

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
THIRTY-THIRD SESSION
*Official Records**



FIRST COMMITTEE
12th meeting
held on
Monday, 23 October 1978
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 12TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PASTINEN (Finland)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 125: REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS
ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION: REPORT OF THE
SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3558.

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

Distr. GENERAL

A/C.1/33/PV.12
24 October 1978

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 125 (continued)

REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/33/279, A/33/305, A/33/312, A/33/317; A/C.1/33/L.1-4)

Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (interpretation from French): First I must thank the delegation of Burundi most sincerely for its courtesy in yielding its place on the list of speakers to me in view of this afternoon's meeting of the Security Council and my obligation as President of the Council for this month.

The French delegation has listened with great attention to the statements that have been made since the beginning of this debate, which covered nearly all the questions connected with disarmament. In those statements we heard again the concern and the hopes that were voiced during the special session. We noted with great interest the constructive proposals made, which in due course we shall support. We noted that a number of delegations were good enough to welcome our own suggestions and we thank them for that support. We should like, in turn, to make some comments on the prospects opened up by the tenth special session.

There are very few fields in which the gap between the aspirations of peoples and the reality with which they are confronted is wider than in the field of disarmament. The absurdity of this situation, accompanied as it is by the growing impatience of all, but particularly of those countries that have the most limited resources, explains why more and more voices are raised more and more insistently in support of concrete action which could at least reverse the trend of the arms race.

(Mr. Leprette, France)

The course of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will have brought out clearly this determination on the part of Member States to implement all measures likely to further disarmament negotiations. After a very thorough debate, principles were defined, a programme established and negotiating machinery reviewed and reformed, all by unanimous agreement among Members of the United Nations.

Doubtless, divergent opinions were voiced on various ways of achieving the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. It could not have been otherwise in so complex a field as this, which touches the security of States and their very survival. However, this did not hinder our reaching positive results, particularly in so far as the debate was placed in its proper perspective - that of an undertaking affecting the interests of all members of the international community.

France is gratified, in this regard, at the effort made in order better to adapt the disarmament negotiating machinery to its tasks. True, political will is a prerequisite for any progress in disarmament, but the unprecedented speeding up of the arms race should be accompanied by an improvement in the procedures used to put an end to it.

The strengthening of the United Nations role in the disarmament process, one of the main elements of the reform that took place, should, I think, help to maintain the momentum provided by the tenth special session. From now on, the First Committee will deal only with matters linked to disarmament and security; the new Disarmament Commission has been given a broad mandate, different from that of the Committee on Disarmament which is a negotiating body, and from that of the First Committee. We must therefore make the best possible use of the possibilities provided us in this new forum. Interesting suggestions have been made in this connexion, and the Commission itself has submitted recommendations. The French delegation is receptive on this point, and we feel, as others have proposed, that the Commission could selectively take up the examination of some important items according to the priorities of the moment.

(Mr. Leprette, France)

The creation of an advisory board to advise the Secretary-General, particularly on the study programmes to be undertaken under United Nations auspices, is timely, considering the quantity of studies that progress in disarmament negotiations is bound to give rise to.

Even more significant is the establishment of a new negotiating organ, the Committee on Disarmament, larger than its predecessor and more balanced in its composition, more closely linked to the United Nations and limited in membership for the sake of efficiency, but open to participation by all States through the rotation of its composition and, finally, as far as its functioning is concerned, characterized by the complete equality of all its members.

Like many other States, we consider it desirable that the work of that Committee be so organized that non-members can, if they so desire, contribute to it. The French Government has announced that it will occupy its seat in that Committee and has stated its intention of taking an active part in its work.

The decision has been taken to hold a second special session on disarmament, which may be followed by others. These sessions will provide an opportunity to assess the results achieved and to renew, if need be, the impetus created by the first session. We believe that a four- or five-year period between sessions would be adequate, in view of the scope of the task of carrying out present or future negotiations. It will depend on our persistence whether, at the next session, the results of the negotiations prove really positive, in nuclear as in conventional disarmament, but we believe that similar efforts should be carried out on all fronts.

(Mr. Leprette, France)

As far as nuclear weapons are concerned, the very stockpiles of which are more than sufficient to destroy all life on earth, as the General Assembly stressed last June, two basic elements characterize the present situation: on the one hand, the possession by the two greatest Powers of arsenals unparalleled by any of the military means possessed by other States, and capable of destroying several times over the other's territory; and, on the other hand, the will expressed by the Members of the international community to avoid the proliferation of nuclear weapons, without prejudice to the right of non-nuclear-weapon States to benefit from the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

France follows with close attention the efforts of the United States and the Soviet Union to limit their strategic weapons. We hope that the two parties will come to a mutually satisfactory understanding that will be a step forward from previous agreements. We hope also that that stage will be followed by others which will open the door to significant quantitative reductions and will put a brake on, and possibly end, their technological competition, the effects of which are particularly disturbing.

We must note, in this connexion, that the cessation of nuclear testing by those two Powers, highly desirable though it is as an indication of their goodwill and of their intention to put an end, in the long run, to the qualitative arms race, is insufficient by itself, in the short term, to block that qualitative development, in view of the data gathered from the many series of tests that have just taken place. Such a state of affairs must be borne in mind when the over-all problem of the total prohibition of nuclear testing is considered. Indeed, if an effective halt is not put to the improvement of the most powerful arsenals, it will be difficult for others to agree unilaterally to not maintain a minimum technological level with regard, to their own nuclear deterrent forces.

(Mr. Leprette, France)

Expressing the desire of the entire international community to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the General Assembly noted that:

"The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of ... arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the zone concerned ... constitutes an important disarmament measure."

(General Assembly resolution S-10/2, para. 33)

The Treaty of Tlatelolco, of which France has ratified Protocol II and is studying the conditions for adherence to Protocol I, has in fact blazed the trail in that direction. The Government of France is ready to encourage other initiatives of a similar nature. On the other hand, as a counterpart to the obligations that the countries belonging to the zones have imposed upon themselves, we are ready to conclude with them, through organs which they may set up and after negotiations with the latter, conventions or agreements providing for safeguards. Such conventions, with the growth in the number of denuclearized zones, might well concern the majority of the States represented in this Assembly.

Suggestions have been made to promote the conclusion of conventions providing for the granting of guarantees to all non-nuclear States without linking these to the geographical, political or strategic context of those States. The aspiration to a life free from violence, particularly the violence of nuclear weaponry, is a legitimate one and it is shared by all. It was to meet that legitimate aspiration that commitments not to resort to force were subscribed to, particularly in the United Nations Charter. It was also to meet that desire that very patient efforts, in which France is actively participating, are being carried out in Europe to promote détente and co-operation at the bilateral and the multilateral level. In Europe, where all the causes of tension have not yet disappeared, and where enormous quantities of nuclear and conventional weapons are stockpiled, it is vital that we avoid not only a nuclear conflict but any type of conflict there.

(Mr. Leprette, France)

The proposals presented to us have wide-ranging implications. For our part we wonder whether a treaty guaranteeing the non-use of atomic weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States of that region would in fact represent a strengthening of security or rather be a threat to the political and military balance at present existing. It is the will for peace and détente, based on a relationship of forces that is as balanced as possible, that we believe today offers the best guarantee of security whilst we await the results of the real disarmament that must urgently be undertaken.

While nuclear disarmament is a primary task, none of the efforts made in that field can be used as a pretext for delaying the search for agreement on the reduction of conventional armaments, for the following reasons. Conventional weapons have been developed to such a large extent and their offensive capacity has been refined to such a point of sophistication that they have become a seriously disturbing factor. Furthermore, it is the accumulation of conventional weapons that devours the major part of the human and economic resources devoted at present to the arms race. The General Assembly during its tenth special session outlined the general principles that should serve as guidelines for negotiations on conventional disarmament, stressing the need to guarantee balance and the security of one and all. It is within the regional framework that this balance and the levels of security appropriate to the States can most effectively be envisaged.

France, as a European country, feels that all States with forces in Europe should enter into negotiations to limit and to reduce the conventional weapons stationed in Europe, in order to strengthen any action undertaken in other regards to widen détente and ensure co-operation. As my Government announced in January last, France officially transmitted to all European countries that participated in the Conference on Co-operation and Security in Europe, last May, a proposal for the convening of a conference on disarmament in Europe. We were gratified at the favourable reception accorded our initiative and at present we are carrying out consultations with the countries concerned in that regard.

(Mr. Leprette, France)

With regard to the problem of the limitation of conventional weapons in other parts of the world, including that of the transfer of conventional weapons referred to in paragraph 22 of the Final Document of the special session, France accords that question its full importance, and we have declared ourselves ready in due course to undertake any action likely to provide a satisfactory response to the countries that are particularly concerned in this matter. Let me take this opportunity to say how gratified we are at the efforts made along those lines by a certain number of countries in Latin America.

The adoption at the appropriate regional level of measures to increase confidence, similar to those adopted in 1975 by the signatories to the Final Act of Helsinki, seems to us to be the sort of action that might not only improve the political climate among partners but also facilitate later agreements on disarmament. It is for that reason that France supports the ideas that were presented on this matter by the Federal Republic of Germany.

The General Assembly took a very timely step when it stressed the need to prohibit weapons of mass destruction, such as chemical, biological and radiological weapons. France has prohibited the manufacture of biological weapons and hopes that negotiations will allow decisive progress to be made in the other fields. In this matter we should like to stress the importance of providing for systems of effective verification. We have noted with interest various proposals that were presented during the tenth special session to improve research into ways and means of controlling chemical installations.

The fundamental nature of the problem of control was also recognized by the General Assembly. I do not believe it is an exaggeration to state that it has to a large extent been responsible for the stalemate in the negotiations in the past and that today it represents a potent obstacle to the concluding of disarmament agreements. Therefore the appearance of

(Mr. Leprette, France)

new technical means of verification would be extremely helpful, so long as they are not beset by the problems that have so far stood in the way of agreement by certain States to the classic methods of control. We know that this implies in effect the need for vast numbers of personnel on the territory or in the military and civilian installations of other States. However, the new methods of reconnaissance by artificial earth satellite are open to us. At present these are not used for security purposes except by two countries that possess advanced techniques.

(Mr. Leprette, France)

In the future others may possess this same technique. Why should we not try to ensure that other countries interested in the advantages offered by these new methods be shared by them?

France feels that remote sensing satellites can make a major contribution to the progress of disarmament and the maintenance of security. It is for this reason that France suggested the establishment of an international agency for control satellites, which, according to specific rules to be decided upon, whilst respecting the sovereignty of States, would be capable of collecting information concerning the verification of compliance with disarmament agreements and the strengthening of trust and security. The French delegation will in due course submit a draft resolution on this matter, which was circulated during the course of the tenth special session in the form of a memorandum.

To make every effort to achieve disarmament implies also the speeding up of research on the different aspects on the problems linked to security. It is increasingly necessary to possess objective data to know precisely the possible implications of steps taken from a military, social and economic standpoint in a field where phenomena become increasingly complex.

The United Nations Disarmament Centre has carried out, and continues to carry out, extremely enlightening studies, which are very useful for the development of the negotiations under way. France has felt that within the framework of the United Nations there was room for a body, enjoying scientific autonomy, that might work with a longer range view on conceptual or applied items. Therefore, we will take up again here the proposal for the creation of an international institute on research for disarmament, which we submitted last June.

Furthermore, the implementation of the programme for disarmament fellowships, as decided by the tenth special session, will allow us to increase the number of qualified experts on the subject, particularly from the developing countries, and to a large extent will complete and round-out the research work done in the United Nations.

(Mr. Leprette, France)

But disarmament does not aim only at the establishment of a more secure and confident world. It must also allow us to devote to economic and social development, with particular attention to the needs of the poorer States, as much as possible of the vast resources being poured into the accumulation of armaments.

The many ideas and proposals regarding this aspect of disarmament, proves conclusively the interest taken in it by the international community which, in turn, was confirmed by the tenth special session.

It is only appropriate to note that the practical difficulties of implementing this simple idea are an open secret. Imagination has been shown in seeking concrete ways of putting an end to the scandalous fact that at present, expenditures on armaments are 14 times larger than the assistance given for development in all fields.

Aware of the solidarity that must be shown between the wealthy and the poor countries, particularly through the process of disarmament, France has proposed the creation of a disarmament fund for development. Contributions to this fund would come from the savings effected by disarmament, and the fund would receive voluntary contributions from the wealthier and most militarily strong nations which could thus provide evidence of their will to act. A draft resolution will outline the conditions in which the French delegation suggests dealing with the link that exists between disarmament and development.

The French delegation, during the tenth special session, gave the basis on which we felt negotiations on disarmament should rest, namely, respect for the right to security of States, the adoption of a realistic and progressive approach to the matter taking into account at all stages the most unsettling aspect of the armament race, and the guarantee that no State will be excluded from the great debate on disarmament.

(Mr. Leprette, France)

But we must not lose sight of the fact that disarmament cannot be isolated from the other aspects of international life. On this matter, and in conclusion, I should like to quote the words of the President of the French Republic, Mr. Giscard d'Estaing, speaking from the rostrum of the General Assembly during the tenth special session:

"Progress cannot be made towards disarmament unless further progress is also made towards improving international relations. It is not only when we discuss disarmament that we make progress but also each time we mitigate any international tension." (A/S-10/PV.3, p. 11)

Lord GORONWY-ROBERTS (United Kingdom): It is always a privilege to address Member States of the United Nations at the General Assembly. It gives me particular pleasure to do so on the eve of United Nations Day, which is widely celebrated in my country. It is a day on which we can reflect on the achievement of the Organization, renew our commitment to its ideals and principles and resolve to strengthen its capacity as a force for peace and justice in the world. The theme of celebrations of United Nations Day in the United Kingdom this year is "The United Nations - Working for a Safer World". It is a theme which was underlined at the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which many of us here attended last summer. It is a theme which could be the working motto for this Committee as we consider that most crucial issue for the safety of the world - disarmament.

I am also especially glad to be speaking on the day before the first disarmament week to take place in accordance with the decisions of the recent special session. The week is to be devoted to fostering the objectives of disarmament, which is exactly the purpose of the work of this Committee and the participation in it of the United Kingdom.

(Lord Goronwy-Roberts,
United Kingdom)

The main questions I intend to consider today are three. What did the special session on disarmament achieve? How should we follow up the decisions taken there? And how can we pursue the other ideas and proposals which were raised at the session?

From the outset my Government regarded the special session as a very important event which potentially was able to give a new impetus to progress in disarmament. There can be no doubt of the success of the session in promoting awareness of the imperative need for disarmament. The involvement of independent non-governmental organizations in the debate, which my Government consistently advocated, was valuable in stimulating public interest. There was an opportunity to hear different analyses of the problems and different approaches to their solution, so that we can all now understand better the views of States with security preoccupations different from our own. It was in our judgement helpful to international confidence and security that Britain and other nuclear-weapon States gave the non-nuclear Powers assurances about their security from nuclear attack.

Another achievement was that for the first time the world Organization adopted a comprehensive statement about disarmament; and did so by consensus, with no State dissenting. My Government was also glad that two nuclear weapon States which previously had not been active in multilateral discussion of disarmament took their proper place in the debate and put forward their ideas. The reform of the negotiating Committee in Geneva to make it more representative was a most welcome and tangible outcome of the special session. My Government is also pleased that this First Committee of the General Assembly has been relieved of its other responsibilities so that it can concentrate on disarmament and related international security questions. We shall also play our part in the United Nations Disarmament Commission, which has been revived as the main deliberative body of the entire United Nations membership.

However, the true test will be whether the special session gives more impetus to the process of disarmament, and whether the new machinery assists this process. Here I must confess to disappoint at the outcome of the special session in one major respect. The Final Document is not altogether balanced

(Lord Goronwy-Roberts, United Kingdom)

and it is insufficiently specific. It is not the clear, practical programme which my Government advocated. No improvements in machinery can be of value unless Governments have the necessary political will to reach agreements on practical measures of arms control and disarmament.

We must show that we have that will. There is clearly a great deal to be done in the next few years to follow up the decisions taken at the special session. Action is needed on important subjects discussed in the Final Document, like nuclear disarmament and the abolition of chemical weapons. But we should not neglect some of the important items which were given only a passing reference in the Final Document. One of the most crucial issues facing mankind - preventing the further spread of nuclear weapons - was recognized but not seriously tackled. The passage in the Final Document on the reduction of military budgets was only in general terms and did not call for the testing of the instrument for measuring budgets so that actual reductions could be planned. The brief and rather qualified reference to consultations on limiting transfers of conventional weapons did not go far enough. The proposals for confidence building measures on a world-wide scale were not endorsed. My Government wishes to see action in all these areas.

I will now turn to what I consider to be the most important subjects to be tackled following the special session and give my Government's view in greater detail. As the Final Document stressed, nuclear weapons clearly have a high priority in the disarmament negotiations. The world must be spared the risks of an uncontrolled strategic nuclear arms race. A special responsibility rests on the United States and the Soviet Union, in fulfilling the hopes expressed at the special session. The SALT II agreement which I hope is now emerging will formally establish strategic parity and enhance stability. It will involve actual destruction of nuclear delivery systems. The United Kingdom has given the United States and the Soviet Union full support in their efforts to reach agreement. The world is already beginning to look ahead to a SALT III negotiation to follow the conclusion of SALT II; one of the most encouraging events of the special session was that Vice-President Mondale and

(Lord Goronwy-Roberts,
United Kingdom)

Mr. Gromyko both declared that SALT III should aim to constrain significantly the number of strategic systems, and to limit their qualitative development. The SALT process has been under way for nine years and it is an extremely difficult undertaking. But it has done great good, both in concrete results and in developing between the two super-Powers a dialogue on strategic issues which I believe is an essential ingredient of détente.

Yet, as the Final Document made very clear, the present SALT process cannot be the whole story on nuclear weapons. There are many nuclear systems whose range and capabilities are less than strategic in the SALT definition: but all are weapons of terror and all cause concern to those who feel threatened by them. We for our part are considering in Europe how restraint in such armaments can be achieved. As the British Prime Minister said at the special session, it raises formidable problems, not least because of the inequalities and asymmetries built into the present situation. But, in conjunction with our allies, this matter will be studied with great care.

As a nuclear-weapon State, the United Kingdom recognizes and accepts that it has a special responsibility to curb the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons. We are making serious efforts towards this end, particularly in our negotiations with the United States and the Soviet Union on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. These negotiations began last year in a new climate of optimism that was reflected in the urgency with which individual States, last year's General Assembly and the special session called for their successful completion. I do not believe that your optimism has been misplaced, even though the complexities of the subject regrettably impose a limit on the speed of progress.

The British Government is determined to bring the negotiations to an early and successful conclusion. We want to achieve a comprehensive test-ban treaty which will be non-discriminatory in that it will ban nuclear explosions by all parties, nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States alike. We want a treaty which contains adequate verification provisions, to give maximum confidence that parties will comply with their obligations. One element in the verification system will be an international seismic data exchange, based on the valuable work of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts on Seismic Events of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. We want the treaty to curb vertical proliferation, that is, the qualitative development of nuclear weapons. We hope that such a treaty will attract the widest possible international adherence.

(Lord Goronwy-Roberts, United Kingdom)

Agreement in principle has been reached on many of the major issues in the negotiations, including the key point that the treaty should be genuinely comprehensive. The three negotiating parties are agreed that the treaty should ban all nuclear-weapon tests in all environments and that peaceful nuclear explosions should be covered by a protocol, which will be an integral part of the treaty. In the light of the substantial progress already made, it is my belief that the tripartite negotiations can soon reach agreement on a treaty with the advantages I have named.

In parallel with these negotiations by nuclear-weapon States, it is essential to make further efforts to ensure that the growing international transfer of civil nuclear technology should not create new dangers of weapons proliferation. The aim of my country is to provide for international access to nuclear power for civil purposes while minimizing the risk of the spread of nuclear-weapon technology. As the British Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary said in the General Assembly on 27 September, it is possible for the equipment and services which are essential to a successful civil nuclear industry to be made available while minimizing the proliferation risk. The Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) system of safeguards are the main bases of our policy. But we also support other measures that can serve the same aim, such as new technologies more resistant to proliferation, harmonized nuclear export policies, and of course nuclear-weapon-free zones. I emphasize that these non-proliferation efforts are designed to benefit all States.

As a quick study of the annual reports of the IAEA will show, there has been an enormous growth in the development of peaceful nuclear technology throughout the world since the NPT entered into force in 1970. At the same time the Treaty has greatly contributed to an international climate hostile to proliferation. Without that Treaty the risks of proliferation and nuclear war would be much more serious today. The Treaty contributes to the mutual security of the Treaty parties. It has received very wide acceptance in the international community and now has 106 parties. We strongly encourage more States to adhere. The United Kingdom itself has gone beyond

(Lord Goronwy-Roberts, United Kingdom)

its obligations by voluntarily accepting safeguards on its civil nuclear industry. That arrangement came into force on 14 August.

The United Kingdom also sought to meet the wishes of non-nuclear Powers by taking a lead before the special session in advocating appropriate negative security assurances. We hope that the assurances given during the special session by three nuclear-weapon States will enhance the confidence of the non-aligned States in their security from nuclear attack and further reduce any incentive they might feel to acquire nuclear weapons.

In the Final Declaration of the 1975 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference the parties proposed that a second such conference be held in 1980. The thirty-first session of the General Assembly decided in 1976 to discuss the matter this year, including the establishment of a preparatory committee for the second Review Conference. For this purpose the United Kingdom is co-sponsoring a draft resolution at this General Assembly. It is straightforward and brief, being based on a similar draft resolution which preceded the first Review Conference. It envisages a preparatory committee consisting of a broad spread of industrialized and developing countries. I sincerely hope that this Assembly will adopt it by consensus.

The United Kingdom is encouraged by the scientific and technical progress being made in the eight working groups of the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation (INFCE) study, and impressed with the high standard of contributions being made by the 40 or so participants. This work has been greatly facilitated by the excellent assistance the exercise has received from the IAEA secretariat. The International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation study is an open-minded attempt to produce an objective evaluation of fuel cycles, in which the developing countries have an important contribution to make. We hope the results will be significant and useful, particularly in the development of non-proliferation ideas which are generally acceptable to all States with civil nuclear industries. They are due to appear in February 1980, before the date envisaged for the second Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference. They will thus form part of the background to what we hope will be a comprehensive and thorough discussion of this whole field of non-proliferation at the Review Conference.

(Lord Goronwy-Roberts, United Kingdom)

The Final Document of the special session declared that the process of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world should be encouraged, with the ultimate objective of achieving a world entirely free of nuclear weapons. My Government supports the establishment of such zones on the basis of agreements freely arrived at among all the States concerned, and believes that the status of the zones should be respected by the nuclear-weapon States. The United Kingdom was the first State to ratify the Additional Protocols to the Treaty of Tlatelolco. It has taken a long time for the Treaty to win the support of other nuclear-weapon States, whose adherence to the Protocols is necessary to make the Treaty fully effective. As this process is completed, there will I hope be no political reason for any State in Latin America to delay the entry into force of the Treaty in its territory. I here pay a tribute to the tireless efforts of the Government of Mexico to give full reality for the first time to the exciting concept of a continental nuclear-weapon-free zone. It will surely be a fitting model for other regions of the world to emulate.

The United Kingdom strongly believes that new scientific discoveries should not be used to create new weapons like those already recognized by the United Nations as weapons of mass destruction. We demonstrated this concern by sponsoring a draft resolution at last year's Assembly. The Final Document of the special session supports our belief that the best way to achieve this aim is for the Committee on Disarmament to remain vigilant so that specific agreements can be concluded on any particular new weapon of mass destruction, based on new scientific principles, which may be identified. The matter should be kept under active review in the Committee on Disarmament and we shall play our part in that process.

I believe it is even more important to concentrate on weapons of mass destruction which are already in existence, particularly chemical weapons. The United Kingdom has renounced offensive chemical weapons and calls upon other States to do likewise. Multilateral efforts to follow up the 1925 Geneva Protocol by negotiating a ban on the production and stockpiling of chemical weapons have gained momentum in recent years. The Final Document of the special session gave proper emphasis to this task. Important steps have been taken towards overcoming one of the main problems of chemical disarmament - the question of the scope of the intended ban. But verification remains the key.

(Lord Goronwy-Roberts, United Kingdom)

We are very conscious that the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union are dealing with matters of great complexity. We are glad that both sides agree that verification procedures should be based on a combination of national and international arrangements, including the creation of a consultative committee. We hope the language in the draft convention tabled by the United Kingdom in 1976 will be useful to the Committee on Disarmament when it comes to consider the framework of a treaty.

Another forthcoming event in the disarmament calendar is the review conference of the biological weapons convention to be held in 1980. That international agreement was a true disarmament measure in that it required the destruction of all stocks of biological weapons. The United Kingdom played an active role in its negotiation and at this session of the Assembly will join in sponsoring a draft resolution setting in hand the arrangements for the Review Conference. Some concern has been expressed about developments in genetic engineering in recent years that might permit laboratory culture of new organisms dangerous to mankind. This would be a perversion of scientific knowledge with incalculable consequences. It is right that the review conference should examine such developments so that the world could be assured that none was being used for military purposes.

The Final Document of the special session underlined the value of the regional approach to disarmament as an element in the world-wide effort towards general and complete disarmament. The United Kingdom supports this principle. We are participating actively in the talks on mutual and balanced force reduction designed to achieve a more stable military balance in Europe. We have supported the Latin American nuclear-weapon-free zone since its inception. We welcomed the Declaration of Ayacucho by the Andean States as an example of voluntary restraint on a regional basis. We believe it would be useful to examine regional approaches, including initiatives such as those, to ascertain the general principles which should govern regional arms control and to identify new possibilities. For example, we have proposed that measures such as giving advance notification of military movements and manoeuvres, exchanging observers at manoeuvres and exchanging military visits should be adopted in regions where confidence needs to be fostered.

(Lord Goronwy-Roberts, United Kingdom)

We also believe it essential to implement and reinforce the proposals in the Final Document to deal with the accumulation of conventional weapons throughout the world. In this area of arms control two principles stand out: nothing should be done to endanger the security of States that are not able to produce their own armaments, and nothing can be done without the agreement of both the major arms suppliers and recipient countries. There must be thorough discussions between the two groups of States. The United Kingdom accounts for only 5 per cent of the international arms trade and, although this means export earnings and jobs in Britain, we shall continue to exert our best efforts to secure measures of restraint by international agreement.

The first initiative has come from the major arms suppliers. We have followed with interest the talks between the United States and the Soviet Union on the problem of the international transfer of conventional armaments. We welcome the recent initiative of the Latin American and Caribbean States concerning limiting the supply of arms in their area. Those are promising developments which we hope will lead to further serious attempts to tackle the great problem of the accelerating world-wide build-up of conventional weapons.

While many of the arms control and disarmament measures I have so far discussed would greatly enhance international peace and security, few would have a substantial impact on military spending. It is a sad fact that our world, riven though it is by poverty and by social and economic injustice, devotes 6 per cent of what it produces to military expenditure. We manage collectively to spend over \$1 billion a day on armed forces and armaments - a figure which is equivalent to the combined incomes of the poorer half of the world's population. That is double the world's expenditure on health and larger than its expenditure on education. The world spends on defence in two days the equivalent of a year's budget for the United Nations and its specialized agencies, and in three hours the equivalent of a year's budget for United Nations peace-keeping.

Those are striking figures. We ought, as a world community, to determine to reduce the drain on our scarce resources that this level of military expenditure involves. But the problem is not just one of economic management

(Lord Goronwy-Roberts, United Kingdom)

or resource allocation; it has a crucial political and security dimension as well.

Reductions in military expenditure can help to limit the global arms race. I know this is a broad-brush approach compared with specific agreements on individual categories of weapons; but it has the advantage that it covers all military activities, including those that cannot be effectively limited on their own, such as military research and development. And it can have the result of freeing resources from the military sector for peaceful purposes, including urgent economic and social needs.

Past efforts in this field have shown that international agreement on balanced reductions of military expenditure depends on devising an accepted method for measuring and comparing those expenditures. The United Kingdom has played an active part in the work of the United Nations Secretary-General's group of experts, which has produced a standardized method of measuring and comparing budgets. This reporting instrument needs to undergo a practical test by a representative sample of States, and when the results have been assessed any necessary refinements should be made with a view to the adoption of the reporting instrument by the United Nations for general use. We should then have an agreed base on which we might work towards negotiating reductions in military budgets. I urge that this Assembly move forward on this significant aspect of arms control.

The budgetary approach could also provide the statistical basis for the United Nations study on the relationship between disarmament and development. The United Kingdom is participating actively in this important study sponsored by the Nordic countries. To understand the full implications of the subject we need to examine the present-day utilization of resources for military purposes, the economic and social effects of a continuing arms race and of the implementation of disarmament measures, and the problems of transferring resources released from military purposes to economic and social development. The conversion and redeployment of defence production is a particular problem for the industrialized countries. It is an area of the study to which my Government will be paying special attention. We believe that non-governmental experts can also make a useful contribution to the research.

(Lord Goronwy-Roberts, United Kingdom)

My Government is also determined to carry out the measures suggested in the Final Document of the special session for mobilizing public support for disarmament. In 1978 - which we now tend to think of as disarmament year - we have prepared a series of publications which have enjoyed a wide circulation through British non-governmental organizations with a special interest in arms control and disarmament. Those publications include a comprehensive report on the special session itself, a leaflet and poster for United Nations Day and a booklet explaining disarmament policy.

(Lord Goronwy-Roberts, United Kingdom)

When the Committee on Disarmament meets in January, it will be in many ways a new body. With its additional members, it will be more representative. The new Committee inherits a large store of expertise from the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), but its organization and procedures have been improved in several important ways. My Government is glad to have played a part in devising generally acceptable reforms which should enhance the Committee's ability to discharge its crucial function of negotiating multilateral treaties on arms control and disarmament. The United Kingdom stands ready to play a full part and looks forward to co-operating with the existing and the very welcome new members of the Committee on Disarmament. We are glad that France will be there and we hope that before long China too will participate.

The Final Document of the special session contained in its Programme of Action a number of longer-term elements as well as immediate and short-term measures needed to halt and reverse the arms race. The short-term proposals demand urgent action. Our aim should be to complete as many as possible before the next special session meets to review progress. Above all, we should ensure that a second special session is likely to be of real value. We must therefore leave sufficient time for the tasks set out in the Final Document to be pursued. And the reformed machinery - the Committee on Disarmament and the United Nations Disarmament Commission - should be given time to come to grips with their tasks before another special session is convened.

It is a welcome fact that disarmament has been a major theme in the United Nations and the world during the past year. I hope that this Organization will continue to play its central role and that the current negotiations will be speedily and successfully concluded. As the Final Document of the special session reaffirmed, our objective should be general and complete disarmament under effective international control. At each stage of the process the objective should be undiminished security at the lowest possible level of armaments and military forces.

The United Kingdom believes in balanced disarmament with international verification, so that each State reduces its armaments and sees its potential adversary reducing his. This should not only make for national

(Lord Goronwy-Roberts, United Kingdom)

security but should also increase security in a wider sense by releasing skilled human and material resources for redeployment on economic and social projects for the good of all peoples. At the special session the British Prime Minister pledged my country's willingness to accept on its territory whatever further measures of verification, including international inspection, are needed to underpin future arms control agreements. I suggest that universal acceptance of this principle would go some way towards easing the path of future negotiations.

We must now all make much greater efforts to achieve faster progress by concluding multilateral, balanced and fully verified treaties on concrete matters of importance. I dedicate my Government to that objective. The United Kingdom has played a prominent part in all the multilateral disarmament negotiations since the United Nations was founded. We worked hard to achieve success at the special session, guided by the view that arms control measures can enhance both international stability and national security.

In conclusion, may I emphasize that our prime task in the immediate term will be a comprehensive test ban and progress on mutual and balanced force reductions in Central Europe.

Mr. SAHLOUL (Sudan): The convening of the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament last May and the level of representation by many leading Powers were indeed a measure of the concern felt by the international community towards the aggravating problem of armaments.

The complex and grave nature of the problem of disarmament and its direct bearing on such important subjects as international security and development make it all the more important to pursue further and consolidate the comprehensive approach which has been adopted towards the examination of the problem both in the preparatory stage - leading to the special session on disarmament - and during the course of the session itself. The application of the consensus technique in adopting the ultimate Declaration and the comprehensive set of proposals and recommendations was in itself recognition by the international community that, if the Declaration is to act as a

(Mr. Sahloul, Sudan)

universally acceptable guideline to the arduous process of negotiations which will follow to work out a programme of action and evolve the necessary machinery to implement and supervise it, then the Declaration itself will have to be a comprehensive document, vague in many respects and with obvious shortcomings. That was the price to be paid, if a new and pragmatic approach is at last to be applied to eventual progress along the path of disarmament.

Another lesson which we feel that we have learned from the special session is the fact that the General Assembly, although it was empowered by the Charter to consider general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including, the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, has been capable over a period of three decades only in evolving inadequate agreements and partial measures. The final and cherished objective of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control continues to be as elusive and complex as ever. This may perhaps be due, on the one hand, to the deliberative nature of the General Assembly and, on the other, to the peculiar characteristics of disarmament negotiations, which are subject to a slow and meticulous process of comparing positions and proposals so as to provide maximum protection for the vital interests of States.

Be that as it may, sight must not be lost of the fact that the United Nations has a central role and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament. This in effect means that all States have the right to participate in disarmament negotiations on an equal footing, because such negotiations have a direct bearing on their national security. The disarmament measures resulting from these negotiations must be such that they should be adopted:

"in such an equitable and balanced manner as to ensure the right of each State to security and to ensure that no individual State or group of States may obtain advantages over others at any stage. At each stage the objective should be undiminished security at the lowest possible level of armaments and military forces." (A/RES/S-10/2, para. 29)

(Mr. Sahloul, Sudan)

These principles have been the achievement of the special session on disarmament and, what is more, they have been adopted unanimously by the international community in the Final Document which was adopted by consensus. The evolutionary character of disarmament negotiations, the interrelationship and interdependence of such elements as relaxation of international tension, the respect for the right to self-determination, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the strengthening of international peace and security - all these factors have had a direct bearing on the measures recommended in the special session and the kind of machinery which the Member States considered adequate for the purpose of implementing them.

(Mr. Sahloul, Sudan)

As consensus was considered crucial for the purpose of effective and complete disarmament, the measures and the machinery emanating from the session naturally fell far short of the expectation of a great majority of the participating States. Nevertheless, the euphoria felt by many of the countries that took part in the session at the very idea of holding such an important and critical meeting at last, after years of demanding that the problem of disarmament be given a more serious examination by the international community, led to the prevalence of a strong desire to avoid fruitless confrontation and take a step in the right direction. The general awareness that negotiations on disarmament would take a number of years and a great deal of patience coupled with the ability to compromise in order to achieve practical and manageable solutions to a wide and complex range of subjects, led to a growing conviction that wider participation by States Members of the United Nations, and others, would bring broader results than otherwise would be achieved in more restricted negotiations or bodies dealing with the various disarmament questions.

However, although in the last resort this aspect of universality of participation may cover the negotiation of measures and agreements through the mandate assigned to the General Assembly to deliberate on the problem of disarmament and review the implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the special session, sight must not be lost of the fact that international disarmament negotiations have to be conducted on a bilateral, regional and multilateral basis, in appropriate conditions and with the participation of all the countries concerned in the consideration of the different aspects of disarmament.

These aspects can be divided into two broad categories, nuclear and conventional, both naturally directly related to the respective international security questions. Hence the deliberative function of the General Assembly has to be supplemented by the negotiating function of a more restricted body capable of undertaking examination of problems in depth and taking decisions on the basis of consensus. The machinery which emerged from the deliberations of the special session on disarmament reflected all those

(Mr. Sahloul, Sudan)

aspects. However, the consensus was also a result of many compromises and, consequently, the machinery covered by the consensus may eventually prove rather unwieldy.

This is especially so in view of the fact that the Disarmament Commission will assume the role of a deliberative body and a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly, while at the same time the First Committee of the General Assembly has been assigned the role of dealing exclusively with questions of disarmament and related international security problems. Here we may run the risk of having two comparable organs dealing in a deliberative capacity with what are largely the same questions. The assignment of the recommendations of the Disarmament Commission, through the General Assembly, to the negotiating body, namely, the Committee on Disarmament, may require a mandate to accord the necessary priority to proposals covering a wide range of subjects, such as: nuclear, bacteriological and conventional weapons; the establishment of zones of peace; the use of the sea-bed, the ocean floor and their subsoil, and of outer space; the level of armed forces and military budgets; the necessary steps to be taken to strengthen international peace and security and to build confidence among States; the relationship between disarmament and development; and the rest of the complex maze of items, which are in many respects interrelated and mutually interdependent.

That is why we feel that the workload of the Disarmament Commission and, consequently, of the Committee on Disarmament may prove overwhelming if they are required to follow up the decisions and recommendations of the special session and, at the same time, consider the elements of a comprehensive programme for disarmament. We therefore support the recommendation adopted by the Disarmament Commission at its organizational session last week that priority be accorded at its May-June 1979 session to consideration of the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, provided enough views and suggestions are forthcoming from Member countries by 31 March 1979, as suggested by the Secretary-General.

(Mr. Sahloul, Sudan)

The high priority accorded to this important item naturally implies that the Commission will set aside for the time being its other mandate, namely, to follow up the relevant decisions and recommendations of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Since the forthcoming session of the Disarmament Commission will be of limited duration, we feel that less time should be devoted to the general debate so as to provide Member States with more time for an examination in depth of the proposals and suggestions for a comprehensive programme of disarmament. We shall support any proposal that may be forthcoming for the holding of another organizational session towards the end of the current session of the General Assembly, because the latter may take decisions which have a bearing on the agenda of the 1979 session of the Commission.

Although the problem of nuclear weapons has become over the past few years the preserve of those Powers directly involved - especially the two super-Powers - and the conclusion of the SALT I Agreement may have already established the appropriate procedure and machinery for the negotiation and conclusion of further agreements in that particular field, we feel that the interest shown by the international community in the course of the negotiations of the SALT I Agreement continues to act as moral pressure on the participants in those talks and on other actual and prospective nuclear Powers. The international community is concerned with, and even at times directly involved in, some aspects of nuclear armaments and technology, such as the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the prohibition of nuclear-weapon testing, the safeguards covering nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes and the development of parallel political or internal measures to strengthen the security of States, including the conclusion of effective arrangements to protect non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. We therefore feel that the widest possible participation of non-nuclear States in the work of the Committee on Disarmament and in any subsequent negotiations covering the aforementioned fields will ensure the eventual application of the agreements and the measures which may result from the ultimate deliberations and negotiations.

(Mr. Sahloul, Sudan)

My country, being a small country, is naturally most interested in the issue of the international transfer of conventional arms. This subject should cover not only the transfer of weapons through traditional channels between supplying countries and importing countries, but, in our view, also the supply of conventional weapons by arms dealers through channels which are in many respects illicit. The international community has addressed itself to this question in the general context of disarmament deliberations and negotiations. Several approaches have been initiated to find a solution to this problem, which in the first instance affects the developing countries. Unfortunately, none of them has proved satisfactory, because in essence they reflect the point of view of those countries that have taken the initiative in presenting them.

The problem of disarmament with regard to conventional weapons cannot be considered in isolation from the general subject of disarmament. Any attempt by developed countries and big Powers to impose practical limitations on the international transfer of conventional weapons may adversely affect the interests of the smaller Powers, for the following reasons.

First, disarmament can only be effected if other matters are attended to simultaneously, such as the elimination of the causes of instability and tension that seem to be prevalent in many regions of the world and that make it imperative for the respective States to seek to ensure their security by the acquisition of the necessary weapons. The continued existence of territories under colonial rule and occupation and the development of wars of national liberation form the main causes of tension in the third world, as we all know.

(Mr. Sahloul, Sudan)

Secondly, if the industrial countries try to impose a restraint or limitation on the transfer of conventional weapons, to the detriment of the security needs of small Powers that happen to be located in or around the areas of tension, those small Powers will be forced to seek their requirements from arms dealers at exorbitant financial cost. This eventuality may act as a complicating factor in the deteriorating economic situation in many developing countries.

Thirdly, the proposal to approach the problem of disarmament on a regional basis has so far proved to be not entirely satisfactory to the countries of the third world and, in particular, of the non-aligned group, because it seeks to eliminate the conventional armaments race on a regional basis without stressing the global approach within the framework of general and complete disarmament. It also fails to link the problem of international transfer with the production of conventional weapons. This link is all the more important since certain States in the Middle East and in the southern part of Africa have been enabled fully to develop their armament-production capacity and therefore have been put in a position to defy the international community and pursue their policies of expansion and hegemony in the regions where they happen to exist. Any restraint on the supply of conventional arms to the other countries in those regions will naturally give a preponderant say in the affairs of the regions of the aggressive régimes in question.

We believe that the studies envisaged in the Programme of Action which was adopted by the General Assembly at the special session on disarmament, should take special note of the above points. As far as those studies are concerned, we believe that we should make sufficient financial resources available to the United Nations Centre for Disarmament rather than attempt to set up priorities for those studies, even through the intermediary of a panel of experts, as has been suggested by some delegations. The problems of disarmament are complex, wide-ranging and in many respects interrelated, and the accordance of priority to the studies might prove to be a very difficult task indeed, if not an impossible one.

(Mr. Sahloul, Sudan)

My delegation supports the idea of the association of some of the world-famous institutions in the field of armaments and strategic studies with the preparation of the studies. For instance, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) and the International Institute of Strategic Studies (IISS) in London are well known to all of us and their contribution to the better understanding of an otherwise complicated and difficult subject need hardly be emphasized. However, we believe that similar institutes in the third world may also be called upon to introduce a fresh element into the subject of disarmament. Such institutes as the Indian Institute for Defence Studies and Analysis, and others, have made significant contributions to the better understanding of military and strategic problems in their regions and are therefore in a position to participate positively in our joint effort.

My delegation also supports the view that the programme of fellowships on disarmament should be given priority in the regular budget and must not be conditional on any savings that can be made within the existing budgetary appropriations. However, we feel that in view of the extensiveness of the programme, including lectures and seminars, the period of six months may not be quite sufficient for the purpose of training well-qualified candidates. We are aware that there are budgetary constraints and limitations, but we feel that the point we are trying to make may be of assistance when future courses are considered.

As for the date of the next special session, we think that enough time should be given for the machinery set up by the first special session to grapple with the problems of disarmament and produce tangible results, at least in some areas, before a second special session is convened to assess the progress achieved and attend to the problems identified in the course of deliberations and negotiations. That is why we tend to support the view expressed in this Committee that 1981 should be considered seriously as the earliest practicable date.

Mr. BALETA (Albania) (interpretation from French): At the outset, Mr. Chairman, may I congratulate you on your election to preside over the work of this Committee. Through you, I also congratulate all the other officers of the Committee.

Quite rightly, disarmament has continued for many years to be a matter of major concern to all peoples and countries desirous of living in freedom and independence and anxious to develop and progress in peace and calm, safe from the threat of the armaments of the imperialist Powers.

Nearly four months have elapsed since the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament concluded its work and adopted by consensus, as it is called, a Final Document containing a series of recommendations and decisions.

That tenth special session set as its target the examination and evaluation of the present international situation in the light of the present need to achieve substantial progress in the field of disarmament, peace, international security and economic development. In order to respond appropriately to the many questions that arose in this context, it was necessary to make an objective analysis of the entire world situation, particularly the main causes of armament and the arms race, and to highlight the factors that stand in the way of progress towards true disarmament.

At a time when we are called upon to examine the implementation and the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session, we cannot avoid certain questions. Did the tenth special session and its Final Document in fact allay fears and satisfy the wishes of the majority of Member States which genuinely desire to find a real solution to the problem of disarmament without delay? Can we consider that the work, the decisions and the recommendations of the tenth special session represent a successful result and some progress in the activities of our Organization in the field of disarmament?

We should very much like to be able to answer these questions in the affirmative, but unfortunately that is not possible. Instead, we are forced to say that during the session, and particularly in its final phase when the document was approved, it was not difficult to note that the initial optimism

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

was misplaced and that the views of delegations diverged more and more as regards both the results of the session and the new prospects that might have been opened up of solving the disarmament problem.

The development of events in the world in the course of the period that has elapsed since the tenth special session gives rise to no optimism as far as we are concerned regarding the effect of the decisions and the recommendations adopted at that session. The prospects of a solution to the problem of disarmament seem no more promising today than they were before the session was held. The development of events confirms the opinion we have already expressed, namely, that the special session, because of the international conditions that prevailed, could not produce concrete and substantive results in the field of disarmament. We cannot congratulate ourselves simply because at the end of that session a document was adopted that added a new item to the agenda of the General Assembly, or because a certain number of more or less symbolic measures were envisaged, such as the increase in the membership of the Committee on Disarmament and some other changes in the machinery of disarmament.

At the closing meeting of the tenth special session the Albanian delegation stated that it did not approve the Final Document and disassociated itself from the consensus. Explaining the reasons for its position, our delegation stressed, inter alia, at that time that the Final Document represented nothing but a series of basically contradictory ideas, thoughts and concepts. That document does not show the true causes of armament and the arms race, and does not pinpoint the main factors that stand in the way of the achievement of true disarmament.

In the course of the entire special session, and particularly during the period of the adoption of the Final Document, we noted that the adversaries of disarmament, first and foremost the imperialist super-Powers, did all in their power to impose their own views and their own ideas and to introduce them in the document in such a way as to be detrimental to the efforts of others to achieve a solution to the problem of disarmament. When a problem as important as disarmament is being discussed, and when a document is adopted at such a high level as the United Nations, it is extremely

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

important, we believe, to speak openly to peoples and to tell them the truth, the whole truth. We believe that the Final Document fails to do this. On the other hand, there are in the document a number of elements and formulations that those who oppose disarmament, the imperialist super-Powers in particular, can make use of to serve their own aggressive designs and to camouflage and justify their own armament and the arms race. This having been said, it must also be noted that no progress has been made in the field of disarmament since the tenth special session.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

No specific action could be cited susceptible of kindling the slightest spark of hope or optimism that some progress may be achieved in the near future. The problems of disarmament, at present as in the past, are inextricably linked with the political, social, economic and military situation in the world. The complete lack of progress towards disarmament, the increase in the arsenals of all types of weapons and the headlong arms race are a manifestation and an aspect of the extremely tense complicated situation in the world, so beset with dangers and major confrontations. Armament and the arms race are the direct consequence of the aggressive and hegemonistic policies pursued by the imperialist super-Powers, and of the efforts of the imperialist Powers and their reactionary régimes to oppress and exploit peoples and to threaten the freedom and independence of sovereign States.

The last months have been marked by a number of events that prove that the imperialist super-Powers have no intention of yielding one iota of their policies and their aggressive acts. On the contrary, they are intensifying them even further. They constantly and ever more openly practise a policy of intervening from a position of strength in the internal affairs of other States, of increasing their pressures and political, economic and military blackmail everywhere, and of indulging more and more in sabre-rattling. The areas of tension, aggression and armed conflict in the Middle East, Africa and elsewhere clearly attest to the harmful and dangerous consequences of this activity.

No concrete measure has yet been taken to reduce existing stockpiles of nuclear or conventional weapons which the imperialist Powers have built up, or to slow down the arms race. On the contrary, those Powers - and particularly the two imperialist super-Powers - have stepped up their preparations for war and have further increased their military budgets. Precisely at the moment when we are discussing disarmament more billions of dollars have just been added to the already astronomical figures for military expenses. The imperialist super-Powers carry out further nuclear explosions, continue to improve their arms, invent and manufacture new types of sophisticated weaponry and constantly militarize their economies.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

The two imperialist super-Powers - the United States and the Soviet Union - as usual cover up their true desires and interests by seemingly contributing to the achievement of disarmament goals and constantly repeating their outmoded slogans about "the restoration and safeguarding of peace and security in the world", "détente", "the non-resort to force", "the reduction and prohibition of nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons testing", "the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons", "the prohibition of chemical weapons", and so on. They try to give the impression that they are more eager than anyone else to implement the decisions and recommendations of the tenth special session. But, at the same time, in practice, they act very differently and, in fact, do the opposite.

The super-Powers and the imperialist powers, despite their demagoguery, have yet to reduce their arsenals in any way; they have not destroyed even a single rifle. Far from it, they have increased their arsenals of tanks, military aircraft, rockets and other weapons of mass destruction. Military bases, warships, American and Soviet armies of occupation are still to be found everywhere: in Europe, in the Mediterranean, in the Indian Ocean and elsewhere. And the imperialist super-Powers are seeking by every possible means to acquire new military bases and supply points on all continents, and in all seas and oceans.

The aggressive military blocs of NATO and the Warsaw Pact also are continuing to strengthen their potential and their military complexes, at the same time as they organize large-scale offensive manoeuvres in an effort to extend the scope of their dominion. The meetings of these military blocs, convened on the eve of and during the special session on disarmament, were an open challenge to that session. The strengthening of their potential, and their acts, are another challenge to the decisions and recommendations of that session.

The imperialist Powers have always taken advantage of disarmament discussions to put obstacles in the way of all sincere efforts at opening the way to the disarmament process. When the imperialist super-Powers speak out in favour of any symbolic disarmament measures, or when they undertake negotiations or come to some agreement, they are always acting in their own interests, bargaining in order to ensure their own military supremacy or to establish a convenient, relative

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

balance between themselves. Even if one day they should agree to a symbolic reduction in their armaments for propagandistic purposes, that would in no way advance the cause of disarmament, since it would have no effect on their enormous arsenals or reduce the danger those arsenals represent.

The United States and the Soviet Union give great publicity to the agreements they have concluded on nuclear weapons and nuclear-weapons testing and make fine promises to reach other agreements in order to make it appear that because of those agreements the danger of nuclear weapons will gradually disappear and that even the danger posed by conventional weapons will be reduced. But we know all too well that the negotiations between the two imperialist super-Powers, such as SALT or the Vienna talks, and all the agreements they have signed are only measures to allow them better to plan their own arms race and maintain their own military superiority. And thus for the same reasons they try to manipulate the discussions that take place in international bodies at various levels dealing with the question of disarmament. Their sole interest in those organs is to use them to sow illusions by submitting proposals and counter-proposals and to accuse each other whenever they need to justify their manoeuvres.

Another revealing indication of the demagoguery of the super-Powers and the imperialist Powers is the weapons trade in which they are engaged. The American imperialists and the Soviet socio-imperialists are at one and the same time the greatest manufacturers and the greatest suppliers of weapons to other countries. They consider the supply and sale of weapons as an effective means of penetrating various regions of the world politically, economically and militarily in order to support their policies of interference in the domestic affairs of other countries. In this connexion, as has been stressed by the leader of the Albanian people, Comrade Enver Hoxha:

"The super-Powers are engaged in a large-scale weapons trade which has become the most lucrative trade of our day. If at first glance it appears that these weapons increase and strengthen the fighting ability of the recipient countries, in point of fact, this trade is a noose around the neck of the purchasers, and these weapons but chains around their feet and wrists. Not only could these weapons never be used against those that sell them, or their allies, in the event of possible aggression on their part, but they cannot even be used against anyone without the seller's permission.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

"Through this weapons trade the super-Powers incite small and medium-sized countries to lesser arms races which then become the source of disputes and conflicts among neighbours, provoking local wars and thus opening the way to expansion and hegemonism on the part of the United States and the Soviet Union."

The lengthy discussions that have been held so far on the issue of disarmament in the many international bodies created for the purpose, as well as the abundant decisions and resolutions adopted, have still not brought the issue of disarmament closer to solution. In the Final Document of the tenth special session it is stated that all States should evince the political will to solve this problem. But it appears a pipe-dream to expect the super-Powers and the imperialist Powers truly to show such a will, just as it is illusory to believe that they will decide to disarm of their own free will. War and aggression are part of the very nature of the imperialist super-Powers and for that reason they scarcely dream of disarming, but do everything to continue arming themselves.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

The aggressiveness of the imperialist super-Powers grows unceasingly, their rivalry to dominate the world and divide it into spheres of influence grows ever greater. Thus the possibility of the unleashing of a new world war remains a real threat.

This being the case, it is incumbent upon the peoples and democratic and progressive States which love peace and freedom to redouble their vigilance, to denounce the aims and practices of the imperialist super-Powers and resolutely to oppose their aggressive policies and wars. In struggling against the preparations for a new war or the threat of a new war the peace-loving nations must never renounce their struggle for national liberation and the safeguarding of their freedom and independence, as their enemies and their false friends advise them to do. They must persevere in this struggle and reject any offer that might oblige them to yield to the policies of blackmail of the imperialist super-Powers. The peoples cannot remain impassive and immobile, in the face of the aggressive threats of their enemies and the danger of war complacently accepting the theories of the inevitability of war and powerlessness against the future.

The peace-loving and freedom-loving peoples must redouble their efforts to achieve true disarmament, but the struggle for disarmament must have as its main goal the disarmament of the imperialist Powers, because it is their arsenals, it is their weapons, that threaten international peace and security.

The People's Socialist Republic of Albania has spoken out firmly against the armament and the arms race of the imperialist Powers. We support the right of all peoples to preserve their independence and to take the necessary measures to defend it. We believe that no people and no country, in order to defend their freedom, integrity and rights, should rely on one super-Power in the hope of avoiding the threat of the other, or should count on the protection of one military bloc or other alliance formed by imperialists in the hope of escaping the toils of another. We are firmly convinced that the right course is to count upon the strength, the will and the determination of the people to live free and independent and on the anti-imperialist solidarity of the peoples.

Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure for us to express our sincere congratulations on your well-deserved election to preside over this Committee. I shall abide by your wishes and try to be as brief as possible, but I hope I shall have a future opportunity to express our feelings with regard to you and your friendly country.

The convening of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was a result of the initiative taken by the group of non-aligned countries. The holding of that session was a challenge to the Governments of the world, particularly the Governments of the countries possessing most of the sources of armaments, especially nuclear armaments, to make those countries accept their responsibilities in view of the extremely serious threat to the peace and security of the world. Consideration of the question of disarmament within the United Nations, with the participation of all the countries of the world, made that session a unique event in view of its universal nature and the fact that that session was devoted entirely to examining a problem of extreme importance, namely, the question of disarmament.

The delegation of Iraq in the course of that special session laid particular stress on the need to establish a close link between the question of armaments and the political, economic and social problems of the present-day world. In order to resolve the main problems confronting our world, efforts will have to be made by all countries and not merely by one country alone or a single group of countries, however important. Likewise, a problem cannot be solved separately, divorced from its main context. Comprehensive solutions have to be found to all problems. Today, at a time when we are evaluating the results emerging from the decisions reached at the special session and from its work, we feel it our duty to make the following comments.

First, the fact that a special session was convened with the participation of all Members of the United Nations is a positive step forward of extreme importance, particularly since that session was crowned with success in a relatively short period of time and because at that session the General Assembly discussed a very complex issue in a comprehensive and thorough manner. That discussion made it possible for us to obtain a better grasp of the problems inherent in disarmament, and thus we were able to determine the points of agreement and the points of disagreement.

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

Secondly, the fact that the special session was able to produce a single document comprising the principles which had been unanimously agreed upon is undoubtedly an indication that it was a major success, particularly since this was a matter of great importance. It was thus possible to devise disarmament machinery that will turn those principles into reality. Therefore we are very pleased to welcome the resurrection of the Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body to deal with this matter. The first session of that Commission was held at the beginning of this month. We should like to express our sincere congratulations to the Committee on Disarmament on the fact that the other nuclear Powers are now participating and also on the fact that the membership of that body has been enlarged in the hope that it will produce more positive results as a deliberative body.

Thirdly, the special session decided that a further special session devoted to the question of disarmament should be held, and during the present session it is our job to decide exactly when that special session should be convened. We are in favour of the convening of a new special session. However, the date for that session should depend on the way in which the decisions of the previous special session are implemented. Furthermore, the necessary preparatory work will have to be done, because the most important thing is to ensure that the second special session devoted to disarmament will be as successful as possible. For that reason, action should not be undertaken hastily.

Fourthly, the fact that the Final Document emphasized the close relationship between disarmament and development was the result of the action of the non-aligned countries. The progress achieved in disarmament will undoubtedly make a major contribution to the development process, in accordance with the Declaration, which states:

"resources released as a result of the implementation of disarmament measures should be devoted to the economic and social development of all nations and contribute to the bridging of the economic gap between developed and developing countries." (resolution S-10/2, para. 35)

Fifthly, nuclear disarmament has been given extremely high priority, as can be seen from the Final Document, which lays great emphasis on the responsibility of the nuclear-weapon countries.

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

In this connexion I should like to welcome the Soviet proposal referring to the need for an international agreement to be concluded to strengthen guarantees for the security of non-nuclear-weapon States since this would be pursuant to paragraph 59 of the Final Document. The special session laid emphasis on the need to establish non-nuclear-weapon zones and also the need to promote the establishment of such zones throughout the world in accordance with the final goal, namely, the creation of a world which is totally devoid of nuclear weaponry.

In this connexion, the situation in the Middle East is a very great danger. This was reflected in the Final Document in which it was requested that a non-nuclear-weapon zone be set up in the Middle East, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, whenever the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons occurs in any area.

Our delegation has fully appreciated the danger which threatens the Middle East in view of the actions of the Zionist entity which is now seeking to acquire nuclear weapons. The Government of Tel Aviv was not satisfied with setting up a conventional military force. According to the figures and statistics which have been provided, their budget can perhaps be regarded as one of the largest budgets in the world. It is the first in military budgets throughout the world in comparison with the gross national product. These figures in 1976 rose to 10 per cent of the total national income. The military budget from 1964 to 1965 amounted to \$3.7 billion, in other words, more than one third of the national income that year. The military budget of 1970 was 41 billion Israeli pounds as opposed to 54.5 billion Israeli pounds in 1968. Military imports for the previous year were \$1.3 billion as opposed to \$1.6 billion for this year, in addition to the fact that the Zionist entity proceeded to improve its nuclear weapons and also to stockpile these destructive weapons.

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

We have already published a study on this question, which was issued during the special session on disarmament. If we refer to sources in Israel and the West, we are confirmed in our conviction that Tel Aviv is attempting to accumulate a stock of nuclear weapons. From 1974 to 1976 the American Central Intelligence Agency revealed the fact that the Zionist entity possesses nuclear weapons. This was revealed by Mr. Richard Helms, the Chairman of the Central Intelligence Agency in 1974, and also by the Secretary of State for Technology attached to the Agency. The latter also revealed the fact that Israel possesses from 10 to 20 atomic bombs. This information was published on 14 September 1974 in a five-page document in accordance with United States information regulations. This document is the first official recognition on the part of the Americans that Israel is a nuclear Power.

On 12 April 1976 The New York Times published information that the number had risen to 13 atomic bombs, which were distributed to air force units during the October war. Nevertheless, Israel did not wish to make use of these bombs to reverse the course of the war in its favour. According to Maariv of 5 April 1976 these bombs have the same destructive power as those which were used on Nagasaki and Hiroshima. In December 1974 Ephraim Katzer, chief of the Hebrew State said:

"We still have the desire to get the necessary material to perfect our nuclear weapons. We intend to use every means in our power in order to further perfect our nuclear weapons so that we will have ever more sophisticated weapons to defend ourselves with".

At the beginning of 1976 Moshe Dayan declared:

"We are capable of manufacturing the atomic bomb and Israel should possess this weapon before the Arabs, but we shall not be the first to use it."

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

According to a spokesman from the Weizmann Institute, Israel is the eleventh country in the world which is capable of manufacturing an atomic bomb if it wishes to. According to the same Institute, Israel is capable of delivering that bomb on Phantom sky rockets, and also earth Jericho missiles which are built to carry nuclear weapons.

According to the International Strategic Institute, in its annual publication of 1974, there are two nuclear centres in Israel which are capable of manufacturing plutonium in order to produce nuclear bombs with a capacity of 10 to 20 kilotons.

According to the Strategic Defence Studies Centre at Canberra University, Australia, which in 1978 published a study entitled The Strategic State of 1980, Israel would be in a position to be a nuclear Power in 1980 if it wished to do so.

According to Moshe Dayan in an article published in Al Emsmar on 9 April 1976:

"The Americans and I do not follow the same course. In view of the fact that Egypt no longer has Soviet nuclear cover and since we wish to assure our presence in Jordan, we have to manufacture nuclear weapons. This has to be made into an official doctrine."

Professor Shlomo Ahrenson deduced from Mr. Dayan's statement that it was absolutely essential that the nuclear option be made an official part of the foreign policy of the Israeli State.

According to Patrick Moynihan, who until quite recently occupied the post of head of the United States delegation to the United Nations, it would be desirable for the world to know that there are atomic bombs in Israel - from 10 to 20 such bombs - so that no one should have any illusions about future developments.

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

In testimony given before the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate he said that it would be preferable for the world at large to be informed of that fact. Finally, we are aware that Israel took a negative attitude to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the United Nations resolution on the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, because the Government of Israel is not among those countries which signed that Treaty. On the other hand, all the Arab countries were in fact signatories to that Treaty.

Because of that, and pursuant to United Nations resolutions referring to the prohibition of nuclear weapons, and in order to bring about international peace and security, the Group of non-aligned countries submitted a draft resolution during the tenth special session of the General Assembly, a proposal entitled "Military and Nuclear Collaboration with Israel", of which 33 countries became co-sponsors. In the preamble of that draft, emphasis is placed on United Nations resolutions referring to the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. It expresses grave concern over the continued and rapid Israeli build-up, over the increasing evidence regarding Israeli attempts to acquire nuclear weapons, and also the threat which this policy represents to international peace and security, particularly since such weapons are designed to serve the expansionist designs of Israel and to deny the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine as recognized in General Assembly resolutions.

The Zionist entity has undertaken action in order to acquire nuclear weapons, and has not confined itself to that, but is also seeking to co-operate with the other racist entity, namely, the Government of South Africa. It is for that reason that we have introduced the relevant paragraph into the 33-Power text which refer to the danger which this represents to international peace and security.

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

The draft resolution in question is addressed to the Security Council in particular in order to make that body realize its responsibilities. It asks the Council to call upon all countries to refrain from providing the Zionist entity with any form of weapons whatsoever, to ensure that such supplies do not reach Israel through other parties and to end all transfer of nuclear equipment or fissionable material or technology to Israel. The draft resolution further requests the Security Council to establish machinery for supervising the implementation of those measures and invites all Governments and organizations to take all appropriate actions to promote the purposes of the resolution.

When the draft resolution was submitted to the special session, we were quite certain that it would receive considerable support, but we felt that there was a general trend in favour of producing a single document which could be approved by all countries without exception. As was the case with the sponsors of other draft resolutions, we agreed that that draft should be referred to the thirty-third regular session of the General Assembly so that a decision could be taken on it. That is why the General Assembly, at its meeting of 30 June 1978, decided to transmit the 33-Power draft resolution to its thirty-third regular session.

Today we have before us document A/C.1/33/L.1, and this is the draft resolution to which I have referred and which was previously introduced at the special session under the title "Military and Nuclear Collaboration with Israel". Here I should like to recall that the wording of this resolution as we now have it is very similar to another resolution previously adopted by the General Assembly, relating to military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa. The two drafts have almost the same title.

It is our hope that this draft will be adopted. It is not a new draft, because it was previously introduced at the tenth special session, as I have said, and all delegations have had an opportunity to study it. That is why it is our hope that this draft will be voted on after the discussion on the present agenda item, namely item 125.

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

Nuclear weapons are a matter of extreme seriousness, particularly the escalation of the Israeli military, because it does not only represent a danger to a single country, but imperils an area of great strategic importance in the world, that is, the entire Middle East. This also represents a danger to the world at large and for the future of mankind. For that reason, it is our bounden duty in the international community to prevent that danger. We have to make every country in the world aware of its responsibilities with regard to this very important question. We are sure that Members will adopt a position which will help to establish the precise role which the United Nations should play in this matter.

The delegation of the Iraqi Republic would like to reserve its right to speak again on this subject, if this should prove necessary.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the representative of Iraq has formally introduced the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.1 and has suggested that this Committee discuss it as soon as the general debate on item 125 has been concluded.

Mr. SAHINGUVU (Burundi) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, without wishing to violate the terms of the rules of procedure, I nevertheless feel that, speaking for the first time, I should address to you the warmest congratulations of the delegation of Burundi on your brilliant election to preside over the work of the First Committee. Your well known qualifications, both professional and human, as well as those of the other outstanding members of the Bureau, are an earnest of success in the work of our Committee, to which the General Assembly has entrusted an extremely important agenda, namely, consideration of the problem of disarmament.

(Mr. Sahinguvu, Burundi)

Because of its seriousness, the problem of disarmament has become a matter of world-wide concern. The holding of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and the very agenda of the First Committee, a Committee traditionally entrusted with important political problems, attest to this fact. In other words, disarmament has become a matter of extreme urgency and all nations, great and small, must contribute to its solution.

(Mr. Sahinguvu, Burundi)

The time when this problem was a private matter for the great Powers is over and thus the delegation of Burundi wishes to add its views and suggestions to those that have been made by others. The delegation of Burundi is aware of the fact that the present arms race constitutes a major obstacle to the development of nations and is a permanent threat of unprecedented global warfare, to say nothing of the impressive number of our fellow men who daily fall on the fields of battle and whose deaths so profoundly affect humanity.

The developed countries, though unable to meet the target of development aid set in the Development Decades, nevertheless devote enormous resources, both human and material, to their so-called defence. Military budgets constantly grow and thus considerably increase their stockpiles of weapons and their armed forces at the expense of assistance to the developing countries.

Terrified by the conflicts created on their frontiers and the amount of weaponry in the arsenals of their neighbours, the developing nations are themselves forced to increase their military budgets in order to be ready at all times to defend their own sovereignty and safeguard their territorial integrity. Populations that should be actively engaged in their own social and economic development are nevertheless diverted from their true objective in order to increase military personnel for the prevention of war or effectively to serve their own countries and flags when threatened by foreign aggression.

These two developments prove the extent to which the objectives of the Development Decades as well as those of the New International Economic Order have been jeopardized, as has the success of the will of peoples to emerge from under-development, a will which is making itself felt in most developing nations.

Since the end of the Second World War, because of the struggle for spheres of influence and profit the great Powers have competed in the manufacture and perfection of their weapons. In this field they have achieved an unprecedented technological revolution, to the extent that they now possess large arsenals of conventional, chemical, bacteriological, nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction.

(Mr. Sahinguvu, Burundi)

This competitive situation is not conducive to the creation of trust and normal relations among States and lately seems to have become more acute. Signs of a return to the cold war are appearing and, daily, points of tension are created in the world particularly in Africa.

The conflicts that break out in all parts of our continent as well as the constant challenge hurled at the international community by the racist minority régimes of southern Africa, all constitute subjects of concern to the delegation of Burundi and should be more seriously studied and examined by the international community.

The delegation of Burundi also feels that in order to strengthen international peace and security the international community itself should endeavour to achieve the following objectives, among others. First, to make Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East zones of peace; secondly, to demilitarize the Indian Ocean; thirdly, to put an end to the manufacture and perfecting of weapons of mass destruction; fourthly, to use nuclear techniques and energy for economic and non-military purposes; fifthly, to reduce military budgets and increase economic investments; sixthly, truly to undertake the process of general and complete disarmament.

By so doing, the delegation of Burundi is convinced that the international community will be able to give priority to the sector which deserves it, namely, the social and economic development of peoples, and will greatly help to improve international relations and do away with the danger of a world conflagration which would seriously jeopardize the very survival of mankind.

The tenth special session of the General Assembly was a very good step forward since it devoted itself to an in depth study of the question of disarmament and prepared a Programme of Action and machinery for disarmament which are worthy of the highest praise. The delegation of Burundi hopes that in the course of the present session the conclusions of that first world session on disarmament will be further strengthened so that they can be fully implemented as soon as possible.

(Mr. Sahinguvu, Burundi)

The delegation of Burundi welcomes the idea of holding a second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament within a reasonable time-limit, and a world conference on disarmament, thus speeding up discussions on disarmament and adopting decisions of a binding nature.

The principle of the renewal of the terms of office of the members of the Committee on Disarmament should be encouraged and strengthened in order to ensure the widest possible participation in the negotiations on a problem which is of such great importance and urgency. The disarmament fellowships should be granted bearing in mind not only geographical distribution but also the effective needs of the Members of the United Nations.

The delegation of Burundi is convinced that the political will of all States is an essential precondition for the implementation of the Programme of Action and of the disarmament machinery and it is within this framework that the Burundi delegation considers that the responsibility and the co-operation of the nuclear-weapon States is the major factor.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, since this is the first time that the delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic is speaking in this Committee at the present session of the General Assembly, I should like sincerely to congratulate you and the other officers of the Committee on your unanimous election to these responsible posts and express the hope that under your skilful guidance the Committee will accomplish useful work in the light of the decisions reached at the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament.

The tenth special session made it abundantly clear that the overwhelming majority of States throughout the world consider the cessation of the arms race and the implementation of genuine disarmament, and primarily of nuclear disarmament, as the most urgent task of the present time, a task of historic world importance.

The speedy resolution of the primary tasks relating to the field of disarmament is in full accord with the vital interests of all States and peoples throughout the world and will serve the purpose of deepening the process of détente and strengthening universal peace and security.

The adoption of the Final Document of the special session on a consensus basis very cogently demonstrates that whatever problems there may be and however complex and difficult, generally acceptable agreement can be reached provided that all parties concerned evince a constructive and realistic approach to the solution of the most urgent problems of contemporary international life.

The delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic would like to emphasize that the strict and conscientious observance of the fundamental principles underlying disarmament negotiations as laid down in the Final Document of the special session should serve as a basis if any further effective practical steps are to be taken in order to implement the main tasks in the field of disarmament.

(Mr. Endembileg, Mongolia)

It is generally recognized that the problem of disarmament is a universal one, and in order to attack it at its roots it is essential that joint efforts be made by all States of the world without exception, particularly all those Powers which possess nuclear weapons.

The adoption of disarmament measures, as stated in the Final Document, should be carried out duly observing the principle of not jeopardizing the security interests of any party to the talks. There are also other important principles relating to the conduct of disarmament negotiations by which all States should be guided. In this connexion, the delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic would like to draw representatives' attention to paragraph 41 of the Final Document which says:

"In order to create favourable conditions for success in the disarmament process, all States should strictly abide by the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, refrain from actions which might adversely affect efforts in the field of disarmament, and display a constructive approach to negotiations and the political will to reach agreements." (A/S-10/23, para. 41)

One of the most important results of the tenth special session was that, by taking a broad look at the question of disarmament, it unambiguously affirmed the direct interrelationship existing between disarmament, détente and the goals of development.

The fundamental purpose of efforts made by all States should now, as we see it, be to bring about the practical implementation of the very important steps outlined in the Programme of Action contained in the Final Document of the tenth special session. It is quite proper that among those urgent tasks a particular place is occupied by the cessation of the nuclear arms race and the question of nuclear disarmament. Therefore, in paragraph 50 particular emphasis is laid on the need for urgent negotiations to be held to reach agreement on the cessation of the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons, the cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, and the devising of a comprehensive phased Programme, for the gradual and balanced reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, leading to their ultimate and complete elimination.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

In this connexion, the Mongolian delegation would like to emphasize the importance of the concrete proposals made by the Soviet Union "on practical measures to end the arms race" and submitted to the tenth special session. In those proposals we found a deep reflection of a whole range of measures: putting a stop to the manufacture of nuclear weapons in all their forms; putting an end to the manufacture of, as well as the complete prohibition on, all forms of weapons of mass destruction; a prohibition on the creation of new forms of conventional weapons of massive destructive force; refraining from expanding armies and increasing the conventional weapons of the permanent members of the Security Council, as well as those countries allied to them by military agreements. We consider that the General Assembly at this session should, quite clearly and unambiguously, pronounce itself in favour of the implementation of those constructive proposals. The implementation of those urgent measures will, undoubtedly, serve the cause of achieving the final goal of general and complete disarmament.

The Mongolian People's Republic, like many other States, is fully in favour of the practical implementation of all the provisions contained in the Final Document. In this connexion, the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic warmly supports the new initiative taken by the Soviet Union at the present session of the General Assembly pursuant to paragraph 59 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The proposal made by the Soviet Union to conclude a convention on the strengthening of the security guarantees of non-nuclear States is, first, fully in accord with the interests of those States. Its implementation would undoubtedly make a considerable contribution to strengthening mutual trust among States and help to strengthen peace and security among peoples. In the opinion of our delegation concerted action and effort by all nuclear Powers in this particular area will be an important guarantee for success in the expeditious elaboration of such an international convention. The

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic would like to make further comments on this particular subject at a later stage.

In connexion with the most important measures to be adopted in the field of disarmament, the special session referred to the need to continue to bring about the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, to continue efforts to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones, and, in the purview of that forum were such urgent questions, the gradual reduction of military budgets and the restriction of sales of weapons and so on. The adoption of effective measures to restrict the arms race and bring about disarmament is of particular urgency under present conditions when the forces of international imperialism and big-Power chauvinism and reaction are making attempts to further foster an atmosphere of tension in certain parts of the world by indulging in flagrant interference in the internal affairs of States and encroaching on their sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

As we see it, the success of disarmament talks is something which affects all peoples of the world. Therefore all States must act in concert in order to achieve the goals of disarmament and promote any effort made in that area. At the same time, bilateral or regional talks on disarmament matters can play an important part and may well facilitate talks on multilateral disarmament agreements. In this connexion, we attach particular importance to the Soviet-American talks on the restriction of strategic offensive weapons, success in which will undoubtedly help to check the nuclear arms race. We should like in particular to draw attention to paragraph 122 of the Final Document of the special session, which states that a world disarmament conference should be convened at the earliest appropriate time. In order to ensure that that forum is adequately prepared for, we believe that a preparatory body should be established as soon as possible and the precise date for convening it should be determined.

With regard to the machinery for disarmament talks, there is every reason to believe that considerable changes are occurring in this field. First, the First Committee of the General Assembly, starting with this session, deals only with disarmament matters and related international security questions. Secondly, the Disarmament Commission, in whose work all States Members of the United Nations participate, has been renewed and has

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

already started to organize its work. Thirdly, not later than January 1979 the Geneva Committee on Disarmament will start its work with an enlarged membership. In this connexion, I should like to point out that there was a preconceived view which favoured simply disregarding the useful activity of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. We cannot agree with that. In speaking further about this we should like to express our conviction that, with its enlarged membership, the Committee on Disarmament will successfully continue its work in the common interest of implementing practical disarmament measures.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The Mongolian People's Republic would like to welcome the new members of the Committee on Disarmament and express its readiness to co-operate with them in a spirit of goodwill and mutual understanding. We hope that the participation of France in the activities of the Committee on Disarmament will serve as another factor encouraging further efforts by States in this area. In this connexion the Mongolian delegation considers that the constructive participation of all nuclear States in the work of this multilateral negotiating body will prove an important and favourable factor as regards the adoption of effective and radical steps to put an end to the arms race and bring about disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament.

As the Committee knows, in order to promote disarmament talks a new body will be set up - an advisory board to assist the United Nations Secretary-General, in accordance with paragraph 12⁴ of the Final Document of the special session.

Referring to these changes which have occurred in the negotiating machinery, we should like to recall that there was a time when it was asserted that the main reason for the lack of concrete success in disarmament talks was to be found in the imperfection of those bodies dealing with disarmament matters. Once again, we cannot agree with that viewpoint, since the main reason is essentially the lack of political will and decision on the part of certain Western negotiating partners in the attempt to achieve generally acceptable decisions on specific disarmament problems.

The Committee on Disarmament in Geneva has a great deal of complex work to do to reach agreed decisions on many urgent disarmament issues. As a member of that Committee, Mongolia considers that among the priority matters on the agenda of that multilateral and prestigious body should be included such items as the achievement of agreement on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, the prohibition of the creation of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction and the question of the comprehensive prohibition of chemical weapons.

The participation in the work of the special session of representatives of international non-governmental organizations and scientific research institutes lent further weight to the growing part played by public forces in taking decisions on disarmament matters and thus preserving and strengthening peace throughout the world.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

As the Committee knows, in order to bring about the broad and continued mobilization of world public opinion and to support the process of the cessation of the nuclear arms race and disarmament, the Mongolian People's Republic both in the Preparatory Committee and in the special session itself introduced the proposal to celebrate an international week to promote the objectives of disarmament. We are very pleased to note that the General Assembly has proclaimed the week starting 24 October, the day of the foundation of the United Nations, as a week devoted to fostering the objectives of disarmament.

In this connexion I have the honour, on behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Jordan, Nigeria, Venezuela and Mongolia, of introducing today at this meeting of the Committee a draft resolution entitled "International week devoted to fostering the objectives of disarmament", which has been circulated in document A/C.1/33/L.4 dated 20 October 1978.

This draft resolution speaks for itself. Nevertheless, my delegation would like to draw attention to its main points. The fundamental purpose of this draft resolution, as we see it, is to promote the efforts being made by Governments and various international organizations to promote broad measures to mobilize world public opinion in order to create an international atmosphere conducive to the implementation of further practical measures on the cessation of the arms race and disarmament. It is also proposed in the draft resolution that the United Nations and its relevant bodies assist in holding this Week, since we consider that their effective participation is important and necessary in order to ensure that this International Week helps to serve everything that fosters the efforts being made by States to put an end to the arms race and achieve disarmament.

The sponsors of the draft resolution hope that it will enjoy broad support among the members of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Israel has asked to exercise his right of reply. I need hardly remind him that there is a time-limit of 10 minutes for such replies.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): For a number of days now the First Committee has been discussing agenda item 125 and representatives of all regions of the world have been giving their views on the significance of the Final Document of the special session on disarmament. It has been a constructive and serious debate conducted with the quiet gravity the subject deserves.

Suddenly, this afternoon, an ugly and jarring note of discord and blind hostility has been struck on a subject that is totally extraneous to the deliberations on agenda item 125. It is therefore not without certain distaste that I have asked to speak in exercise of my right of reply to the statement of the representative of Iraq.

This Committee, it is true, has grown accustomed to the annual litany of hate against Israel which certain delegations feel obliged to introduce, strange as it may seem, into a debate, on peace and disarmament. These statements, such as the statement of the representative of Iraq this afternoon, are invariably accompanied by a mandatory ritualistic incantation coupling Zionism with racism and what have you.

I wonder if the representative of Iraq, while intoning the prescribed list of political expletives, ever looks up from his prepared text. I would advise him to do so. Perhaps, on seeing the expressions of utter boredom and listless resignation on the faces of so many representatives, it might dawn on him that political terminology like "Zionist entity", which is appropriate to the gatherings of certain kinds of political parties, is somewhat counter-productive when voiced at international conferences of sovereign States.

There exists a prescription for slander which is simple and effective: accuse your opponent of every possible crime regardless of truth and then watch him deny those charges as well as he can. The delegation of Israel is not going to oblige the representative of Iraq by refuting every allegation however absurd. Suffice it to say that I had occasion last year to refer to stories about nuclear weapons supposedly at the disposal of Israel. It was first reported in a journal which goes under the name of Rolling Stones. The veracity of these rumours can best be judged by the journalistic level of its original source.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

The Government of Israel has stated on several occasions that it would not be the first to introduce nuclear weapons into the Middle East. That is an official Government statement. It is an official undertaking of which responsible quarters the world over have duly taken note.

The First Committee has been discussing disarmament now for 33 years, and in the course of those deliberations it adopted some 300 resolutions. Even the most idealistic among us cannot pretend that the cause of disarmament has been greatly advanced in those 30-odd years. Nevertheless, we continue in our task because we have no choice but to persevere. Mankind, aware of the path to self-destruction which it now treads, allows the voice of its conscience to be heard in this Committee. Even if this is all that we are doing, we cannot allow ourselves to be deflected from our task and our ultimate goal by the introduction of extraneous issues. Above all, we do not sit in judgement of each other. We have no time for mutual recriminations.

Therefore, the intervention of the representative of Iraq today is not only demeaning in that it lowers the standard of the deliberations of this Committee, but it is also inimical to the principal aims of the Charter, as stated in its preamble: "to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another".

This is not the time to discuss draft resolutions, but this Committee has been saddled with a draft resolution which the special session quite rightly refused to consider. I put it to the Committee that if the special session did not consider the Iraqi draft resolution to be germane to the consideration of what became the Final Document, that same draft resolution is equally irrelevant when the implementation of that very document is being discussed.

However, I should like to ask for the right of my delegation to refer to this at the appropriate time.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to announce the following additional sponsors to draft resolutions: to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1, Guinea; to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.2, Egypt, Guinea and Bhutan; to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3, Egypt, Fiji and Guinea; and to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.4, Guinea.

I should also like to announce that the speakers' list for tomorrow is closed.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.