

FIRST COMMITTEE 25th meeting held on 1 November 1989 at 3 p.m. New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 25th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MASHHADI (Islamic Republic of Iran) (Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

General debate on all disarmament items (continued)

This record is subject to correction Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2 750 2 Unned 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.1/44/PV.25 10 November 1989 ENGLISH In the **absence** of the the Chairman, **Mr.** Mashhadi (Islamic Republic of Iran), Vice-Chairman, took the **Chair**.

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 TO 69 AND 151 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Monsignor TAURAN (Holy See) (interpretation from French): Since this is my delegation's first opportunity to speak in the First Committee at this session, I should like to address to the Chairman our warm congratulations upon his election to the chairmanship of this body. The discussions of the last weeks have shown the commitment an3 competence with which he has guided the Committee's work on matters of particular complexity. Our congratulations also go to the other members of the Bureau.

It is an honour for me to speak today before such a select audience and thus jnin my voice with that of all those who, here and throughout the world, long for the day when weapons will. he silenced and a lasting peace will allow mankind at long last to look to the future with greater confidence.

The Holy See, a completely **inarmed Power** - if it is at all possible to use that term - follows with constant interest the efforts of the international community to achieve the kind of disarmament that at the very least makes possible the transition from a angerous situation of offensive over-armament to a situation of balance Of defensive weapons at the lwest possible level consistent with general security.

That is why the Holy See, which has long followed with attention regional and other initatives on disarmament, cannot hut rejoice every time agreements, which move beyond the always precarious system of deterrence, are reached to reduce and to control the use of weapons of al.1 kinds.

(Monsignor Tauran, Holy See)

Because of its spiritual nature and mission time Holy See cannot enter into the technical aspects of the Committee's deliberations, hut it feels called upon to proclaim, wherever there is a auestion of war and of peace, the moral obligation the human family has for the elimination of the causes that drive individuals and peoples to war: the will to dominate, the fear of hecoming one day or another the nhject of aggression, the threats to vital rights and interests - I am thinking particularly of liberty and independence - that every nation must defend.

The **Committee** will **remember** the message that Pope John Paul II addressed to the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, on 2 June 1988, in which he stated:

"The reduction and elimination of weapons are in fact nothing more than the visible manifestation of another process of deeper disarmament. I mean the disarmament of spirits and hearts." (1./S-15/PV.5, p. 88)

A political system of dialogue strengthened by recourse to different forms Of good offices, of mediation and of other means elaborated hy international law and practice must necessarily he added to the measure designed to increase confidence hetween persons and peoples an3 to the concrete steps taken to reduce the production, stockpiling and deployment of weapons.

Clearly, the United Nations has a paramount role in this field, Arole it plays with universally recognized competence.

Finally, what is imperative, in addition to necessary and indispensable technical measures of disarmament, is the progressive creation $\Im f$ a new climate of trust. For, as the Pope also stated:

"Disarmament is not an end in itself. The and is peace, and security is one of its easen tial elements." ($\Lambda/S-15/PV.5$, p. 83-85)

 $\mathbb{R}/4$

(Monsignor Tauran, Holy See)

That is **thereasonwhy** the Holy See would like to draw the Committee's attention to the urgent need to Promote a genuine education for peace. Our delegation cannot hut share the views expressed hy the Government of Costa Rica in the memorandum attached to its reauest to include in this year's agenda the item entitled "Education and information for disarmament".

In that connection, allow me to auote the words pronounced by Cardinal hgostino Casaroli, Secretary of State, on 19 March of this **year** at Georgetown **University** in Washington, D.C. He said:

(spoke in English)

"The nuclear area should convince humanity that it has reached a point in which it is no longer possible to steer a course hetween peace and war. For war now means self-destruction. Man is therefore almost 'condemned' to peace. It is essential to know how to huild peace. . . . 'It is necessary to combat with decision the causes of war, in order to eliminate the temptation of having recourse to weapons."

(continued in French)

Sincere dialogue, creative solidarity, resolute **struggle** against injustice and protection **of** human rights must replace the instruments of death. What mankind urgently needs is not more strategic knowledge hut an extra measure of conscience and moral strength.

Education for peace will thus no longer appear to he a Utopia, hut arealistic necessity. It will he the appropriate method for remedying the insufficiencies that emerge in matters of disarmament, notwithstanding the agreements and efforts recently achieve?.

The peoples represented here have sufficient spiritual resources to accomplish this service to mankind and to life itself and to bring shout in a short time the realization of the words of the prophet Isaiah, who said:

(Monsignor Tauran, Holy See)

"... they shall heat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall. not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." (The Holy Rihle, Isaiah 2:4)

<u>Mr. HOHENFELLNER</u> (Austria): The First Committee has before it the report of the Disarmament Commission (A/44/42), which is to he discussed under agenda item 66 (a). I should like to make some comments on this report, with regard to the role and the work of the Disarmament Commission.

The Disarmament Commission was set up by the General Assembly in 1952 to deal with disarmament questions under the auspices of the Security Council. After 1952 the United Nations Disarmament Commission met only occasionally, even following its universalization in 1959. Discussions on arms-control issues took place in other forums, such as the Committee on Disarmament or the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

The role of the United Nations disarmament machinery was reconsidered by the General Assembly at its tenth special session, the first special session of tile General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in 1973. One of the results of that special session was the re-establishment of the UnitedNationsDisarmament Commission. The Commission, whose mandate was laid down in paragraph 118 of the Final Document, wassetup as a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly and as the deliberative hody of the United Nations disarmament system, with the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva as the negotiating forum.

In making that distinction the international community took into account the fact that disarmament is an extremely important but also very delicate undertaking that evolves through a rather complicated process. That is why it seemed advisable to have an organ of universal membership based on the consensus rule to undertake i n-depth consideration and assessment of various disarmament questions and to make,

(Mr. Hohenfellner, Austria)

if **possible**, recommendations on items intended **to** provide valuable guidelines and hackground information, **in** particular for the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. The States participating in the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament were well aware of the usefulness of the consensus rule, for it seemed evident that in-depth **deliberations** - the very task of the Disarmament Commission - can be conducted in a more **fruitful** manner if there is no **possibility** of putting controversial issues to a vote. Since the opinion of the whole community of States is to he reflected, voting does not seem adequate, since the points of view of a minority of countries would he neglected.

Between its substantive session of 1979 and that of 1988 the Disarmament Commission concluded consideration of nine agenda items **by** adopting consensus texts. The most recent of those were **finalized** at the substantive session in 1988 and were related to such important issues as guidelines for confidence-building measures and verification in **all** its aspects.

RM/4

n/c. 1/44/PV. 25

(Mr.Hohenfel Iner , Aus tr ia)

My Government regards all those quidelines and recommendations elaborated by the Disarmament Commission as very useful background material for multilateral, as well as regional and bilater al, disarmament endeavours. Furthermore, my Government considers the Disarmament Commission a forum of great importance because it is designed to complement, with i to deliberative functions, the disarmament efforts of other bodies, thus making the overall disarmament process more comprehensive and complete.

Looking at the present report of the Disarmament Commission we cannot hut note that at this year's substan five session li the progress was achieved in the consideration of the various items and that, hence, the Disarmament Commission was not able to conclude even one of the outstanding agenda i terns.

The Austrian delegation noted with particular regret the lack of progress on agenda item5, "Reduction of military budgets", on which consensus really seemed very close. The outcome of the consultations and discussions on the items relating to South Africa's nuclear capability, naval armaments and disarmament, the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, the declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade, and conventional disarmament, was also rather limited and therefore disappointing.

This standstill, as it were, has even been aggravated by the increase in the number of agendaitems over tile year?. At its substantive session in 1989 the Commission had to conside r seven substantive items, three of them dating hack to 1979. As many delegations said, seven agenda items for one session seems too much, given the existing resources of the Secretariat and of the infrastructure, the size of delegations and, in particular, therather limited time allowed for consideration of each topic.

Anumber of delegations have been somewhat disappointed at the lack of progress and therefore have proposed undertaking some changes and alterations in

(Mr. Hohenfellner , Austrin)

the structure of the Commission and its me thod of work in order to increase its efficiency and effectiveness. The Austrian delegation proposed that consideration should be given to the establishment of a small working group, composed of the officers Of the Committee and other interested delegations, to look into the organizational and substantive possibili ties of enhancing the role, the work and the output of the Commission.

My delegation welcomes the fact that two informal meetings convened hy the Chairman of the Commission nave already taken place and have led to a very fruitful and promising exchange of views. Several delega tions or groups of delegations have forwarded a number of proposals with a view to making the Commission's work more effective. I should like to pay a particular tribute to the Chairman, Ambassador Bagheni Nzengeya, for his valuable initiative as well as to the Department for Disarmament Affairs and the Secretary of the Commission, Mr. Lin, for their helpful and dedicated work in compiling and systematizing the various sugges tions. A large number of delegations participating in these informal talks show a keen interest in all the efforts to improve the Commission's functioning and to provide thisforum with highly interestingthoughts and ideas. My delegation is therefore confident that the consultations will lead to tangible results and will makepossible a substantive enhancement of the work of the Disarmament Commission.

Permit me to say a few words on the Austrian position with regard to the Commission and it; work. The Austrian Federal Government regards the Disarmament Commission as a highly valuable part of the United Nations disarmament machinery. As Austria considers the multilater, aspect of disarmament in its interrela tionship with the un iln teral, bilateral and regional aspect.;; to be extremely important, we hold that there is a need for a forum that works on a consensus basis with the task of making in-depth deliberations on disarmament issues with universal participation. The global disarmament process would be BHS/td

h/f. 1/44/PV.25

(Mr.Hohenfellner, Austria)

incomplete without the Commission. As questions of arms limitation and international security affect all countries, there has to be a forum where the concerns and desires of allStates can be discussed. Fur thermore, disarmament is a voluminous task in which concrete step, have to be prepared and accompanied by measures of a more theoretical nature. These can help to create and maintain a political and conceptual climate conducive to more openness and confidence and, hence, the increased security on lower levels of weaponry. In our understanding, the Commission provides an adequate forum for both tanks.

Because we believe in the Commission and its important role, we see an urgent need for strengthening it; functioning and increasing its efficiency. The Commission's output is, theoretically speaking, of course a function of three conditions: first, the international political will; secondly, the mandate established in the Pinsi Document of the first special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament; and thirdly, the organization and method of work. The first two factors are beyond our direct sphere of influence. Thus, we have to concentrate on the third factor. Were we not to do so we would deprive ourselves of the very possibilities we have to influence the results of the Commission's session and we would also deprive ourselves of the chance we have to achieve a positive change.

The informal discussions and deliberations are now more or less crystallixin.7 on the following points. First of all, it, does not seem advisable to attempt to remove certain items from the agenda completely. As many delegations have said, the topics to be discussed in the Commission are too important to be eliminated, even when there is a lack of progress in the process of deliberation. On the other hand, as T said earlier, the time and resources allocated to the substantive session do not allow for fruitful work on all the agenda items. For that reason it seems necessary to concentrate, at each session, on alimited number of issues.

(Mr. Hohenfellner, Austria)

That means that at its annual session the Commission could concentrate on A limited number of topics and, thus, enqage in more intensive in-depth deliberation. This, of course, would not necessarily inhibit the possibility of commenting, in the general debate, on issues that are not on the working agenda of the session in question.

Secondly, the number of working groups should he reduced for the same reasons and to the same effect. Roth measures would provide for making hetter use of the Secretariat's infrastructure – including staffing – and better use of time. Furthermore, this would be of advantage in particular for small delegations, which now encounter a certain problem in covering meetings that take place at the same time.

Thirdly, the Commission is a body for deliberative body discussions which should - but need not in all circumstances - result in the adoption of specific recommendations. The proposal was made that, if no progress was achieved in considering a specific item for a certain period of time, the Chairman could make a "Chairman's report" reflecting accurately and specifically the divergent opinions on this subject. To our mind, this also would he a positive element in the process of deliberation. After the Chairman's report, consideration of the item could be suspended for a certain time. Consultations each year could clarify the advisability of the possible resumption of the item.

Fourthly, we are in favour of a rotation of the chairmen of the working groups after a certain period. This could bring about a new and fresh approach to the work on the various topics and could help to overcome certain deadlocks.

Fif thly, the general debate in the working groups could be abolished since there is a general debate in plenary where delegations can make comments on any issue they wish.

A/C.1/44/PV.25 15

(Mr. Hohenfellner, Austria)

Sixthly, the Bureau should meet more often in order to evaluate the stage and progress of discussion and, if necessary, to look into the possibilities for improvement.

(Mr. Hohenfellner, Austria)

These thoughts and idea:; are, to a certain extent, already being deliberated in the said informal talks, **The climate** in those meetings is a very positive one; we are therefore confident that they will lead to some concrete steps towards an enhancement of the Commission's functioning.

For Austria, these endeavours are very important. That is why the Austrian delegation will participate and co-operate in an active, interested and flexible manner.

<u>Mr. KATSIGAZI</u> (Uganda): Allow me to start hy expressing my delegation's congratulations to the Chairman on his election to the chairmanship of this very important Committee. His vast experience will lead our deliherations to a successful conclusion. Allow me also to congratulate the members of the Burean. I would Like to take this opportunity to record our appreciation of the commendable work done by Ambassador Roche of Canada, who chaired this Committee during the 43rd session to the satisfaction of everyone.

We are meeting at a time of exciting moments in history. We are not seeing the end of history, as some scholar has suggested: we are seeing the seeds of the history of a new world, and are participating in Laying the foundation of that world. If we lay the foundation bricks with care, compassion and foresightedness, we will have created a development-oriented world that will ensure security for humanity.

The two major Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, seem to have at long Last realized that their past preoccupation with cold war, with reckless rivalry for spheres of influence, has become a real, threat to humanity. I would like to think that what we are seeing is the unravelling, the dramatic solution, of the very complicated plot of the post-war story. This welcome change has been described by a Foreign Minister of one of the super-Powers as a rejection of the

(Mr. Katsigaz i, Uganda)

traditional polarization. However, he has warned that it cannot resolve the existing contradictions overnight, although, as a start, it can alleviate them.

Uganda has cautioned against the danger of rushing to a hasty conclusion that peace has at long last come, Thorn was euphoria following the signing of the INF Treaty. We have heard and have read that certain categories of weapon! specified under the Treaty have been destroyed, hut we still hear of some Staten' modernizing their military capabilities. How, then, can we he sure that, during this apparent improvement in the relations between the two major Powers, advanced military and scientific technology hae not been used to produce weapons which are more sophisticated, more accurate and more destructive? It is the view of my delegation that we still have along way to go. What is the use of signing a Treaty purporting to destroy weapons when at the same time you secretly improve military capabilities to, as it were, compensate Por the weapons you have eliminated Under that Treaty? The Treaty then becomes a meaningless piece of paper. It registers no achievement. The arms race continues and its virus spreads, attacking the defence mechanism of peace and security and weakening the structures and system of development. According to World Military and Social Expenditures by Ruth Léger Sivard, in 1984 the industrialized countries spent 5.6 per cent of their gross national product on defence. The developing countries also spent 5.6 per cent of their gross mational product on defence, but much of that 5.6 per sent spent by developing countries went to those who produce and export armaments.

Because this colossal sum of noney gets spent on defence, as a result of the impact of the arms race, we still live in a world where it is estimated that 40,000 children die of malnutrition and disease every day. But it is not serious diseases that kill these children: they die of simple and immunizable diseases which could easily be eradicated if there were enough resources. What do you

(Mr. Katsigazi, Uganda)

expect in this world, when the amount disbursed as official development assistance is less than 20 per cent of that spent on armaments?

A major issue in the disarmament process is the nuclear test ban. Yet for over 30 years, this item, considered by the majority of Member States as crucial if nuclear weapons are to be eliminated, has remained a mirage on the disarmament agenda. Some nuclear-weapon States have obstructed progress towards a nuclear test ban by inflexibly sticking to antiquated doctrines such as nuclear deterrance. These are doctrines based on terror, and they are of no value to humanity.

Uganda believes that we should take advantage of the relaxation in relations between the super-Powers to reach an agreement banning, once and for all, the testing of nuclear weapons. Our support for the initiative to convert the partial test-ban Treaty into a comprehensive test-ban treaty was expressed by my Second Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign and Regional Affairs, when, in his address to the General Assembly on 9 October, he said:

"There is an urgent necessity to conclude a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The process that has already begun towards the convening of a conference to amend the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963 should be used to achieve a comprehensive nuclear-weapon-test ban". (<u>A/44/PV.24, p. 29</u>) We await the response of the nuclear-weapon States. Those who are committed to total and comprehensive disarmament should put up their hands and be counted.

Next year there will be a Review Conference on the non-proliferation Treaty, to which Uqanda is a State party. The Treaty is due for renewal in 1995. Article VI of that Treaty imposes obligations on nuclear-weapon States to negotiate in good faith towards nuclear disarmament. The future of the Treaty therefore will be determined by the success or failure of the nuclear-weapon States in fulfilling what was expected of them in article VI.

(Mr.Katsigazi, Uganda)

My delegation is hearkened by developments in neqotia tions on chemical weapons. A consensus seems to be in sight on the question of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons. Uganda was one of the more than 145 countries that participated in a meeting on chemical weapons held in Paris in January this year. The Paris declaration atrongly repudia ted chemical weapons.

In Septemhec this year, another meeting of Government and chemical industry representatives was held in Canherra, Australia. These meetings, in the view of my delegation, constitute a clear expression of the will of the peoples of the world – and lately of industries – to do away with chemical weapons. The outcome of the two meetings ahould give a new impetus to the work of the Conference on Disarmament and hasten the conclusion of the convention placing a total ban on chemical weapons.

(Mr.Kataigazi, Uganda)

We should like the convention to he wa ter tight and non-discriminatory. It should not, however, he use? to frustrate the legitimate need of developing countries to acquire the scientific and technological capability to develop appropriate pharmaceutical indus tries. We cannot afford to lose 40,000 children every day simple because we do not have the necessary vaccines.

Uganda consider8 it essential that we tackle arms-race control and disarmament on several fronts. The creation of nuclear-free zones and zones of peace is an integral part of the disarmament process. It stems horizontal and geographical proliferation of weapons capable of mass destruction. My delegationia disappointed that, apartfrom the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in La tin America - the Treaty of Tlatelolco - and the South Pacific countries' Treaty of Rarotonga, no progress has been made, Uganda will remain steadfast in its aupport for initiatives on the creation of such zones in and outside Africa.

Uganda supports efforts aimed at transforming the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. We are, however, aware of the problems that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean has faced for about 18 years through certain States creating obstacles that make it impossible for the Committee to discharge its mandate to prepare for the Conference on the Indian Ocean, which was or iginally scheduled to take place in Colombo in 1981. At its summer session this year the Ad Hoc Committee was informed hy its Chairman that, after consultations with the Government of Sri Lanka, dates had been fixed and the Conference would take place in July 1990 - this despite moves by opponents of the Conference to wind up the Committee. We should now he aware of yet other attempt:; to use the Committee on Conferences and the utilization factor to kill the Ad Hoc Committee. At its ninth summit meeting, held in Belqtade, the Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries supported the convening of the Conference in July 1990, and we expect no further delays.

(Mr. Katsigazi, Uganda)

I turn now to the question of dumping, which has been cm the agenda of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) since last year. The OAU Council of Ministers hae vigorously condemned dumping of toxic nuclear waste in the African continent. Africa has its own prohlsmsr drought, deforestation, creeping desert, hunger, disease, illiteracy, stagnant economies and debt crises, to name hutafew. These problems are themselves fertile ground for violence and insecurity. Their exacerbation by the dumping of toxic nuclear waste from industrialized countries, for whatever motives, must he resisted most energetically, My delegation's position is that those that produce toxic nuclear waste should get rid of it in their own territories and not dump it in other people's hack yards.

In 1964 the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity insued the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. Africa was therefore the first continent to expressitalegitimate desire to be a nuclear-free zone. The General Aaemhly endorsed the Declaration in 1965. However, to date that political Declara tion has not been translated into action or given a legal character and authority through the conclusion of a treaty or convention. We therefore request the *Secretary-General to provide 011 the assistance that the OAU and the African Regional Centtt far Peace and Development may seek regarding the modalities for and elements of the preparation and implementation of a treaty or convention On the denuclearization of Africa.

Racist South Africa continues to build up its nuclear-weapon capability and strengthenits already advanced military structure in collaboration with some Member Staten, contrary to numerous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

(Mr. Katsigazi, Uganda)

Despite the requests of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and of the international oommunity, the a<u>partheid</u> rdqimr has persistently violated in terna tional law as well as the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, upon which the IAEA's activities are based, in accordance with Articles III B 1 and IV Bofits statute. The rdqimr has refused to permit the IAEA to inspect its nuclear installations.

It will he recalled that following the 1979 nuclear explosion by South Africa and the report prepared hy a group of experts in 1981, which stated that there was no doubt that South Africa had the technical capability to make nuclear weapons and the necessary means of delivery, South Africa has continued to get scientific and technical assistance from its supporters. Thus the régime wan able to boastlast year that it had the capacity to produce nuclear weapons if it wanted to do ao. We should now also consider the Blowpipe affair early this year and the latest reports that Israel has helped the racist rdgime to develop a medium-range missile. It is reported also that South Africa has hetween 10 and 20 nuclear weapons and is exporting enriched uranium to Taiwan. These reported activities of the racist régime constitute aserious threat to international Peace and security and meri t investigation by the UnitedNations.

We should also note and condemn the régime's destabilization policy, which has hindered development in Africa, especially in the front-line States. It is estimated in the report of the Inter-Agency Task Force commissioned by the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa that as a result of South Africa's aggression the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference States have lost over \$60 billion and 1.5 million lives in the past nine years. There has been an annual reduction of 2 to 3 per sent in the gross domestic product of those Staten because of high defence spending.

(Mr.Katsigazi, Uganda)

Uganda appeals to the interns tional community to put maximum pressure on South Africa not only to dismantle <u>apartheid</u> hut also to abolish its destabilization policy.

<u>Mr.TUN</u> (Myanmar): I am delivering this statement on behalf of Ambassador Kyaw Min, al ternate Chairman of the Myanmar delegation. Much as he would have liked to he here this afternoon, he regrets his inability to do so as pressing husiness in another important meeting requires his presence there.

My delegation takes pleasure in congratulating Ambassador Taylhardat of Venezuela on his election to the chairmanship of the First Conmittee and on the ahle manner in which he has been leading our deliberations since the beginning of our work.

We should also like to associate ourselves with previous speakers in expressing deep appreciation to Amhassador Douglas Roche of Canada for the most competent way in which he guided our work last year, It would he remiss of me not to take this opportunity to pay a well-deserved tribute to Under-Secretary-General Mr. YasushiAkashi and his small team of dedicated officials for performing an excellent joh under stringent financial and manpower constraints.

(Mr. Tun, Myanmar)

We are meeting at a time of unprecedented change in the international political climate. The single most important factor contributing to this transformation is the qualitative improvement in super-power relations, as well as in the relations between the world's two most powerful military alliances. This emerging trend has gone beyond a mere relaxation of tensions and has brought the world to the threshold of a new era of active co-operation and partnership in the search for workable solutions to long-standing international questions, particularly those bearing on international peace and security. What is most heartening is that the indications are that the phenomenon we are witnessing today is based on more solid and enduring foundations than were the short-lived periods of détente and the false dawns of the past. As speaker after speaker at plenary meetings and in the First Committee have emphasized, the transformations now taking place offer an opportunity, such as we have never had before, to fashion a more secure and peaceful world. Nations, large and small, must seize this opportunity by coming to grips with the multiplicity of Problems that have long afflicted the world, Particularly those in the field of arms control and disarmament, with a view to achieving lasting solutions to them.

Each and every disarmament question that has so far defied solution needs to he tackled urgently so as to ensure that disarmament and detente, which interact, will become a self-cenerating process. We must seek measures to prevent armament, measures to limit armament and measures of disarmament at the global, regional **and** subregional levels. These **measures** must encompass the whole disarmament spectrum, **ranging** from nuclear and other mass-destruction weapons to conventional arms.

There is universal recognition of the fact that nuclear weapons pose the greatest **danger** to the survival of mankind and that their limitation, reduction and ultimate elimination must remain **at** the top of the disarmament agenda.

AE/ras

(Mr. Tun, Myanmar)

Having remained frozen for decades, during which the world helplessly watched an ever-spiralling race in the accumulation of these dreadful weapons, the process of nuclear disarmament has at last begun. I am referring to the conclusion of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the INF Treaty - which, when fully implemented, will rid the world of an entire class of nuclear weapons, This agreement and the good faith in which it is heing implemented by the parties have given added momentum to the resumed negotiations to secure a cut of 50 per cent in the strategic nuclear forces of the two super-Powers, We are encouraged to hear that good progress is being made in that regard. I should like to take this opportunity to commend the two major Powers for their foresight and their spirit of compromise, which have made these developments possible. we hope that condi t ions will soon be created to enable the negotiations to be broadened to cover nuclear weapons of lower yield, including "mini nukes" and "baby nukes". we hope also that, as progressive cuts are made in the nuclear arsenals of the two super-Powers, the **remaining** nuclear-weapon States will associate themselves with the process of halting and reversing the nuclear-arms race.

Now that a real heqinning has been made in the direction of nuclear disarmament, the need for the achievement of a universal and comprehensive test ban becomes all the more urgent. Such a step, we believe, would underpin the **gains** that have already been made in the Quantitative control of nuclear arms. Moreover, by serving as an effective har to the further sophistication of existing nuclear weapons and to the development of new and deadlier types of such weapons, it would facilitate the achievement of further tangible progress towards halting and reversing the nuclear-arms race.

(Mr. Tun, Myanmar)

In our view, the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests in the three environments covered by the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty has now become part of international common law. We therefore consider that the best way of achieving a universal comprehensive test ban would be to complement that Treaty with a separate treaty banning all underground nuclear-weapon tests. Nevertheless, in deference to the wishes of the vast majority of United Nations Member States, we voted for General Assembly resolution 43/63 B concerning the convening of an amendment conference to convert the existing Treaty into a comprehensive test-ban treaty. However, we feel constrained to state that the proposed conference must confine itself strictly to the job of extending the provisions of the Treaty to include underground nuclear tests and must in no way entertain any attempt to modify its scope as defined in article I.

Chemical weapons represent another class of mass-destruction weapons whose total and comprehensive banning cannot, and must not, be delayed any further. Representing a country that is unequivocally committed to the achievement of such a ban - a country that neither possesses such weapons nor has the means of producing them Or the intention of acquiring them - my delegation takes heart from the fact that, thanks to the convergence of the positions of States, this objective is now within reach. This became clearly evident at the Paris Conference of States parties to the 1925 Geneva Protocol, held in January this year, and at the Government-industry Conference against chemical weapons, held in Canherra. Here I should like to mention, as an aside, that the Union of Myanmar participated in these two Conferences as an earnest of its commitment to work for a world totally free of these weapons. We commend the Governments of France and of Australia for their far-sighted initiative in calling the meetings.

A/C.1/44/PV.25 29-30

(Mr. Tun, Myanmar)

The **convergence** of views to which I alluded earlier was carried a step further at the bilateral meeting in Wyoming and by the very constructive statements made in the General Assembly by President Bush and by Foreign Minister Shevardnsdze. In **these circumstances** we consider that the General Assembly, at this session, should give the Conference on Disarmament the necessary mandate to get down in **earnest** to the business of elahorating, on a priority basis, the draft text of a convention, without any loopholes, on the complete and effective prohibition of **chemical** weapons.

We note that the work of the <u>Ad Hoc</u> Committee, un **er** the able and **skilful** leadership of Ambassador Morel of France, has already ade considerable headway. We believe that - given the political will - any outstanding issues can be resolved.

While weapons of mass destruction, particularly those using uncontrolled nuclear and thermo-nuclear reaction for their destructive power, are the ones whose use would bring about the extinction of the human race, it is Conventional armaments that pose an everyday danger to the security of States in various p rts of the world. Our preoccupation with mass-destruction weapons must not, therefore, distract us from the search for meaningful limitation measures in the field of conventional arms.

(Mr. Tun, Myanmar)

The danger of such arms has been fully realized by the States of Europe, the scene of what is by far the largest concentration of such armaments in the world. Much to their credit, members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Warsaw Treaty organization are now undertaking serious efforts to strengthen stahility and security in Europe through the establishment of stable and secure balance of their conventional forces at significantly lower levels. Here I should like in particular to command those States that have made unilateral cuts in their conventional forces even before the conclusion of the talks on conventional forces in Europe (CFE). We also note with appreciation that China, a permanent member of the Security Council not involved in the CFE process, has on its own initiative unilaterally taken some concrete steps on disarmament. It is our earnest hope and expectation that those multilateral efforts and unilateral initiatives will he emulated by States in other regions of the world where the need to reduce massive conventional armouries is no less acute. I should like to add that in any given region or subregion States in a militarily preponderant position beat a special responsibility to promote peace and stability.

It goes without saying that the pursuit of conventional-arms limitation at the global, regional and subregional levels must necessarily include naval forces. The massive naval build-up programmes - far beyond legitimate needs of self-defence - that are being relentlessly pursued are causing growing concern and exerting a destahilizing effect in various regions. We therefore consider that this matter must he addressed urgently.

My delegation has today highlighted a few issues which in our opinion deserve to be addressed on a priority basis. Many other challenging **questions** of disarmament of course remain on our agenda, and we hope to elaborate our views on them when the need arises.

A/C.1/44/PV.25 32

(Mr. Tun, Myanmar)

At this propitious time in international relations, my delegation believes that we must seek to turn the first faltering steps of recent years into hold and purposeful strides, in order that succeeding generations may live in a het ter world, free from the threat of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its general debate on all disarmamentitems.

Tomor row the Committee will embar k on the second phase of its woe k, consideration of and action an all draft resolutions under disarmament agendaitems.

The meeting rode at 4. 25 p.m.