

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records*



UN/SA COLLECTION

FIRST COMMITTEE
48th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 22 November 1978
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 48TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PASTINEN (Finland)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 35: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE FIRST REVIEW CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SECOND CONFERENCE (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 36: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 32/76 CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL I OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TLATELOLCO) (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 37: CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 38: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 32/78: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 39: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 32/79 CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL II OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TLATELOLCO) (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 40: EFFECTIVE MEASURES TO IMPLEMENT THE PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DISARMAMENT DECADE: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 41: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE DENUCLEARIZATION OF AFRICA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 42: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN THE REGION OF THE MIDDLE EAST (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 43: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN SOUTH ASIA: 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-3550.

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.48
23 November 1978

ENGLISH

AGENDA ITEM 44: PROHIBITION OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND MANUFACTURE OF NEW TYPES OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION AND NEW SYSTEMS OF SUCH WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 45: REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 46: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE INDIAN OCEAN AS A ZONE OF PEACE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 47: GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT (continued):

- (a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;
- (b) REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY;
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 48: WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 49: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS OF USE OF CERTAIN CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WHICH MAY BE DEEMED TO BE EXCESSIVELY INJURIOUS OR TO HAVE INDISCRIMINATE EFFECTS: REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY CONFERENCE (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 35, 36, 37, 38, 49, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48 AND 49
(continued)

Mr. OGISO (Japan): Since I have already discussed SALT II, the comprehensive test ban, the cut-off of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes, a ban on chemical weapons, conventional arms control and disarmament, confidence-building measures and public information measures on disarmament in my statement before this Committee on 18 October during the discussion of agenda item 125, I should like today merely to state the views of my country on the issue that I did not cover in that statement. I am referring to the issue of the control of military uses of outer space a problem that is becoming an issue directly related to international security and is an important aspect of general and complete disarmament.

In considering military satellites, one should first note that orbiting reconnaissance satellites are becoming indispensable as a means of verification in negotiating such arms control agreements as a nuclear test-ban treaty and the second and third Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), and that they are regarded as being likely to play an important role in realizing the "effective international control" that is a prerequisite to the future achievement of general and complete disarmament.

In this connexion, my country has been interested in the French proposal regarding an international monitoring satellite agency but believes that there are a number of legal, financial and technological problems that require careful study before putting it into effect. Since the agency could only be set up with the co-operation of those countries that are capable of launching satellites or already operating them, it is desirable that consultations should take place among the concerned parties with a view to securing the participation of the aforementioned countries at every stage of the study to be undertaken by the United Nations bodies concerned.

We should further consider the fact that certain satellites play a crucial role in the present nuclear strategic system as early warning devices for the discovery of attacks by strategic missiles. In this connexion, we come

(Mr. Ogiso, Japan)

up against the issue of hunter-killer satellites. Clearly, if a nuclear-weapon State seeks to launch a pre-emptive first strike using nuclear weapons, it will at the same time have to attempt to destroy its enemy's reconnaissance satellites so as to keep the enemy from detecting the attack for as long as possible and thereby prevent any counter-attack. Indeed, articles in a number of newspapers and other public sources have reported that the major nuclear-weapon States are already developing so-called hunter-killer satellites for this purpose.

Now if the development of such hunter-killer satellites is pursued by one nuclear-weapon State, this may well lead other nuclear-weapon States to follow suit. It is also possible that missiles and laser beams would then be developed to destroy the hunter-killer satellites. In this connexion, I should like to reiterate the suggestion that I made last 14 March at the seventeenth session of the Legal Sub-Committee of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to the effect that we should consider

"various legal controls to be applied to satellites, especially those equipped with nuclear-power sources, including the possibility of prohibiting the launching of satellites designed for use as destructive weapons".

Having said all this, I should like to point out that in view of the fact that certain military satellites have a role to play as a means of verification in arms control and disarmament, we cannot deal with this problem simply through the principle of the denuclearization of outer space. Nevertheless, we are concerned over the possibility that, if we simply leave this problem untouched, such a course might intensify the arms race in outer space and may in the near future produce a situation that is beyond control. In this sense, I hope that the United States-USSR bilateral consultations referred to by the United States last 24 May at the special session on disarmament will achieve substantial progress in bringing about appropriate international negotiations for the prevention of an arms race in outer space, as provided for in paragraph 80 of the Final Document of the special session.

Now, I should like to take this opportunity to express the views of my delegation on two draft resolutions that are before us, beginning with that contained in document A/C.1/33/L.3 concerning a moratorium.

(Mr. Ogiso, Japan)

In its statement before the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on 2 March 1978, my delegation proposed that a moratorium should be declared on all nuclear-test explosions, including explosions for peaceful purposes, until a comprehensive test-ban treaty comes into force. My delegation further stated that

"the matter of our greatest concern to us is naturally the early conclusion of the treaty. However, through the declaration of such a moratorium, these countries should at least show the international community how much they are aware of their responsibility, and they should express their conscientious intention not to use the delay of treaty negotiations as an excuse for the continuation of nuclear testing". (CCD/PV.776, p. 10)

(Mr. Ogiso, Japan)

My delegation still maintains that view and therefore appreciates the efforts of the co-sponsors in submitting this draft resolution.

We are aware, of course, of the view that a moratorium is not helpful in sustaining the momentum toward concluding a treaty on a comprehensive nuclear test ban. However, my delegation feels that, in view of the fact that all nuclear-weapon States have been conducting nuclear-weapon tests either in the atmosphere or under ground, and that frustration among the world community on disarmament has been generated by the failure of the trilateral negotiations to yield concrete results even after having continued for so long, a moratorium is still meaningful in the sense that the nuclear-weapon States would thereby cease to conduct nuclear-weapon tests in any environment whatever, and that the very fact that a moratorium lacks any means of verification would serve as a further stimulus for the expeditious conduct of the tripartite negotiations on a comprehensive test ban. Based upon this position, the attitude of Japan to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.3 before us is generally favourable.

However, since Japan, together with a number of other countries, has consistently taken the position that under a comprehensive test ban, and also under a moratorium, no nuclear explosion should be conducted by any country under any pretext whatsoever, I wish to propose the following amendments, contained in document A/C.1/33/L.8, to the operative part of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3, in order to make this point abundantly clear.

First, in order to arrest the nuclear arms race it is absolutely necessary to prevent any further increase in the number of nuclear-weapon States. Therefore, my delegation would propose a formulation at the beginning of the operative paragraph of this draft resolution, as follows:

"Calls upon all States, in particular all the nuclear-weapon States ...,"

instead of the formulation:

"Calls upon all nuclear-weapon States ...".

This formulation is also intended to help alleviate the concern of the world community that certain non-nuclear-weapon States might produce nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Ogiso, Japan)

Needless to say, my delegation understands that in the task of achieving the goals of nuclear disarmament all the nuclear-weapon States bear a special responsibility, as noted in paragraph 48 of the Final Document. Hence, while stressing the special responsibility of all the nuclear-weapon States, I expressed our deep regret, in my previous statement on 18 October 1978 before this Committee, that during the year since the last session of the General Assembly nuclear weapon tests have still been conducted by them.

Secondly, it is not entirely clear whether or not this draft resolution covers peaceful nuclear explosions. As I said before, it is part of Japan's basic policy on nuclear disarmament that no peaceful nuclear explosion should be conducted unless an international agreement is reached on an international supervision and control system which will ensure that no weapons-testing can be carried out in the name of peaceful nuclear explosions. My delegation would therefore propose, at the end of the same paragraph, the phrase:

"... to refrain from conducting any testing of nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices",

instead of the present formulation:

"... to refrain from conducting any further testing of nuclear weapons."

As the Committee will have noticed, since we refer to all States, we should delete the word "further" immediately before "testing".

If the co-sponsors accept these amendments, then my delegation is ready to become a co-sponsor of this draft resolution.

With regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.4 concerning an international disarmament week, my delegation informally made several substantial comments on paragraphs 1 and 2 of its operative part and appreciates that the original co-sponsors have accommodated all our comments. Hence, my country has become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.4/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will have noted that during his statement the representative of Japan was good enough to introduce his delegation's amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3. Those amendments are contained in document A/C.1/33/L.8. The Japanese delegation also declared itself a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.4/Rev.1.

The next speaker on my list is the representative of Sweden who has asked to speak in order to introduce the draft amendments by the Swedish delegation to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3, and also to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.17/Rev.1.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): I shall first introduce my delegation's amendments to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.3, entitled "Urgent need for cessation of further testing of nuclear weapons". Our amendments to that draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/33/L.33, and they concern the first two paragraphs of the preamble.

To the first paragraph of the preamble our amendments would add more weight to the aspect of the health of present and future generations of mankind. We propose a change in the second paragraph of the preamble in order to obtain a clearer distinction between the arms race aspect and the aspect of horizontal proliferation. If these amendments are acceptable to the original sponsors of the draft resolution, Sweden will be happy to join the group of sponsors.

It is my pleasure now to turn to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.17/Rev.1, entitled "The study on the relationship between disarmament and development". The co-sponsors of that resolution are Botswana, Denmark, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Jamaica, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Romania, Senegal, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela and Zambia. I should like to take this opportunity to express my delegation's thanks for the contributions of the delegations of those countries and also our thanks to the delegations which in their statements here have expressed support of this draft resolution.

The grave economic and social consequences of the ongoing arms race and the relationship between disarmament and development are problems which practically all speakers have emphasized in the present debate, as well as in most previous disarmament debates in this forum. At the tenth special session of the General Assembly there seemed to be unanimity from the beginning

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

that the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee should be followed to the effect that the Secretary-General should be requested to initiate a study on the relationship between disarmament and development.

Another point of great satisfaction was that the special session had no difficulty in reaching a consensus in adopting as terms of reference for the study those which were contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Group appointed by the Secretary-General in accordance with General Assembly resolution 32/88 A of 12 December 1977.

Let me recall that according to this decision the study should cover the following three main areas: first, present day utilization of resources for military purposes; secondly, economic and social effects of a continuing arms race and of the implementation of disarmament measures; thirdly, conversion and redeployment of resources released through disarmament measures from military purposes to economic and social development purposes.

The special session also underlined, as is stated in its Final Document, that the study should be made in the context of how disarmament can contribute to the establishment of the New International Economic Order. I shall not here quote the whole of paragraph 95, but I think it is particularly important to recall that it was also stated that a principal aim should be to produce results that could effectively guide the formulation of practical measures to reallocate at the local, national, regional and international levels the resources which are now being used for military purposes.

We have now through the Secretary-General received a first report of the Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which was appointed by the Secretary-General pursuant to the decision by the special session. As we may recall, the special session requested the Secretary-General to submit an interim report on the subject to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session. The Group of Governmental Experts decided at its first session, which was held in September, that it might be of interest for this thirty-third session of the General Assembly to have an organizational report on its work. As can be read in that report,

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

which is contained in document A/33/317, the Group agreed on a number of proposals concerning the organization of, and a tentative time-table for, its work.

As regards the organization of the work I wish to draw the Committee's attention in particular to the following questions.

First, the financing of the study. The Group emphasized that every effort should be made to secure financial resources from the regular budget of the United Nations, which is, if I may recall, a long-established rule. The Group also felt however that the study no doubt would require additional voluntary contributions. For such voluntary contributions the Secretary-General has already established a special fund - the Disarmament Project Fund - and I may add that this fund has received its first contribution and others have been pledged.

The Group has declared its intention to assess at the earliest possible moment the total financial cost of the study. The Group has recommended that the Secretary-General appeal to all Governments to make voluntary contributions to the Disarmament Project Fund and/or to finance the cost, in domestic currency where appropriate, of carrying out research projects.

I may in a few words explain why the Group has felt it necessary to have recourse to this extraordinary form of financing. The Group is required in its terms of reference to place special emphasis on securing broad participation in the study. The Group will therefore ensure that institutions and researchers in as many countries as possible are engaged in the research projects. In particular it would be of importance, as is stated by the Group, that research institutions in developing countries are engaged in the work. Consequently, the study, in addition to data and information supplied by Governments, will be based upon research projects carried out for this purpose by a number of specially selected research institutions and individual researchers in co-operation with the United Nations Centre for Disarmament.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

I may add the information that invitations have been sent out to a large number of research institutions and researchers to submit research project proposals, and that the group at its next meeting in January will select the projects. It may then be possible also to make a preliminary assessment of the total financial costs of the study.

A second important question I should like to draw to the Committee's attention concerns the possibility of enlarging the circle of participants in the study. The group recommended, as stated in its report, that Governments, non-governmental organizations and research institutions for this purpose organize conferences and international symposia on the subject of disarmament and development with a large participation of representatives of public and private organizations, especially from the developing countries.

Finally, I should like briefly to recall that the group states in its report that it had agreed upon a tentative time-table. According to that the main research work will be carried out during the year 1979 and the group will endeavour to finalize the main report during the spring and summer of 1980, so that it can be submitted to the General Assembly one year ahead of the time envisaged by the special session.

Since the draft resolution is largely of a procedural nature, I think I may be allowed to be rather brief in its presentation. In its operative paragraph 1 it takes note of the organizational report of the group of governmental experts on which I have already commented. It then spells out the appeal, recommended by the group, namely that all Governments seriously consider giving, as supplement to financial resources for the study from the regular budget of the United Nations, voluntary contributions to the Disarmament Project Fund, or to finance, on a voluntary basis, in domestic currency, where appropriate, national research projects, in order to ensure adequate total resources necessary to carry out the study. A second appeal is made in the draft resolution to Governments to make available data and information relevant to a meaningful completion of the study. Finally, it proposes that the General Assembly should decide to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-fourth session an item entitled "Interim report of the Secretary-General with respect to the expert study on the relationship between disarmament and development".

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

I should like to finish my introduction by saying that the sponsors hope that it will be possible to adopt this draft resolution by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair has noted the desire of the sponsors that draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.17/Rev.1 will be adopted by consensus when the Committee comes to that stage.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): I apologize to the speakers who are already inscribed on the list of speakers today but if you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words at this stage in response to the amendments introduced by the delegations of Japan and Sweden. I believe that my statement, which will be brief, will help the Committee in its work.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of India.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): I am speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3, which calls for the cessation of further testing of nuclear weapons by all nuclear-weapon States. The sponsors are very grateful that our draft resolution has met with a wide measure of support in this Committee. We have discussed it with a number of delegations on an informal basis, and we are encouraged by the very positive interest which the members have shown in our proposal. We appreciate particularly the efforts which the delegations of Japan and Sweden have made to put forward concrete amendments to this draft resolution. We have considered those amendments and, in the light of the explanations given by their sponsors, I am happy to announce that they are acceptable to us.

With regard to the first amendment proposed by the delegation of Japan, which would replace the reference to "all the nuclear-weapon States" by "all States, in particular all the nuclear-weapon States", I should like to make it clear that by saying that in accepting the amendment the sponsors would not in any manner wish to detract from the special responsibility of the nuclear-weapon States in this field, because it is only those States which are at

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

present carrying out tests of one kind or the other. The non-nuclear-weapon States are by definition non-nuclear-weapon and are not conducting any nuclear-weapon tests, or any other tests for that matter. So, while accepting the Japanese amendment, we would like this to be very clearly reflected in the records of our Committee.

As regards the second amendment proposed by the delegation of Japan, the sponsors have had no difficulty in accepting that. The same applies to the amendments submitted by the Swedish delegation. We feel that they express our meaning perhaps even better than we had succeeded in expressing it in our original text, and for that reason the Swedish amendments are also acceptable to the sponsors.

We have noted that the authors of these amendments have indicated that they would be prepared to become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3 if the amendments are accepted. We would be very happy to have Japan and Sweden join us as sponsors of the draft resolution and we hope and trust that the acceptance of these amendments will encourage many other delegations in this Committee to join in sponsoring the draft resolution and in promoting our common objective.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of India for his acceptance on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3 of the amendments put forward and introduced today by the delegations of Japan and Sweden.

I call now on the first speaker in the general debate for this afternoon, the representative of Uruguay.

Mr. CAMPS (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): May I begin with a quotation from the statement of my Foreign Minister, Mr. Adolfo Folle Martinez, during the general debate on 2 October:

"Uruguay is clearly aware of its position and responsibilities in the international arena. We know that the world is undergoing a period of transition and a crisis of values, an age in which the acceleration and diversification of every relationship be it cultural, political, economic, or technical, make our planet a one-way circuit, where no one can ignore anyone else's fate.

"Interdependence and consequently solidarity, which, after all, are the only valid answers, have ceased to be an option and have become a necessity and an imperative need. Therefore, and although it could be argued that the world's fate and the solution of its great political problems depend partly on an agreement and the goodwill of the world Powers, we must be concerned with everything that happens for we have not only the right but the duty to put forward our opinion, thus contributing with our thoughts to the search for rational solutions."

(A/33/PV.15, p. 26)

It is in that same general spirit that my delegation wishes to comment on the items now before us - those on disarmament and related international security questions, as recommended in resolution A/S-10/2, which was adopted at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The spirit to which I refer reflects the constant concern of my country for problems that affect the survival of mankind.

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

In 1969, in its resolution 2602 E (XXIV) the General Assembly proclaimed the Disarmament Decade, which is now coming to a close, and it is with concern that we evaluate the results achieved.

If we compare what was stated by all delegations at that time with their recent statements in the debates of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and in this Committee, it will be apparent that the intentions expressed remain the same, but with one major difference: that today, qualitatively and quantitatively, the stockpiles of weapons are known to be greater.

The proclamation of the Disarmament Decade aroused optimistic expectations among mankind, which was threatened with self-destruction in the event of a war, particularly one in which atomic weapons might be used. At the same time, those optimistic expectations of an agreement on general and complete disarmament created the illusion among the peoples of the world that technological development would be achieved for the application of nuclear energy to peaceful purposes, particularly in the less developed countries, by means of international co-operation in accordance with agreed and adequate safeguards to be applied without discrimination.

We note, as is stated in resolution A/S-10/2, as well as in the debates of this Committee, that, not only have the objectives set by the General Assembly in 1969 not been achieved, but the arms race has gained considerable momentum. This situation, which hampers every effort to achieve a relaxation of international tensions, has totally adverse effects on the economic and social conditions of peoples.

Almost unanimously, delegations have referred with disappointment to the fact that no effective measures for disarmament or for the prevention of nuclear war have been taken, and calls for the adoption of such measures are heard not only here but in the streets and in the most distant corners of the world.

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

Our country shares that concern, as well as the view that in taking non-proliferation measures we should not jeopardize the full exercise of the inalienable right of all States to implement and develop their own programmes for the peaceful use of nuclear energy for economic and social development, in accordance with their respective national priorities, interests and needs.

Despite our declared concern, we recognize that some advances have been made which, as we have already said, while not meeting the original objectives, do offer a glimmer of hope that we shall attain them.

In this connexion, we would cite the positive attitude of the Government of the United States of America in having signed Additional Protocol I to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, the Treaty of Tlatelolco, and we voice the hope that ratification will soon follow. Similarly, we welcome the news that soon France will do likewise.

We are also pleased by the positive attitude of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in having signed Additional Protocol II to the Treaty of Tlatelolco and by its announcement that it will soon ratify that Protocol, thus joining the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, France and China, for which countries that Additional Protocol has already entered into force.

It is our hope that sensible agreements will be reached on the establishment of denuclearized zones in other parts of the world. At the same time, we confidently expect the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to reach an agreement during the second round of Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT II), scheduled to begin in Mexico next month, because an agreement on this subject could represent an important step towards nuclear disarmament.

To refer specifically now to resolution A/S-10/2, adopted at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, I wish to state that my country agrees with it almost in its entirety.

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

We think it suitable to have requested the Secretary-General to establish an advisory board of eminent persons:

" ... to advise him on various aspects of studies to be made under the auspices of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and arms

limitation, including a programme of such studies". (A/RES/S-10/2, para. 124)

Perhaps it would be beneficial for the advice provided to the Secretary-General by that board - that is to say, its eventual conclusions - to be transmitted to the General Assembly at its next session.

We also welcome the decision in paragraph 126 of that resolution, since it shows a positive collective intention when it states:

"In adopting this Final Document, the States Members of the United Nations solemnly reaffirm their determination to work for general and complete disarmament and to make further collective efforts aimed at strengthening peace and international security; eliminating the threat of war, particularly nuclear war; implementing practical measures aimed at halting and reversing the arms race; strengthening the procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes; and reducing military expenditures and utilizing the resources thus released in a manner which will help to promote the well-being of all peoples and to improve the economic conditions of the developing countries." (Ibid., para. 126)

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

I would not wish to conclude without referring to the various proposals submitted at that special session which are summarized in paragraph 125. In particular I wish to refer to those submitted by the great Powers. We hope that they are inspired by the concept stated in paragraph 126 which I just quoted, because that would reaffirm the objectives of resolution 2602 E (XXIV) of 1969 which proclaimed the Disarmament Decade, facilitating the conclusion and effective implementation of disarmament agreements and accepting appropriate verification provisions for these agreements.

Mr. RAKOTONIAINA (Madagascar)(interpretation from French): During the tenth special session of the General Assembly, we had ample opportunity to express our views on the various issues relating to disarmament and arms control. More recently, when this Committee was considering recommendations adopted at the special session, we had another opportunity to state our views on the best manner of moving towards the objectives contained in the Final Document of the special session. Today we have another opportunity to deal with the same issues. My delegation's statement will deal with some items on our agenda, because we feel that most of the other items have been dealt with in earlier statements in this Committee and elsewhere.

The world very quickly became aware of the danger of nuclear arms to mankind. Unable to eliminate such weapons quickly, our society seems to have settled for the expedient of trying to prevent the proliferation of these weapons, and the efforts to that end led to the conclusion of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. In its dual role that Treaty basically deals with two issues: preventing the acquisition of nuclear weapons by States which at present do not possess them, and curbing the nuclear arms race.

The undertaking by non-nuclear-weapon States not to acquire such weapons and that by the nuclear Powers to take measures for effective disarmament or arms control could have been a good point of departure and they could have created a climate of increased mutual trust. However, unfortunately, the will and sincerity of nuclear States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty have not stood the test of time. We feel that nuclear States parties to the Treaty should immediately consider abiding by the obligations which they voluntarily accepted under that Treaty.

(Mr. Rakotoniaina, Madagascar)

Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa has been on our agenda for years, but we have never been able actually to implement it. My delegation does not believe that African countries have abandoned the objective of making Africa a nuclear-weapon-free zone. The main obstacle to this undertaking is to be found elsewhere. South Africa persists in continuing its nuclear programme, which gives it the potential ability to produce nuclear weapons, thus endangering peace and security in that part of the world. States which are partners of South Africa will bear a heavy responsibility if they assist Pretoria in its nuclear activities.

Chemical and bacteriological weapons could lead to uncontrollable competition. An increase in and further sophistication of such weapons could one day make control difficult, if not impossible. So my delegation feels that the new negotiating machinery should give priority attention to that category of weapons.

At the highest level attention has been drawn to the scandalous situation which is a fact in the world today, namely, the extremely distressing contrast between poverty in the developing countries and the squandering of human and material resources for the manufacture and further development of arms. Interdependence of nations requires that the richer countries come to the assistance of the poorer ones. However, generosity would be meaningless if it was not accompanied by measures that would ensure not only material security but also security in the broadest sense of the word.

It is quite natural that my country, an island in the Indian Ocean, should be concerned over what happens in the Indian Ocean area. The international situation and the political and military situations in that part of the world have a great influence on tranquillity in the region. However, proposals by countries which really wish to make that region an area of peace are not always received with the best will in the world. Now that disarmament is an issue which it seems is being dealt with afresh the major Powers and major maritime users should reconsider their reluctance to join the effort to make the Indian Ocean a true zone of peace.

(Mr. Rakotoniaina, Madagascar)

Having made those few comments, and in the light of the fact that the new disarmament machinery will have to deal in greater depth with the issues before us, we feel it would be a good idea to learn the lessons of past experience.

First of all, my delegation feels that any agreement or arrangement that emerges so far as disarmament or arms control is concerned should reflect an acceptable balance of obligations. We recognize that the great Powers have a major role to play and special responsibilities in respect of disarmament, but we continue to believe that it is not fair to demand from others more than one is willing to give in return.

Next - and this is not the least important point, we feel - States should, in all good faith and diligently, live up to the commitments into which they have entered voluntarily. Otherwise our efforts would simply end in disillusionment and disenchantment.

But how can we encourage those who are rather reluctant to join the disarmament undertaking if, from the outset, they realize that some States are ready to go along with some things that are hardly such as to guarantee their security?

Those are, in our opinion, a few guidelines that we might use as a basis in future when we work on initiatives that we will be taking within the context of disarmament and arms control.

Mr. SHIPTON (Australia): The Australian delegation wishes to intervene at this point in the debate to make a few remarks about nuclear testing.

I believe the strength of Australia's opposition to nuclear testing is so well known that I do not now have to set out at length actions taken by Australia in the past in opposition to nuclear testing. When appropriate, Australia has been prepared to undertake necessary action in international forums to press for an end to testing. That is why Australia welcomed the negotiations among the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union over a draft comprehensive test ban treaty which commenced last year. The Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Fraser, reaffirmed Australia's position at the tenth special session of the General Assembly when he described the cessation of nuclear weapon testing in all environments as an urgent objective which was more immediately achievable than other nuclear arms control measures.

As we said in our statement under item 125, our view is that the appropriate action to be taken by the Assembly this year ought to be to press the nuclear-weapon States which have been negotiating to conclude, as soon as possible, their discussions to enable the Committee on Disarmament to commence its urgent task of preparing a treaty.

Therefore Australia is pleased to be associated with draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.1, which was introduced by our neighbour and close friend in the Pacific, New Zealand. This draft is designed to achieve the goal I have just outlined.

The key to this draft resolution is its time-table. It envisages commencement of negotiation of a treaty in the Committee on Disarmament as soon as it starts in January 1979 and it envisages conclusion of negotiations before the commencement of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. The omnibus resolution, A/C.1/33/L.11, on the results of the tenth special session, contains a similar sentiment. However, the language in document A/C.1/33/L.11 is deficient because it does not set any terminal date for the conclusion of negotiations.

(Mr. Shipton, Australia)

Some delegations have commented that the proposal in document A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.1 that negotiations should conclude before the thirty-fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly would not provide the Committee on Disarmament with adequate time to consider the question properly. My delegation finds these comments puzzling. There is unanimity that conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty is urgent. There should be ample time available to the Committee on Disarmament if it utilized all the time which might be available to it and gave the comprehensive test ban question priority. In saying this, I assume that the Committee on Disarmament, having a major task to tackle, will work at a more productive pace than the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament was able to. Surely, also, the urgency of the issue would justify scheduling extra meetings of the Committee on Disarmament to expedite conclusion of the consideration of a comprehensive test ban treaty, if that were warranted.

The comment has also been made that the language in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.1 is too soft. Let me say this. The strength of this draft resolution lies in the tight time-table it proposes. The goal of the co-sponsors of this draft resolution is to have the negotiating nuclear-weapon States accept such a time-table. This is the most effective way to realize the objective of urgent conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty. My delegation has no substantive difficulty with stronger language. In the past we have endorsed very strong language in resolutions on this subject; but, given the stage which we understand discussions about a treaty have reached, it is virtual consensus about a time-table rather than stronger expressions of opinion which would be more effective in realizing conclusion of a treaty.

However, there is another specific proposal about nuclear testing before us. Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3, which was introduced by India, proposed a moratorium on all nuclear testing. Our hope had been this year to concentrate the opinion of representatives in this Assembly into a single resolution on the subject urging the three nuclear-weapon States which have been negotiating to conclude quickly their discussions. But it is clear that there is a wish to have two expressions of opinion. One, that of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3,

(Mr. Shipton, Australia)

is to call for a moratorium on all nuclear testing. The other, the approach in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.1, is to set out a time-table for early negotiation of a treaty banning nuclear tests. Each of these texts is designed to achieve a separate purpose. We note changes to the text of document A/C.1/33/L.3 which are contained in documents A/C.1/33/L.8 and A/C.1/33/L.33 and which the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3 have just accepted. I take pleasure in announcing now that Australia wishes to join the co-sponsors of what we presume will be draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3/Rev.1. There also appears to be a common attitude among a number of supporters of both draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3 and draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.1 that both texts be kept distinct. This approach not only is logical, since there is no sense in adopting two similar resolutions, but is the only way in which each resolution can achieve the purpose for which each was designed.

The question has been asked why draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.1 addresses itself only to those three nuclear-weapon States which are discussing a comprehensive test ban treaty text and does not appear to address itself directly to the activities of the other two nuclear-weapon States which have not given an indication of preparedness to join a treaty prohibiting testing or any negotiations for that purpose. The answer to this is quite straightforward. Three nuclear-weapon States have already accepted legal obligations under the partial test ban Treaty and the Non-Proliferation Treaty to cease nuclear testing. They have now also demonstrated a preparedness to negotiate a treaty. The view of the Australian Government is that it is more important that these States be encouraged to take steps to realize the obligations they have already undertaken to restrict the development of their nuclear arsenals than it is to defer any action until such time as all nuclear-weapon States are ready to negotiate a treaty. Of course, it remains the Australian Government's view that all States, particularly all nuclear-weapon States, should join in a treaty prohibiting all nuclear testing. It is a matter for regret that France and China are not yet prepared to signify willingness to cease testing by joining the other three nuclear-weapon States in their discussions about a comprehensive test ban.

(Mr. Shipton, Australia)

Draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.1 and A/C.1/33/L.3 neatly complement each other. One would call upon all States to cease all nuclear testing. The other would urge those three nuclear-weapon States which have already accepted an obligation to do so to take the necessary steps to enable the opening for signature of a comprehensive test ban treaty.

The CHAIRMAN: I take note of the announcement by the representative of Australia that Australia will be a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3.

Mr. AL-KOYUMI (Oman) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation has examined the documents before it and has also followed with great interest the deliberations of this Committee so far, but in fact we have not found a great deal we can add to what we said at the tenth special session or at previous sessions. Since that time no noticeable progress has been made, and no steps that we could describe as positive have been taken in the various fields of disarmament. So far the results of the current Disarmament Decade, which is coming to a close, have in sum been negative. In fact we could say that things are going from bad to worse. The arms race continues and becomes more acute, while the feeling prevails in the world in the present circumstances that there is a lack of any effective world security system that would provide countries, particularly the small countries, with a feeling of security and peace and protect them from interference in their internal affairs. At the same time, there is little hope for finding solutions to the problems of poverty and underdevelopment and achieving a New International Economic Order which would be more equitable to the developing countries, as envisaged in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, which we, along with others, regard as a framework covering all the problems in disarmament, and at the same time an expression of the hope of finding serious and effective solutions to these problems in order to save mankind from the possibility of total destruction or at least to reduce the problems of rivalry and the stockpiling of the most destructive and deadly weapons.

(Mr. Al Koyumi, Oman)

We agree with those who have said that the tenth special session devoted to disarmament has produced a framework for a world strategy for disarmament, and for our part we support these results and join with others who have preceded us in expressing the hope that the aspirations will be achieved and that the next disarmament decade will achieve what the first one failed to secure. The responsibility for meeting these aspirations, though it is a group responsibility in which each participates according to his capabilities, falls nevertheless on the shoulders of the major Powers, and particularly on the two super-Powers. It goes without saying that we cannot expect any kind of progress in the field of disarmament, whether at the international or regional level, unless these countries implement their commitments and take serious steps to achieve the objectives as stipulated in the Final Document of the tenth special session.

The most urgent problem on our agenda is that of nuclear disarmament and the need to eliminate the tremendous stockpile of weapons of mass destruction that can be found in the arsenals of the major nuclear Powers. If we maintain the present situation and continue to have the potential to destroy mankind ten times over, that would be inconsistent with what some have said here in this Committee in affirmation of the spirit of co-operation and the proclamation of intent to achieve disarmament. We hope, for our part, that the political will of the nuclear Powers will be equal to the responsibility or the level of their statements until we can restore some degree of hope and faith in a better future.

We have before us today a number of items relating to the creation of zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones. The delegation of Oman has previously supported such efforts, believing in the importance of the steps that can be taken at the regional level, whether in Latin America, in the Middle East, in South Asia or in the Indian Ocean; and we, with others, have called for respect for the desire of the countries of the areas concerned to create these zones of peace and that the nuclear Powers should be committed to this. At the same time, there should be an effective system for guarantees of the security at an international level, effectively for the countries of these areas. We believe in the importance and the need of United Nations participation in

(Mr. AL-Koyumi, Oman)

supporting the proposals for the creation of zones of peace. For our part and in line with the opportunities we have available to us we look forward to the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace so that this may benefit our area and our peoples.

When we speak of this area, which is of vital interest to us because of the geographical position of Oman, which borders on the ocean, we can but express our sorrow that there has been an impasse in the negotiations between the two super-Powers in this field. We also view with great concern the increased infiltration and foreign military presence in our area. We are also following with care the attempts to secure new spheres of influence and the plots to dominate the fate of the peoples of the area, as well as the attempts of some to create disturbances in order to destroy the peace and security of these countries.

We call insistently for the taking of effective and realistic steps to prevent this dangerous trend and to maintain the security of this area and make it a zone of peace removed from external conflicts so that all the countries of the area may enjoy the necessary peace and security in order to advance their efforts for development and construction and to remove them from the conflicts of the great Powers and the attempts to win new spheres of influence.

In our statement at the tenth special session, we expressed our hope for and support of an increased activity of the current negotiating body in the field of disarmament, and we welcomed the steps taken during that session in that field, particularly with regard to strengthening the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, and we look with great hope to the new Committee's meeting at the beginning of next year in the expectation of the opening of a new era in international negotiations and fully confident that its members will overcome the impediments and circumstances that have hindered the work of the old Committee in past years, particularly now that the responsibilities of the new Committee have been set out and which it cannot shirk because more countries are carrying out consultations and negotiations outside the Committee, a fact that could be used as justification for stopping its work.

We hope that this Committee will also give the greatest priority and importance to the problem of chemical weapons, since we all know that, in spite of repeated appeals of the General Assembly in recent years on the need to reach an effective

(Mr. Al-Koyumi, Oman)

and total ban on the production and manufacture of chemical weapons as well as for the total destruction of the stockpiles thereof, the Committee has nevertheless failed in its efforts until now on the pretext that there were bilateral negotiations being held on this topic. We know that the path is not an easy one and that there are problems and obstacles to controlling certain chemicals used in the manufacture of these weapons and which are at the same time used in industrial production. We also know that all the details of the problem have been discussed time and again at the level of technical and military experts. As far as we are concerned, only the political will is lacking, a will that we hope will now evince itself in order that we may reach an acceptable formula in line with what the Committee achieved in the field of the prohibition of bacteriological (biological) weapons.

My delegation has considered the report presented by the Preparatory Conference for the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, weapons whose use has caused great suffering and pain to civilians. As we all know, there has been a general consensus that the time has come to prohibit incendiary bombs, shrapnel and small calibre weapons and projectiles and other weapons that do not differentiate between civilian and military targets.

In this context, I can only express my regret in noting that the military and technical aspects of the work of this Committee have superseded the more important aspect, which is the human one, in the negotiations that took place recently in order to prohibit such weapons. The same thing happened previously at the Conference on the development of international humanitarian law applicable in armed conflicts, and we hope that the next session will achieve a greater basis of agreement on the prohibition of such weapons and that the developing countries may have an opportunity to participate on an equal basis in this context.

In conclusion, I hope that when we meet again at the next session to discuss the items on disarmament we may be able to note effective steps towards the achievement of the objectives of disarmament, that we do not find ourselves once again caught in a vicious circle and that international circumstances will allow the progress that we all hope for.

Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): The question of general and complete disarmament, which represents one of the important items being discussed in this hall, has become a main objective for all peoples of the world and of their peace- and freedom-loving forces which aspire to create a world free of all means of threats and aggression. In spite of the efforts exerted by the United Nations in the field of disarmament, the world is still living in an era characterized by violence and threats of destructive war, since force has not been overcome as a means of solving conflicts. The circumstances which have required the convening of a special session devoted to disarmament still prevail and the arms race increases day by day, constituting an escalating threat to international peace and security. The current stage of military technology - particularly nuclear technology - have led to the development and proliferation of weapons of great destructive capacity which can destroy all of humanity. The arsenals of the great Powers, and particularly their nuclear-weapon arsenals, are increasing daily and this has made disarmament more difficult and complex. We regard with great anxiety the fact that the United States is developing the neutron bomb, despite the fact that the United Nations General Assembly has indicated the prohibition of the development of nuclear weapons as one of the urgent measures in this context. In addition, the postponement of the SALT II discussions is also regrettable; in fact it is likely to have a very negative effect upon international relations as a whole.

The first Disarmament Decade is coming to a close and the hope expressed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Waldheim, for the achievement of noticeable progress towards general and complete disarmament by the end of the 1970s has not as yet materialized. That means that one of the aims of the Disarmament Decade, namely, directing the resources made available as a result of measures of disarmament to the strengthening of scientific, technological and economic development in the developing countries, has not been achieved either. Yet what is spent on armaments has practically reached \$400 billion annually, that is, more than \$1 billion daily, and a very small part of that expenditure would make an enormous and very positive change in the lives of millions of people, particularly those living in very poor and adverse circumstances in developing countries which are obliged to spend part of

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

their resources to buy arms at a time when they are most in need of directing all their resources to development projects and to overcoming the causes of under-development. The reason for this regrettable state of affairs is the continued policy of aggression and of terrorizing people, of their exploitation and the spread of the logic of force in order to achieve national security to the extent of threatening the liberty, security and interests of peoples, exerting pressure on them by threatening the use of force, as well as the use of force to protect the two racist régimes in South Africa and the Middle East. At a time when the struggling African people are being subjected to aggression by the racist régimes in South Africa and Rhodesia, and while the whole world is fully aware of the danger of South Africa acquiring nuclear weapons, the Palestinian people are facing the worst type of racist settler imperialism which is based on the merging of the interests of the racist Zionist movement and the racist régime in South Africa as well as the interests of the world colonialist movement, led by the United States.

The world community has condemned the racist régime in South Africa and has pointed out the danger of introducing nuclear weapons into Africa. Here we should like to stress the danger of nuclear co-operation between that régime and another similar racist entity which has been implanted in our Arab area. We refer in particular to the report issued this year by the Special Committee against Apartheid concerning recent developments in the relations between Israel and South Africa. Page 5 of this report includes detailed information regarding military collaboration between the Zionist entity and South Africa, which leaves no doubt of the danger of this collaboration and the threat which it poses to the Arab and African people. We should also like to stress a paragraph on page 10 of this report, under the title "Conclusions and recommendations" where it is stated that the Special Committee:

"... notes with particular concern the equivocal and contradictory statements made by Israeli spokesmen concerning the implementation of Security Council resolution 418 (1977) on a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa, which reflected the insistence of the Israeli Government on circumventing that resolution and other relevant decisions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly." (A/33/22/Add.2, para. 44)

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

There is no need for me to comment on that, and I leave it to the representatives here to judge the content of that report issued by the United Nations.

The fact that the United States continues to provide the Zionist entity in occupied Palestine with developed and sophisticated weapons and with economic and technological support at a time when that entity is violating the various resolutions of the United Nations and flouting world public opinion will only lead to more aggressive action and expansion, to its continued occupation of the Arab territories, to its non-recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and, of course, concurrently with that, to increased tension in the area, drawing it into the arms race.

Now that this Committee is discussing item 37 of our agenda, we should like to point out that the Zionist entity, in its aggression against Lebanon, has used weapons which have been internationally prohibited - incendiary bombs, for instance - and it has used these weapons on the civilian population, on refugee tents and even on hospitals.

Another source of anxiety for the people of the Middle East is the fact that the Zionist entity has refused to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty, in spite of the fact that the other countries in the area have signed it. This entity continues to implement its nuclear programme and is preventing even its closest Zionist supporters from obtaining information on the nuclear arming now rapidly taking place in occupied Palestine.

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

The Zionist entity has also rejected the General Assembly resolutions to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East in spite of the fact that last June the special session devoted to disarmament affirmed the principle of creating weapon-free zones and zones of peace as an important and basic measure towards nuclear disarmament.

All of this confirms the fact that the Zionist entity possesses atomic weapons. As opposed to that, the rest of the countries of the area, including the Republic of Iraq, have accepted the resolution for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Thus the Zionists have introduced nuclear blackmail as a new element in the Middle East where tension is increasing daily and where the possibilities of an explosion are escalating as a result of the continued Zionist expansionist, aggressive policy, which is supported and assisted by the United States of America and the other colonialist Powers.

The fact that the Zionist entity continues to maintain its preceding attitude of rejecting the proclamation of the Middle East as a nuclear-weapon-free zone, the fact that it refuses to adhere to and to sign the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty thereby putting all of its nuclear activity under the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the fact that it is the only country flouting world unanimity during the past four sessions to create nuclear-weapon-free zones, in addition to the fact that the Zionist entity continues to develop its nuclear potential, lead us to conclude that some of the countries of the area will find themselves obliged to seek real and effective methods to protect their national security, their national sovereignty and their territorial integrity. This will, of course, make of the Middle East an area threatened with the start of a war that may threaten not only the future of the people of this area but also the future of the peoples of the entire world with destruction.

The General Assembly adopted resolution 2832 (XXVI) on 16 December 1971 regarding the establishing of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. The non-aligned countries have confirmed their deep interest in this topic in statements issued by the Ministerial Committee of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, which was held in Havana in May 1978, and which was further

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

consolidated by the statement issued by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of those countries at the Belgrade Conference last July. In spite of this there has been no noticeable or actual progress in the implementation of this resolution due to the fact that some major Powers have been reluctant to carry out serious negotiations among themselves in order to find ways and means to implement the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. We feel great anxiety regarding the continuing presence of military bases in this ocean and the increased military rivalry, because this constitutes the main obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

In particular we would like to affirm the importance of the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee regarding the convening of a conference for the littoral and hinterland States during the coming year, and we hope that that conference will be a constructive step towards mobilizing and co-ordinating all efforts to implement the resolution of the General Assembly declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace.

Mr. CHALE (United Republic of Tanzania): We are meeting at this session only a few months after the first special session of the United Nations devoted entirely to the question of disarmament. The main objective of the entire international community was crystallized in the introduction of the Final Document as follows:

"While the final objective of the efforts of all States should continue to be general and complete disarmament under effective international control, the immediate goal is that of the elimination of the danger of a nuclear war and the implementation of measures to halt and reverse the arms race and clear the path towards lasting peace."

(Resolution S-10/2, para. 8)

This is a goal we have set for ourselves. It was set in realization of the dangers of international peace and security inherent in the perpetual escalation of the arms race. While it is indeed true that the special session helped to revitalize the efforts of the international community through adding to the public awareness on disarmament, my delegation still finds it difficult to attribute any substantive achievement to the session. My delegation, therefore, hopes that subsequent to the session, the Assembly

(Mr. Chale, United Republic
of Tanzania)

will embark on a process of re-examining the malfunctions in the disarmament negotiating process. The various changes effected in the negotiating machinery may serve to strike a more democratic balance in the disarmament deliberations, but the change in the machinery alone may not be sufficient if it does not offer opportunities for a democratic discharge of equal responsibilities and obligations by all nations. My delegation further hopes that within the course of the deliberations members of this Committee will address themselves to how the international community can best approach this problem.

The question of peace and security has become increasingly crucial as the dangers and possibilities of a nuclear holocaust continue to be more and more evident. At no other time in human history has the need for both international security guarantees and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, both vertical and horizontal, been more evident. The Non-Proliferation Treaty has become the so-called cornerstone for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. We have consistently expressed our views regarding the Treaty. Equally, we have stated that the present international instruments applicable to the question of disarmament have to a limited degree lived up to their purpose, but these objectives have more often been marred by the tendency to regard these instruments as merely an end in themselves. It is the realization of the little that the United Nations has done in the field of disarmament in comparison with its potential that my delegation wishes to caution against. The mere fact that we have so much on our agenda each year shows that the little that we have done has created new problems even more difficult to confront, let alone to surmount. The question of the proposed international convention on negative security guarantees should, therefore, be considered on the basis of a comprehensive approach towards genuine security guarantees.

While it is indeed true that the States which pledge not to commit their resources to the production or acquisition of nuclear weapons contribute significantly to the horizontal non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, my delegation is of the view that this has far less significant relevance as regards the whole question of disarmament. By the same token, the proposed

international convention, which is supposed to be a response by the nuclear-weapon States to the efforts of the non-nuclear-weapon States, will have limited effects unless there is a completely new approach to disarmament, which should be a step towards collective endeavour in solving the common problems facing mankind and not the exploitation of these problems by the more powerful for the perpetual dominance over those less powerful.

(Mr. Chale, United Republic of
Tanzania)

It is precisely because we are aware that the purpose of extending security guarantees cannot adequately be served by the conclusion of an international convention - parties to which would be, on the one hand, nuclear-weapon States prepared to give such guarantees, and on the other, interested non-nuclear-weapon States which renounce the production and acquisition of nuclear weapons and have no such weapons on their territories - that we find it imperative to put on record our reservations on the proposal in its present form.

Since the guarantees extended by the three nuclear-weapon States through Security Council resolution 255 (1968) covered the purpose of safeguarding the security of non-nuclear States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, we would wish to see that this new initiative not only expresses itself as profoundly different and larger in scope but, what is more, that it departs from any requisites and conditions similar to those stipulated in the Non-Proliferation Treaty. I wish, therefore, to clearly express our non-acceptance of the implied conditions that only those States which undertake obligations similar to or more far-reaching than those of the Non-Proliferation Treaty will be parties. My delegation believes that there is no more credible security guarantee to non-nuclear-weapon States and nuclear-weapon States alike than actual disarmament. We share the concern over the continued dependence on nuclear weapons and hope that the commitment expressed by those States renouncing nuclear weapons will appreciably brighten their prospects for genuine security and not make them more susceptible to nuclear threat. We wish to draw reassurance from the prospect of the urgent conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty which will be non-discriminatory in terms of obligations to be assumed by the nuclear-weapon States and adhered to by all nuclear-weapon States. We cannot fail to be disturbed by the present discouraging pace of the tripartite negotiations concerning the treaty.

In paragraph 64 of the Final Document the Assembly recognized the importance of the establishment of zones of peace in various regions of the world under appropriate conditions as may be defined and determined by the States concerned, which in so doing can strengthen not only their own security but also international peace and security as a whole.

(Mr. Chale, United Republic
of Tanzania)

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace is of overriding importance. My delegation has consistently supported the idea of the establishment of such zones. This support has, however, presupposed the realization of certain basic principles, such as: first, that the modalities and the nature of such zones be agreed upon by all States concerned; secondly, that the nuclear weapon States and other major weapon States with comparable weapon capabilities agree to respect such zones; thirdly, of rendering whatever assistance is necessary to establish them. We have noted with interest the co-operation and spirit of compromise demonstrated by the nuclear-weapon States in recognizing the denuclearized status of the Latin American region as provided for by the Treaty of Tlatelolco and its two Additional Protocols. We hope that such a spirit will prevail in considering such a status for other regions.

The question of international peace and security cannot be considered adequately without reference to social and political justice. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted in response to the moral, social and political obligations which this international community had set for itself. My delegation would, therefore, expect every Member State, without exception, to respect and adhere to that obligation and to pronounce itself as being categorically opposed to any Member State which uses military force to suppress the implementation of that Declaration. To that end Member States should refrain from sustaining such military machinery. We have in mind the fascist and racist régime of South Africa which has not only perfected its military machinery but has almost acquired nuclear capability with the express knowledge and active assistance of some States Members of the United Nations. Not only has this been contrary to the wishes and aspirations of peace-loving nations but is in total opposition to attempts to implement the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. The Tanzanian delegation condemns any attempt by South Africa to introduce nuclear weapons to the African continent and calls upon the nuclear-weapon States, through the Security Council, to take the necessary measures to prevent the racist régime of South Africa from developing or acquiring nuclear weapons. It is in this spirit that my delegation fully supports draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.30/Rev.1 on the Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa and would at this juncture give formal notice of its co sponsorship of that draft resolution.

(Mr. Chale, United Republic of
Tanzania)

We have noted with keen interest the reports that "some" progress may be made in the talks between the United States and the Soviet Union regarding limitation of their military presence in the Indian Ocean. However, we equally express our disappointment at the present stalemate in the talks. Despite this optimism, we wish also to express our dismay at the fact that the littoral and hinterland States which are directly concerned have not been involved in those talks and deliberations. We hope that future negotiations regarding the elimination of super-Power rivalry in the Indian Ocean will involve the littoral and hinterland States, together with all nuclear-weapon States. To that end, we strongly support the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean with a view to establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the area. We shall support any positive initiatives in this regard.

My delegation attaches particular importance to the question of other weapons of mass destruction and hopes that a convention prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles will be concluded as a matter of urgency.

(Mr. Chale, United Republic of Tanzania)

Of equal importance to us is the prohibition or restriction of the use of certain conventional weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects. We look forward to collective action during the forthcoming Conference in Geneva next year. Tanzania supports the convening of that Conference.

In conclusion, I wish to make brief reference to the question of the relationship between disarmament and development. The arms race has continued to gobble up enormous human and financial resources, while the standards of living in vast areas of the world have remained stagnant or have declined. It is not the wish of my delegation to go into the statistical details: these have been eloquently analyzed by those who have spoken before us. Suffice it to say that it is imperative for the international community to restructure the present international economic system which allows some States to afford such evil military affluence, while others are condemned to perpetual poverty. Tanzania has always supported the reduction of military budgets. We are aware of, and do appreciate the difficulties involved in arriving at a commonly agreed upon system of reducing military budgets, but hope that the nuclear-weapon States and those with comparable military expenditures will soon come to an agreement and thus save mankind from impending doom and stave off the day when, as one has so correctly put it, the living will envy the dead, be they in the camp of a super-Power or not.

Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran): It is a pleasure for me to introduce, on behalf of Burundi, Peru, Poland, Spain and Iran, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.34, entitled "World Disarmament Conference". The sponsors comprise the entire Bureau of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference and, as such, represent various geographical groups. The arrangements to produce this draft resolution reflecting different shades of opinion are indicative of the realistic approach which has been pursued in order to find common ground for the advancement of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference. This is especially true not only because different groups were consulted, but also because those arrangements ensued from consultations with all the nuclear-weapon States, the consideration of whose views has consistently been perceived as central to the success of the work of the Committee.

The draft resolution is clear in the description of the subject it attempts to cover. Efforts have also been made so that the mandate envisaged in it reads with equal clarity.

The first three preambular paragraphs trace briefly the history of the proposal. The fourth preambular paragraph takes note of the report I personally presented to this Committee a few days ago. The last preambular paragraph repeats almost verbatim what was agreed upon during the special session devoted to disarmament, about the proposal for convening a World Disarmament Conference at the earliest appropriate time.

The operative parts are considered logical conclusions to the preambular paragraphs. In suggesting, in paragraph 1, renewal of the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee, the sponsors felt the necessity of follow-up work to explore further possibilities. The references in paragraph 2 to the need for the Ad Hoc Committee to maintain close contact with States possessing nuclear weapons in order to remain informed of their views, as well as the relevant comments and observations made in the light of paragraph 122 of the Final Document, are indicative of the practical and realistic manner in which the members of the Ad Hoc Committee have assumed their responsibilities for the implementation of the mandate given to them.

As I indicated earlier, this draft resolution is the result of extensive consultations, and it is the hope of its sponsors that it could, as at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, be adopted by consensus.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico)(interpretation from Spanish): I have the honour to introduce in this statement a draft resolution sponsored by Argentina, Australia, Morocco, Nigeria, Peru, Sweden, Yugoslavia and Mexico among the draft resolutions received by the First Committee during this session of the General Assembly and which bears the symbol A/C.1/33/L.29.

This draft resolution deals with one of the most important items which have been submitted to the General Assembly for consideration. While it is the general opinion that the highest priority must be given to nuclear disarmament, there has also been consensus on the fact that in our efforts to achieve that objective the nuclear-weapon States bear a special responsibility, and that, among them, that responsibility is all the greater in parallel with the volume of their respective nuclear arsenals.

It is obvious, then, when it comes to the two super Powers as they are called, each of which possesses nuclear weapons the number and destructive capacity of which are infinitely greater than that of all the other nuclear Powers put together, it is difficult to exaggerate the magnitude of the efforts to arrive at agreements that would make possible limitations and reductions of their gigantic nuclear arsenals.

No doubt, that is why the General Assembly has followed, step by step, from the very beginning, the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT). Barely a month after those negotiations had begun, on 16 November 1969, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2602 A (XXIV) and, beginning in 1972 year after year the General Assembly has adopted various resolutions, the first of which was resolution 2932 B (XXVII) and the last but one resolution 31/189 A. In those resolutions, all of which are recalled in the preamble of the draft resolution which I am introducing, appeals by the General Assembly to the two nuclear Powers participating in the SALT talks have gradually become ever more specific, and from 1974 to 1976 those resolutions have been intended to "broaden the scope" and "accelerate the pace" of those talks and to arrive at an agreement on "important qualitative limitations and substantial reductions" of the strategic arms in their possession.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

In the draft resolution of which I am speaking, we have considered it appropriate to quote provisions from the last two resolutions adopted on this item, that is the one adopted at the thirty-second session in December of last year and the resolution of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament which is reflected in one of the paragraphs of the Final Document of 30 June last.

In its 1977 resolution, the General Assembly took note with satisfaction of the declarations made by the Heads of State of the United States and the Soviet Union in the latter part of that year, declarations which, both because of their source and their categorical content, we shall always bear very much in mind. That is why in the present draft resolution we once again repeat in full what President Carter and President Brezhnev proclaimed at that time in unequivocal terms regarding their willingness to bring about a gradual reduction of existing nuclear arsenals until there was a complete and total destruction of them. In the words of the Brezhnev statement, the nuclear Powers could undertake "... the gradual reduction of existing stockpiles of such weapons and move towards their complete, total destruction". In the words of President Carter's statement, "Then we will work for further reductions with a view to a world truly free of nuclear weapons".

The preamble of the draft resolution includes also the text of paragraph 52 of the Final Document of the special session - which as is known, was adopted by consensus - which usefully supplements those declarations, and in it the General Assembly has pronounced itself without reservations to the effect that the United States and the Soviet Union should: first, "conclude at the earliest possible date the agreement they have been pursuing for several years" in the talks known as SALT II; secondly, transmit "in good time" the text of the agreement to the General Assembly; and, thirdly, follow that agreement "promptly" by further strategic arms limitation negotiations leading to agreed "significant reductions of and qualitative limitations on strategic arms" which would constitute "an important step in the direction of nuclear disarmament and, ultimately, of establishment of a world free of such weapons".

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The last paragraph of the preamble is intended to recall that in the Programme of Action of the Final Document from which I have quoted it was established that

"In the task of achieving the goals of nuclear disarmament, all the nuclear-weapon States, in particular those among them which possess the most important nuclear arsenals, bear a special responsibility."
(Resolution S-10/2, para. 48)

As regards the operative part of the draft resolution, it is very simple and has only three paragraphs.

The first is intended to express a feeling which we are certain is shared by all peoples of the world, since therein the General Assembly "Deeply regrets that, in spite of all that has been declared, resolved or reiterated over the last decade ..." it has not yet been possible for the talks on the limitation of strategic weapons known as SALT to achieve even the immediate results envisaged in the Final Document.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The second consists essentially of an emphatic reaffirmation, brought up to date with the addition of a reference to paragraph 52 of the Final Document, of what was operative paragraph 3 of resolution 32/87 G of 12 December 1977, which, like the resolution of the special session of the General Assembly, was also adopted by consensus.

The case is somewhat similar with the third and last paragraph of the draft, which in essence corresponds to what was paragraph 4 of the 1977 resolution to which I have just referred.

For the reasons I have explained, the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.29 confidently hope that the General Assembly will be able to adopt it by consensus. In so doing it would once again emphasize the really incalculable importance of the need and urgency to achieve positive results in regard to the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons, which because of the significance of such measures might eventually lead to the total elimination of these terrible instruments of mass destruction.

More than 10 years ago Arnold Toynbee affirmed that, with the advent of nuclear weapons, the danger of destruction for man was far greater today than the danger man had to face at the end of the paleolithic period, before he was able to gain dominance over lions, tigers and similar wild beasts. Somewhat similar to what was so graphically described by the British historian is what the General Assembly of the United Nations, the most representative body of the international community, proclaimed barely three months ago, in the only substantive resolution that resulted from the first special session devoted to disarmament, when it expressed its alarm at the "threat to the very survival of mankind posed by the existence of nuclear weapons and the continuing arms race" (resolution S-10/2).

It is our hope that the two nuclear Powers on which the success or failure of the strategic arms limitation talks depends will always keep in mind that sombre diagnosis by the Assembly, as well as the enormous responsibilities they shoulder during these negotiations.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): I wish to speak on a point of clarification. Yesterday when I introduced the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.23 I did not mention Tunisia as being one of the co-sponsors. This was the result of a misunderstanding on my part. Therefore I should like the record of the Committee to reflect my correction of this omission and I hope that a subsequent addendum or corrigendum to the draft resolution will carry the name of Tunisia as one of the co-sponsors.

The CHAIRMAN: That fact will be recorded and the correction made accordingly.

The representative of Israel wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply. Before giving him the floor I must say that the First Committee has during the past six weeks and in a total of more than 200 speeches observed, in my opinion, the highest standards of objectivity and kept strictly within the agenda items the General Assembly and the General Committee have allotted to it. Therefore I am sure that the members of the Committee will join me in my opinion that statements with contents that give rise to the exercise of the right of reply and then to further statements in exercise of the right of reply would not normally belong to the proceedings of this Committee nor to questions of disarmament.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): I take it that the Chairman's remarks about the level of the discussion apply to statements on the subject matter as well as to statements made in exercise of the right of reply. It has happened again that a serious debate was in progress and then the Iraqi representative, after a few introductory platitudes, launched into the usual tirade, which all of us heard and which repeats itself like a broken gramophone record regardless of the subject under discussion.

The subject under discussion happens to be disarmament. If some link between reality and the debates in this Committee is to be at all maintained, note might be taken of what has emerged from the yearly reports of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute and the London Institute of Strategic Studies and other publications. It is very simple. Iraq is today spending

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

a greater proportion of its oil revenue on armaments than any other country in the Middle East. At the same time Israel has reduced its military budget by 23 per cent. These are hard facts. The United Nations will have to choose whether to address itself in its discussions on disarmament to facts that can be verified or whether the debates here are to be conducted on a level of veracity with which we have become familiar from "The Tales of a Thousand and One Nights".

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: Before I adjourn this meeting, I would remind the Committee that, as agreed, we shall end our general debate by Friday night, and subsequently, on Monday morning, begin dealing with draft resolutions.

I intend, at an opportune moment on Friday, to outline for consideration by the Committee certain ideas on the manner for dealing with the draft resolutions, the time-table therefor, and so on, keeping always in mind the fact that we have a deadline for completing our work on them during next week.

It is my understanding at this time that the total number of draft resolutions that we will have to deal with will be around 40, but, as I say, I will revert to the matter on Friday so that the Committee may discuss it.

I wish to announce the following new sponsors of draft resolutions. Jordan, A/C.1/33/L.29 and A/C.1/33/L.32; Morocco, A/C.1/33/L.34; the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, A/C.1/33/L.34; and the Netherlands, A/C.1/33/L.18.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.