing, and agro-forestry activities in the coastal areas of the reverted baselands.

(Mr. De Venecia, Philippines)

The Bases Council report points outt

"The experience of Singapore in converting the Sembawang Naval Facility with the assistance of the British Government should give the Philippines some perspective on the difficulties and timeframe required for converting a military navalbase. It took Singapore five years to effect the conversion plan and to employ the 30,000 workers displaced by the former military complex."

(Mr. De Venecia, Philippines)

The example of Singapore shows that conversion from a military to a viable civilian facility is possible under determined leadership and with a disciplined people, the report added.

Not surprisingly, the aforementioned conversion objectives can be achieved while the United States continues to use the facilities jointly with the Philippines, under the principle of joint use or combined use, now, or during the transition period, or thereafter when the treaty phase-out is finally completed, and the Philippines fully Pilipinixes and privatizes the facilities and operates them on commercial terms, while giving access to the facilities to the military or civilian aircraft and ships of all nations.

Thus, after the winding-down or completion of a new transition treaty, when United States base rights come to an end, we can still envisage continued use of the Philippine facilities under terms not of base rights but of base access under preferential or conventional commercial terms available to all flags.

The expected total cost of the conversion programme over a lo-year period would amount to 158.57 billion Philippine pesos, or about $6.33 billion at the present conversion rate of ₱25 to $1, which, as indicated under Joint Resolution No. 1, the Philippines can finance over time through the safe, lease or joint-venture development of the bulk of the prime real estate, exceeding 1,000 hectares, at present occupied by the major Filipino military camps in the congested Metro Manila area. The Government's share of this cost is ₱65 billion, the balance of which is to come from the private sector and major project cash flows.

The Council was careful to concentrate efforts on reduction of the base dependence of the workers in the surrounding communities by allocating programmes far the retraining of workers, to minimize social disruption, to promote public welfare and social justice and to ensure that the future development of the workers

(Mr. De Venecia, Philippines)

will be efficient and sustainable, with the fullest support of government agencies and the active participation of business, industry and people's organizations.

However, I must say in all candour that the conversion of bases, the shift from a military or defence-related economy to a peace economy, has its own risks and perils, not excluding the loss of assured foreign exchange, jobs, other revenues and markets and, in the context of the Philippines, the phasing-out of the external security arrangements, for indeed the programmed alternative replacements will take time to put in place.

Last week President Aquino urged Congress to pass a bill creating the Philippine bases conversion authority - a sequel to Joint Resolution No. 1 - to oversee implementation of the Bases Conversion Plan, and Joint Resolution No. 10, of which I was also the author and which has now passed the House. It is hoped that Joint Resolution No. 10 will become Joint Resolution No. 2 when it passes the Senate and is signed into law by the President. It authorises the President to proceed with the sale of parts of the military real estate in Metro Manila in order to finance the transfer of the Filipino camps and begin the partial conversion of bases in the vacated baselands relinquished by the United States since 1979, while awaiting the results of the current Philippine-United States bases negotiations on a new transition and phase-out treaty, expected to be completed in the first quarter of 1991. The negotiations, which are being conducted in the historical and traditional spirit of mutuality, bid fair to lead to an understanding worthy of two friends and two countries firmly committed to democracy.

The new treaty will still be subject to ratification by the Philippine Senate and, when Congress so requires, will be submitted to the Filipino people for approval in a national referendum, when it will be recognized as a treaty by the other contracting State.

(Mr. De Venecia. Philippines)

I have referred to this historic restructuring process as three-cushion billiards because one movement will trigger several movements - namely, the restructuring and conversion of the Filipino military camps, conversion of the United States facilities and development of the vacated baselands - while raising P100 billion to P150 billion from the proceeds of the sale of the Filipino camps to finance the conversion objectives and help achieve modest but self-reliant armed forces, as we propel the Philippines to the status of a newly industrialized country before tbe turn of the century.

In disarmament terms, the conversion is twofold: conversion of the Filipino military camps in the Metro Manila area into residential, tourist and light-iadustrial complexes, with ecological parks; and simultaneous partial or total conversion of the United States military facilities and the baselands vacated by the United States in the central plains of Luzon as the world moves on its own steam towards expanding peace and disarmament, new regional balances and adjustments among nations.

I am even hopeful that, considering its leadership in the disarmament process and its phase-down or closure of base facilities within the United States itself and in various parts of the world, the United States may contribute to the Philippine conversion programme in the light of the proposed new terms of reference under the transition.

On the issues of disarmament and conversion, the Philippines welcomes the progress in the field of disarmament and arms control by the United States and the Sovie- Union, the smooth implementation of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Bangs Missiles - INF Treaty, the strategic arms reduction talks (START), and the signing of the agreement between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the destruction and non-production

(Mr. De Venecia, Philippines)

of chemical weapons and on measures to facilitate the conclusion of a multilateral convention banning chemical weapons. It also welcomes the forthcoming Paris summit of Heads of State or Government of the countries participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and the signing, on that occasion, of a historic treaty on conventional disarmament in Europe.

At the same time, it urges tbe conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty as a multilateral step proposed for the 1991 Conference on amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water.

The Philippines further welcomes and applauds the award of this year's Nobel Peace Prixe to President Mikhail Gorbachev for his exceptional role in promoting world peace, security and disarmament, which has given new hope and a lift to those in the USSR and Eastern Europe generally and indeed to all the peoples of the world.

It is unfortunate that the plans for the much-desired peace dividend scheduled to flow from defence budget savings arising from arms and troops cuts under the disarmament process, which dividend would be shared by the countries of the South, have been temporarily derailed by the Gulf crisis, with its grave threat to the peace and economic health of the world community, which is already seeing the beginnings of an emerging recession.

Within the context of East-West co-operation in arms and armed forces reduction there are many opportunities to remobilize for commercial uses and non-military needs the human and material resource8 that will be released by the closing down of military-industrial complexes, and weapons factories. Indeed, hundreds of thousands of qualified military factory workers, base technicians, engineers and scientists will, in time, be released to channel their creative abilities into the civilian and commercial sectors of society. As laymen, it is

(Mr. De Venecia, Philippines)

not difficult to visualize factories that are currently producing tanks and armoured vehicles being retooled so as to build instead farm tractors and heavy road-building and mining equipment, trainer aircraft instead of fighter planes and passenger and cargo jets instead of bombers, for it has been said that

> "They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks," (The Holy Bible. Isaiah 2:4)

Indeed, the dream of disarmament is as ancient as the Old Testament itself.

While we welcome the dramatic and remarkable improvements in arms control and troop cuts in Europe, especially the winding-down and the remarkable events in the former Eastern bloc and the splendid co-operation between the United States and the USSR, there have, unfortunately, been no similar or parallel developments in other regions of the world that, justifiably, are regarded as actual or potential flashpoints in a troubled time.

The Middle East is bristling with military weapons of manifestly offensive magnitude and nature, Considering the ancient bonds that unite the Arab world, it might well be possible, under United Nations auspices, to bring the warring nations and factions in the Middle East to terms so that a favourable climate may be created for the adjustment of the chronic, long-term problems confronting the region.

Historical experience offers abundant evidence that war does not hold the solution to any such problems. Issues of peace and security should be thrashed out by diplomatic means, and the United Nations still offers the best known venue for diplomacy.

(Mr. De Venecia, Philippines)

It is suggested that some initiative may be launched even at this hour to convene an appropriate conference on the Middle East smong the parties, entrusted with the mission, first, of restoring ante bellum conditions; secondly, of ensuring the speedy and just resolution of any economic, commercial or territorial disputes; and thirdly, of holding simultaneous negotiations and preparations for a major demilitarization of forces and removal of weapons among countries in the region to severely restrict their ability to wage further war in the future.

Under United Nations and Arab auspices, the parties may still listen to the collective voice of the world. It is likewise suggested that tbe United Nations take the initiative to convene an appropriate conference on the maintenance of a rational balance of armaments in the Asia-Pacific region. Specifically, we propose the consideration of arrangements that will lead to the reduction of arms and forces in South-East Asia, in North-East Asia and in the Indian subcontinent. Such an initiative is rendered urgent and compelling by the evident inclination among certain sectors in the region to reinforce their forces and weaponry even in the face of an imminent diminution of military presence in the area on the part of the United States and of the Soviet Union.

The pace of armament in the Asia-Pacific region lends dramatic realism to the repeated warning of Singapore Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew that the eventual departure of the United States from the Philippines would occasion the emergence of new powers in South-East Asia.

The existing mechanisms for national and regional security in Asia and the Pacific have to be updated and modernized. The instruments of regional diplomacy have to be synchronized with the current and foreseeable tempo of history. A telling object lesson from the past history of the United Nation6 is obvious to all of us: the fate of nations and of mankind cannot be left to chance and fortune.

(Mr. De Venecia, Philippines)

A distinguished Oriental historian and philosopher, Dr. Charles Malik, who helped make the United Nations the great institution that it is today, once said that if the national treasures and fortunes frittered away on the unending armaments race were spent for the poor and the needy the world would be an infinitely better place to live in. One must hope that his wisdom has shed light on the present United Nations deliberations on disarmament.

Permit me to make'the observation that disarmament is, in all its aspects and implications, only a symptom of an inner conflict between man's irrepressible restlessness and his consuming yearning for peace and quiet. One need not despair, however, for man is endowed with the genius to surmount manifestations of that inner conflict, as is amply evidenced by the vast strides in the promotion of world peace and understanding made by the United Nations against daunting odds.

Let us not make the familiar mistake of looking at issues of war and peace in isolation from the weighty and crucial psychological, political, social and economic problems with which they are inextricably linked. Our attention should not be distracted from the context of the geopolitical phenomena with which we have to deal.

Let us try to fashion in Our own time and place an effective instrument for investing the United Nations and its competent organs and agencies with the power to arbitrate international issues relative to the state and level Of military forces in the world leading to an enforceable world law. That is the Philippine dream, and I am certain it is a cherished dream of all nations.

Mr. LUCK (unanimous) election as Chairman of this Committee is not only a tribute to your country, Nepal, but also recognition of your own personal qualities and brilliant record of accomplishments here. My delegation congratulates you and offers our complete co-operation during the course

(Mr. Tucker, Bahamas)

of the Committee's deliberations. Our congratulations go also to the other officers of the Committee.

Both in the general debate in the General Assembly and in this Committee the significant change6 taking place in the international community in the past year have been highlighted. My delegation agrees that for the most part these developments have been positive, and have raised hopes and aspirations for a more peaceful, more secure world. Confident that in this new climate the prospects for effective action to enhance international peace and security were more realistic, many world leaders called for the establishment of a new international order. In this new order, peace, security and mutual co-operation would be the norm and concepts of partnership, consultation and collective action would govern inter-State relations.

For the first time the possibility that military structures would be dismantled and military budgets reduced and that resources thus freed would be &voted to development seemed a realistic possibility. The creation of a peace dividend remains an issue, and my delegation continue6 to consider it a logical, if not an immediate, expectation.

Ironically, when the international community seems poised to renew its commitment to international peace and security and to general and complete disarmament, it is faced with the threat of a major war, We fear that given the sophisticated weapons - chemical, nuclear and conventional alike - which all parties possess, war in the Gulf could be more devastating than any earlier war. The Gulf crisis underscore6 the fact that our rejection of war and endeavours for peace are no guarantee that there will not be an outbreak of war. Prom this perspective our efforts can be viewed as tenuous at bsst.

(Mr. Tucker, Bahamas)

It is within our purview, nevertheless, to take substantial action to improve our prospects for international peace and security. Among those recent initiatives which my delegation considers vital to the process of disarmament and peace and security are the bilateral agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union for the reduction of nuclear weapons and the elimination of some intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, the initiatives taken by the Warsaw Treaty States in the areas of confidence- and security-building measures and the agreement by members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to negotiate on tactical nuclear weapons following the successful conclusion of an agreement on conventional forces in Burope.

Agreements reached on a format for the strategic arms reduction treaty and on the verification measures for the threshold test-ban Treaty will also greatly facilitate our efforts. The Bahamas would wish, however, to underscore the importance it attaches to the bilateral agreement between the United States aud the Soviet Union on the limitation of chemical weapons. It is our hope that this agreement will spur action for the conclusion of a multilateral treaty on this subject.

This is the final decade of the twentieth century - and complete disarmament remains illusive. It is a matter of concern to my delegation that into the Third Disarmament Decade the proliferation of nuclear weapons continues to be a threat to humanity. The Bahamas strongly believes that the prevention of nuclear war and the promotion of nuclear disarmament must continue to be the international community's highest priority, but it is an endeavour in which non-nuclear States must also play their necessary role.

The issue of a comprehensive ban on test explosions of nuclear weapons has, since 1954, featured prominently in discussions of multilateral disarmament, and

(Mr. Tucker, Bahamas)

scores of resolutions calling for a comprehensive test ban have been adopted. My delegation contends that adoption of a comprehensive test-ban treaty is one step in tangible progress towards arms reduction and nuclear disarmament. Consequently, the Bahamas is among those non-nuclear States that support the conversion of the partial test-ban Treaty into a comprehensive test ban. We were disheartened, but not discouraged, by the outcome of the Fourth Review Conference of the non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) as regards the comprehensive test ban. We urge that the obstacles encountered not be permitted to influence negotiations during the 1991 amendment Conference.

(Mr. Tucker, Bahamas)

Also, no treaty has been adopted by the international community to ban the production of a specific category of conventional weapons. We nevertheless hold that the reduction of conventional weapons is an essential, indeed integral, part of our efforts to achieve disarmament. Initiatives, including the Vienna negotiations on conventional forces in Europe, therefore have the support of the Bahamas, because of their potential for addressing this problem.

My delegation is convinced that only requisite confidence-building measures will guarantee positive advancement in disarmament. In particular, non-nuclear-weapon States need to be assured not only that nuclear weapons will not be used against them, but that there is a firm commitment on the part of nuclear States to a qualitative and quantitative reduction in nuclear weapons. At the same time, we believe, non-nuclear States should be assisted in their bid to acquire nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

As a State party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which establishes a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America and the Caribbean, the Bahamas supports the establishment of similar zones in South-East Asia and the Middle East. We also urge that the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa be implemented, to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons on that continent. Similarly, we would encourage support for all efforts to halt nuclear testing and military manoeuvres in outer space, and the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons. The consequences of nuclear weapons on the environment, brought to our attention in the report of the Secretary-General, have heightened our concern in this regard. We believe this must encourage those concerned to prevent environmental degradation by ceasing activities in this area.

The current crisis in the Gulf makes us mindful that the transfer of and trading in arms and weapons technology can, if there is not transparency, be a

(Mr. Tucker, Bahamas)

direct threat to international peace and security. We call for the degree of transparency essential not only to control and monitor the shipment of arms, but also to prevent their indiscriminate use once acquired.

The international security environment has undoubtedly been transformed by events in Eastern Europe and the ending of the cold war. Meetings, including the Conference on Disarmament, have provided concrete conclusions and recommendations that should inform our efforts. The re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee in the negotiating process is one of the many substantive steps we have made in the right direction. This augurs well for our collective efforts towards general and complete disarmament.

The role of the United Nations in providing the necessary leadership for progress towards general and complete disarmament, and the forum within which such progress can take place, is indispensable to this process. It is th8 responsibility of Member States, however, to provide the United Nations with the support it requires. Also, Member States must co-operate with each other in the interest of ensuring meaningful progress towards a world free of confrontation, the arms race and the threat of nuclear annihilation. The Bahamas pledges its support to this worthy and essential endeavour.

The CHAIRMAN: peaker is the Observer of the International Committee of the Red Cross, Mrs. Denise Plattner. I now call on her.

Mrs. PLATTNER (International Committee of the Red Cross) (ICRC) (interpretation from French): The 1868 Declaration of St. Petersburg was one of the first international documents designed to place constraints upon the conduct of war. The representatives of the signatory States expressed their conviction that the employment Of arms which uselessly aggravate the sufferings of disabled men, or render their death inevitable would be contrary to the laws of humanity. Those

(Mrs. Plattner, ICRC)

States therefore undertook to renounce the us8 of Certain explosive projectiles that could cause particularly horrible injuries. Thus, as long ago as 1868, States expressed a principle which today is one of the fundamental rules of international humanitarian law applicable in armed conflicts.

The 1899 and 1907 Hague Conventions transformed the St. Petersburg principle into a legal rule. Article 35 of Protocol I additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, relating to the protection of victims of international armed conflicts, expresses the rule in its present form. Paragraph 2 of that article states that

"It is prohibited to employ weapons, projectiles and material and methods of warfare of a nature to cause superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering".

This prohibition stems from one of the basic principles of international humanitarian law, which is expressed as follows in paragraph 1 of the same article 35 of Protocol I:

"In any armed conflict, the right of the Parties to the conflict to choose methods or means of warfare is not unlimited".

In addition, article 36 of Protocol I obliges States parties to this treaty to determine, when studying, developing, acquiring or adopting a new weapon, whether the employment of that weapon would be prohibited by international law.

This brief review of the historical background and the present situation of the rule prohibiting or limiting the use of weapons and methods of warfare likely to cause unnecessary suffering is designed to be a reminder that the 1980 Convention - the tenth anniversary of which we shall commemorate this year - is firmly rooted in international humanitarian law, Its three Protocols give concrete expression to a fundamental rule contained in Protocol I additional to the Geneva Conventions and enable it to be applied to specific weapons.

(Mrs. Plattner, ICRC)

Ten years ago the International Committee of the Red Cross hailed the adoption, by the United Nations Conference convened for that purpose, of the 1980 Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons. It was pleased to have contributed to the success of the long, patient negotiations, especially by organizing the preliminary work. Although the ICRC was only an observer at the Conference at which the Convention was adopted, it fully supports its aim, for the following reasons, among others.

First, with each of its three Protocols prohibiting or restricting the use of a certain category of weapons. the 1980 Convention contributes directly to the general aim of international humanitarian law - namely, to limit the suffering caused by hostilities.

Secondly, the 1980 Convention is an open-ended treaty, for the negotiation of further protocols will make it possible to prohibit or limit the use of other methods or means of combat which would be contrary to the general rule in article 35 of Protocol I and whose harmful effects would raise serious humanitarian problems.

Thirdly, the International Conference of the Red Cross and the Red Crescent, which brings together the States parties to the Geneva Conventions and the various components of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, has repeatedly expressed its support for the 1980 Convention. Thus, the twenty-fifth international Conference, held in Geneva in 1986, adopted a resolution - resolution VII - urgently calling on all States to became parties to the Convention.

For those reasons, the ICRC hopes that the 1980 Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapon6 will be widely accepted by the international community. I sincerely urge those States that have not already become parties to use this occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Convention and it% three Protocols to do so.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has concluded the general debate on all disarmament agenda item%.

I shall now call on members who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I wish to remind members, however, that the Committee will follow the procedure set forth previously on this point.

Mr. MALIK (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): In hi% statement the representative of the Zionist entity tried to cloud the issue% and distort facts that are clear enough and known to all State%.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel): Mr. Chairman, I request you to remind the representative of Iraq that it is customary usage in this Organization to call a State by it% name. I represent the Stat8 of Israel. I am proud of being a Zionist but the name of my State is not "Zionist entity" any more than the name of Iraq is "Saddam Hussein's dictatorship*'. I therefore suggest that the representative of Iraq stick to the usage and that, if he want% to make comments about Israel, he use that term.

The CHAIRMAN: I request the representative of Iraq to be guided by the rules of procedure of the United Nations, which require that Member States be called by their proper names, and to continue his statement.

Mr. MALIK (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): No one can impose any term on me or change any expression that I may wish to use.

The representative of the Zionist entity is seeking to cloud the issue and distort fact% that are clear enough and known to all State%. I shall not speak at length at this late hour in replying to the claims of that representative.

(Mr. Malik. Iraq)

He has to prove first the veracity and credibility of what he has said. Is the Zionist entity prepared to declare openly and without any ambiguity that it is prepared to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty and to place its nuclear facilities under safeguards and inspection? Failure to make such a commitment simply means that the claims of that representative are lies.

Iraq, as is well known, is one of the signatories to the non-proliferation Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and has placed its facilities - which are for peaceful purposes only - under the safeguards and inspection of the International Atomic Energy Agency on a regular basis and quite openly.

The policy of aggression of the Zionist entity is known to all. Its occupation of Palestinian land, the Golan and Lebanon and its persecution of the Palestinian people, whose latest manifestation was the Harem Al-Shareef massacre, as well as its armed attacks on Iraq and Tunisia and its co-operation with South Africa, are but examples of its abominable policy.

In pursuance of that policy of aggression it has engaged in a nuclear programme and introduced nuclear weapons into the region, with the assistance of the West, in particular, the United States of America, The Zionist entity now possesses an arsenal of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. Its existence therefore has become a very serious threat to the State8 of the region.

Iraq, through President Saddam Hussein, put forward an initiative in April of this year which called for the declaration of the Middle East as a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction and for the linking of the destruction of nuclear weapons to the destruction of chemical weapons in the region. That initiative stemmed from a sincere desire to rid the region of all weapon8 of mass destruction.

Now, does the Zionist entity agree to that?

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel): I apologise for taking up members' time but I really do not think we can end the general debate with the concoction of falsehoods that has been put before us by the delegation of Iraq, a country which has been accused in six or seven Security Council resolutions of violating the territorial integrity of its neighbour State, Kuwait, annexing that State and trying to obliterate it from the face of the earth, using all the methods of modern warfare. Fortunately for the people of Kuwait, Iraq was able to accomplish that without having to use any part of its qreat arsenal of chemical weapons, with which it has threatened the United States and Israel.

We do not have to quote anybody except the President of Iraq, Saddam Hussein, regarding Iraq's possession of chemical weapons and his threats to other countries - his threat on one occasion to obliterate half of Israel and his threat simply to attack it, on others. That is further proof, if any be needed, of Iraq's violation of the 1925 Geneva Convention. Certainly its use of those weapons in the war with Iran and against his own population, and its intention to use them, are violations of both the letter and the spirit of the Convention.

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

With regard to its violation of the non-proliferation Treaty, there is certainly no connection or correlation between this and whether Israel has signed the non-proliferation Treaty. We are not the only country that has not signed that Treaty. We have explained on a number of occasions in the First Committee and other organs of the United Nations our position on non-proliferation and with regard to the non-proliferation Treaty. But Iraq has signed the non-proliferation Treaty. So how can the representative of Iraq explain the statement of his President on French television on 9 July 1990 that Iraq has no atomic weapons? I am willing to believe that he has no atomic weapons at this stage. "But", he went on to say,

"if one of the Western nations wants to help us to produce nuclear weapons to compensate us for the weapons in Israel's possession" -

of which there is no proof -

"then we see no objection to this."

How does that expressed wish to possess nuclear weapons meet the obligations of Iraq under article 11 of the non-proliferation Treaty?

In the course of the past year, every commentator on the Middle East has commented on Iraq's illegal drive - in the sense of using illegal means - to acquire the components of nuclear weapons, I refer to a few sources only. There is an old one, an article by Mr. J. Snyder in The Middle East Journal, entitled "The Road to Osiraq: Baghdad's Quest for the Bomb"; and there are Leonard Spector, the world's foremost authority on non-proliferation, in "Going Nuclear"; Mid-East Markets; Stern and Der Spiegel, the German magazines; London's The Economist; The Washin These Post;; The New York Times; Time magazine h e r s h a v e all documented Iraq's frantic efforts to acquire the components of a nuclear weapon. Loopholes in the non-proliferation régime and the International Atomic Energy

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

Agency safeguards system, of which the Agency itself is very much aware, have been detailed in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists in a series of issues beginning in December 1988.

So I think it is clear to all of us exactly what Iraq's position is with regard to the non-proliferation Treaty and non-proliferation, the threat and use of force, and, in general, the whole question of disarmament.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.