



UN/DA COLLECTION

FIRST COMMITTEE
10th meeting
held on
Friday, 26 October 1979
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 18th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 30 TO 45, 120 AND 121 (continued)

- General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. **Pojani** (Albania)
Mr. Al-Doy (Bahrain)
Mr. Adeniji (Nigeria)

* 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.1/34/PV.13
29 October 1979

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 30 TO 45, 120 AND 121 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. POJANI (Albania): May I extend to you, Sir, the congratulations of the Albanian delegation on your election as Chairman of the First Committee.

Before the First Committee at this session there are again 18 agenda items relating to disarmament problems. The major part of these items have been discussed for years, from one session to another, both here and in other bodies of the United Nations. A special session was devoted last year to disarmament. A series of new decisions and recommendations on ways to be followed for the solution of disarmament problems was added to a host of resolutions adopted previously. The thirty-third session of the General Assembly adopted the largest number of resolutions on these problems. Various negotiations, both bilateral and multilateral, have taken place during this period, and new proposals have been presented.

(Mr. Pojani Albania)

But has there really been the slightest concrete progress in the field of disarmament? We share the viewpoint expressed by representatives of many democratic and progressive countries during this debate, that facts and reality are such that there is no room for satisfaction. Peoples and countries that want to live in freedom and independence would have liked to see their hopes of genuine disarmament come true and to see some of the main problems find their way towards a solution as soon as possible. But the more that is said and written about disarmament, the more the main protagonists of armament -- especially the imperialist super Powers -- develop the arms race, increase arsenals of all types of armament and intensify their preparations for war. At a time when the grave and complicated international situation continues to be further aggravated, when the enemies of the freedom and independence of peoples become ever more threatening and aggressive, it cannot be expected that the protagonists of armament will disarm themselves or be compelled through resolutions to take any step towards disarmament.

The recent events that have taken place in various regions of the world, in the Middle East, Indochina, Africa, and so on, prove that the United States imperialists, the Soviet socio-imperialists, the Chinese socio-imperialists and other enemies of the peoples are intensifying their aggressive, expansionist and hegemonist activities. That is why they stubbornly pursue the arms race and increase their armed forces and military budgets.

The two imperialist super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, have long since set up the biggest war machinery in the history of mankind and have stockpiled huge quantities of weapons of mass destruction, both conventional and nuclear. They are at present the main Powers engaged in the unbridled arms race, the biggest manufacturers and merchants of weapons in the world.

In the rivalry for world domination and hegemony, the two imperialist super Powers make use of the aggressive North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and Warsaw Treaty blocs. For this purpose, they spare no effort to increase their military potential to include in those blocs other countries as well and to expand their sphere of activity.

(Mr. Pojani, Albania)

The United States imperialists and the Soviet socio-imperialists try to create the impression that they are "seriously" concerned about disarmament, and they call on others to join them in the efforts they are allegedly making to attain the objectives of disarmament, to halt the arms race, to reduce and ban nuclear weapons tests, to ban chemical and radiological weapons, and so on. But time has proved that all this is sheer demagogy. Discussions on that problem, both here in the United Nations and outside it, are used by them to camouflage their policy of aggression and war, to disguise their arms race, to bargain to the detriment of the peoples and to sabotage the sincere efforts of the freedom-loving countries for a genuine disarmament.

This year especially, the two super-Powers are making a lot of noise to convince public opinion that - allegedly - they have made a great contribution in the field of disarmament with the signature of the SALT II treaty. They present this treaty as an "important step" towards the limitation of strategic weapons, and as a service rendered to peace and international security.

In fact, it is clear that the conclusion of the SALT II negotiations, which have been going on for years, and the signing of the Vienna Treaty can by no means be considered a forward step in the field of disarmament. This treaty does not define any concrete measure or obligation for the super-Powers to disarm themselves and to destroy their existing strategic weapons or to halt the arms race and the invention and production of new weapons. Not only does the treaty not touch the nuclear monopoly of the two super-Powers, but, on the contrary, it aims at legalizing this monopoly and props up their efforts to maintain technological and scientific superiority in the field of nuclear weapons. The SALT II treaty is another attempt by the two super-Powers to preserve the status quo between them. It is an "equilibrium of interests" between concerned parties, that is, an equilibrium in the field of armaments, and in the division of spheres of influence to keep others at arms length. The SALT II treaty, on the other hand, does not hinder the United States and the Soviet Union from increasing the military might of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty aggressive blocs, from organizing military manoeuvres, or from interfering in the internal affairs of other countries.

(Mr. Pojani, Albania)

The United States imperialists and the Soviet socio-imperialists have always pretended to have particular responsibilities for the establishment and maintenance of order and peace in the world. They demand that others recognize their right to arm themselves whenever they want, as much and with whatever they like, and at the same time to define the quantity and types of arms the others should have. While trying to disarm peoples and progressive countries and to deny them the right to possess the necessary weapons to gain and defend their freedom and independence, the super-Powers supply the reactionary cliques and régimes at their service with arms.

One of the most blatant examples of such a practice is the omnilateral aid in weapons and technology for the production of weapons including nuclear weapons -- given by the imperialist Powers to the racist clique of South Africa. It is through the constant economic and military aid of the United States imperialists that the Israeli zionists have set up and are maintaining a mighty war machine and are eagerly working to realize their ambition of having a nuclear arsenal as a means of exerting pressure and blackmail against the Arab peoples. The Soviet socio-imperialists also make efforts, by supplying weapons and dispatching specialists and "military advisers", to pave the way for expansion in Asia, Africa and other areas.

The United States and the Soviet Union have made a big and profitable business of the selling of weapons, as well as a means of penetrating and exerting political, economic and military control over the countries that get these weapons and to incite and aggravate local wars and conflicts. It suffices to bear in mind how thirsty the imperialist super-Powers are to draw profits -- even through the arms trade -- in order to understand the fallaciousness of their preachments that the measures they will allegedly take for disarmament will free huge funds to be put at the disposal of the developing countries.

(Mr. Pojani, Albania)

The Albanian delegation would like to reiterate its viewpoint that genuine disarmament cannot be reached by the desire and the will of imperialists and socio-imperialists. The world today is characterized not in the least by "détente" and disarmament but, on the contrary, by a prevailing situation of great tension and dangers and of feverish preparations by the imperialist super-Powers to plunge the world into a new world war. The rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union is the main source of tension and conflicts among various countries. At present, social-imperialist China is involved in this rivalry and, with its aggression against the Vietnamese people and its hegemonistic policy in South-East Asia, it has openly adopted the policy of an imperialist super-Power, thus aiming for world hegemony and domination. That is why China too is seeking aid from imperialist Powers - first of all that of United States imperialism - in order to increase its military potential by obtaining from wherever possible weapons and up-to-date technology for manufacturing weapons. China's statements about disarmament also are sheer demagogy.

The People's Socialist Republic of Albania and the Albanian people are for genuine peace and disarmament. Like all peoples of the world, they stand against imperialist wars. But we are of the opinion that the desires and the aspirations of peoples cannot be realized through the cul-de-sac into which imperialists and socio-imperialists have drawn the problem of disarmament. The competition in which the United States imperialists, the Soviet socio-imperialists and the Chinese socio-imperialists are vying one with the other as champions of disarmament and defenders of peace and international security, and even as anti-hegemonists, is but demagogy. The People's Socialist Republic of Albania stands decisively against their policy of aggression and expansion and against their practices and activities aimed at the domination and exploitation of peoples and other countries.

We hold that the commitment of sovereign States to the struggle for genuine disarmament, as well as the intensity of that struggle, depends not on the number of resolutions adopted or on the types of weapons invented by

(Mr. Pojani, Albania)

modern science and technology, and not even on the degree of the danger they represent, but on resolutely and consistently opposing by all means the policy pursued by the possessers of those weapons. The determined struggle of the peoples of all countries and of progressive forces against such a policy, relying on their own forces and on genuine anti-imperialist solidarity of the peoples, is the right way towards true disarmament.

Mr. AL-DOY (Bahrain) (interpretation from Arabic): It is a pleasure for me to express to you, Sir, on behalf of my delegation, our heartfelt congratulations upon your unanimous election to the chairmanship of this important Committee. I also wish to congratulate the other members of the Bureau on the interest they are showing in the Committee's work.

Mankind is today living through one of the most important and critical stages of its long history. It is from time to time exposed to the danger of mass destruction, due to the unbridled race to stockpile all types of weapons and to develop new ones, especially weapons of mass destruction.

The special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was a brisk step forward on the way towards achieving disarmament. It gave a faithful picture of the dangers that threaten mankind. The Final Document that emerged from it emphasized the determination of mankind to resolve this vital problem which poses the alternative of man's annihilation or his well-being.

The arms race and disarmament have occupied a prominent place among the questions examined by the United Nations since its inception, in view of the fact that they are important issues, and especially so if we consider the tremendous amounts annually allocated to armament, one-tenth only of which devoted to the service of mankind would help to raise the standard of living in developing countries. It is with regret, therefore, that we learn that the financial, scientific and technical resources devoted to the production, acquisition and stockpiling of weapons exceed by far those devoted to improving the deteriorating economic situation in most countries of the world. World expenditures on armaments are approximately \$60 million every single hour, while one billion people are suffering from hunger, ignorance and disease.

(Mr. Al-Doy, Bahrain)

Last year we witnessed some progress in the limitation of the arms race. The most important step was the signing last June by the United States and the Soviet Union of the SALT II Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms. We hope that this treaty will be the first step towards a reduction of armaments and that the quantitative limitation of arms will not have as a counterpart an escalation in quality.

When we speak of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons it is relevant to note that the acquisition of nuclear weapons is no longer confined to the major Powers, because other countries of the world such as Israel and South Africa, now possess nuclear weapons or are attempting to produce them. That is why we feel that it is necessary to adopt effective measures to prevent such countries from acquiring nuclear weapons or from improving the weapons they already possess. The New York Times today announced a number of nuclear explosions probably undertaken by the Government of South Africa last month.

My delegation supports the elaboration of a treaty for the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction, in particular the deadly neutron bomb. Prevention is better than cure.

I should like to add that among the questions related to disarmament which are a cause of concern to my delegation is the use of chemical weapons in war. The method of the production of such weapons, their use and their elimination are questions no less complicated than the question of nuclear weapons themselves, because the countries which can produce chemical materials for peaceful purposes may produce chemical weapons, which are very difficult to control.

With regard to the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bahrain stated in the General Assembly on 5 October that:

"As a State in the Gulf region, we attach special importance to the designation of the Indian Ocean and its natural extensions as a zone of peace and stability. Therefore, we supported on various occasions the General Assembly resolution on the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace (resolution 2832 (XXVI)), called for the implementation of the principles contained in that Declaration and requested the Gulf region be kept aloof from the rivalry of the great Powers. We should

(Mr. Al-Doy, Bahrain)

like to emphasize in this regard that peace and stability in the region are the exclusive concern of the countries concerned, on whose shoulders alone lies the responsibility to protect it, and we declare our complete rejection of any attempt by any party to interfere in the domestic affairs of the region.

"Therefore, we have called for the establishment of mutual co-operation among the States of the Gulf in the political, economic, cultural and technical fields, on a basis of mutual respect, equality, integrity and non-intervention in domestic affairs, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter." (A/34/PV.23, p. 31)

(Mr. Al-Doy, Bahrain)

My delegation welcomes the holding of a conference of the littoral States of the Indian Ocean. Indeed, such a conference will be a positive step towards the implementation of paragraph 64 of the Final Document issued by the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament. We also welcome the content of the report on the meeting of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean (document A/34/45), specifically paragraph 22 of section IV, which invites the General Assembly, at its thirty-fourth regular session, to fix the date and the venue of the Indian Ocean conference as provided for in its resolution 33/68.

We support the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East, in conformity with the appeal made by the special session devoted to disarmament in paragraph 63 of the Final Document. We support, likewise, the other questions relating to item 35 of the agenda, to wit, the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, just as we support item 37 of the Agenda, which is the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia because we believe that the greater the number of nuclear-free zones throughout the world, the more the nuclear zones will shrink until they become little islands from which nuclear weapons must finally be eliminated. We consider that disarmament problems are becoming more complex and we hope that there will be mutual trust among the big Powers in the context of the treaties they sign.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): Were the situation in which mankind finds itself as a result of the yearly escalating arms race not so serious, many people in and outside the United Nations would question the usefulness of our almost ritual general debate on the disarmament items in this Committee. For there is an element of repetitiveness which ought to have become boring were the danger which evokes these annual repetitions not so menacing.

Last year at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, we all conjured up, so far as words could, the desperate situation.

"Mankind today is confronted with an unprecedented threat of self-extinction arising from the massive and competitive accumulation of the most destructive weapons ever produced. Existing arsenals of nuclear weapons alone are more than sufficient to destroy all life on earth."

(resolution S-10/2, para. 11)

Those are the opening words of the Declaration we adopted by consensus. Together with the Declaration, we also adopted a Programme of Action which, naturally, placed well-deserved emphasis on nuclear disarmament.

Even the most charitable judgement on the armament outlook a year after the special session will find cause enough for disappointment. The continuation of the arms race manifests itself in many ways. It does so first in the increased expenditure, quoted at a figure of \$450 billion in the past year; secondly, in the increased arsenals, especially nuclear arsenals, of the major military Powers; thirdly, in the deployment or threat of deployment of more nuclear weapons for the strategic balance of mutual destructive capacity; fourthly, in the conduct of more nuclear-weapon tests, and at present in a nuclear explosion reported to have been conducted recently; fifthly, in the decision by some to increase annual military expenditure; and, sixthly, by a lack of progress in the disarmament negotiations.

My delegation finds it particularly unfortunate that the multilateral negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament, was unable to negotiate in any detail any of the priority issues entrusted to it. The Committee spent a good deal of time on organizational matters, which is to be expected in view of the new outlook given the Committee by the special session. However, I believe that neither the time spent on organization nor the new shape of the Committee was responsible for the lack of any positive result in its work on these priority issues.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

The complete cessation of nuclear-weapon tests continues to be the most urgent task before the Committee. By common accord, an agreement on the prohibition of nuclear tests would not only check the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons but also prevent their proliferation. It would mark a significant beginning of the assumption by the nuclear-weapon States of their obligation under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty under which they undertook to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament.

It is pertinent to recall, however, that negotiations on this urgent measure by the Committee on Disarmament is linked by successive General Assembly resolutions to the transmission to the Committee of the results of the trilateral negotiations on the subject by the United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union. Instead of bringing their negotiations to a positive conclusion as a matter of urgency and transmitting the results to the Committee on Disarmament before the beginning of its 1979 session, the three negotiating Powers, at the end of the summer session of the Committee made a brief statement through a spokesman. Since there was no substance in that statement which could form the basis of negotiating a treaty text, the Committee could only confine itself to a consideration of the report of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to consider international co-operative measures to detect and identify seismic events.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Considering that the main reason given for the delay in the trilateral negotiations is verification, the work of the scientific experts assumes great importance.

The relationship between the work of the scientific experts and the negotiations on a comprehensive test ban treaty is obvious. The link was actually summarized in 1978 by the spokesman of the three negotiating Powers when he informed the erstwhile Conference of the Committee on Disarmament that there was agreement among them that the guidelines for setting up and running the international seismic exchange should be laid down in an annex to the treaty, and that the detailed organizational and procedural arrangements for implementing the international exchange should be worked out after the entry into force of the treaty, drawing on the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Group.

My delegation has always said that a combination of the various means available, national, international and on-site when necessary to give double assurance, should have provided adequate guarantees that a comprehensive test ban treaty would be verifiable. What is lacking, in our view, is the political will on the part of the three negotiating Powers to conclude these negotiations.

It may well be that more progress will be made by the Committee on Disarmament if the General Assembly were to give the Committee a primary, not secondary, role in negotiating a comprehensive test ban treaty. If such an approach were adopted, the Committee would be called upon to commence urgently, during its session in 1980, substantive work on a draft treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear tests. The three nuclear weapon States - that is, the three negotiating States - would also be called upon to assist the Committee on Disarmament by submitting to it, at every appropriate stage in its own substantive work, any joint initiative which they may have agreed upon. By so doing, perhaps the pressure on the trilateral negotiators to provide a package may become less demanding, while the Committee on Disarmament will be enabled to assume its responsibility as the prime motive force for a test ban treaty.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

As representatives are aware, the second Review Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is scheduled for 1980. It is unnecessary to repeat here how crucial it is for progress on a comprehensive test ban treaty to be evident before the commencement of this Review Conference. We have often said in the past, and it bears repetition, that Nigeria, as a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, finds it increasingly difficult to press other non-nuclear-weapon-States to become parties when, despite the pleas of the international community, the nuclear-weapon States proceed at an alarming rate to conduct tests and when negotiations on nuclear disarmament have not even begun.

In the meantime, the signs that countries other than the present nuclear-weapon States will join the nuclear club have become very real indeed. My delegation has repeatedly sounded the alarm about the preparations of the apartheid régime of South Africa to introduce nuclear weapons into the continent of Africa. We have always known that, in defence of its damnable policy of apartheid, which has made the South African régime an international outcast, that régime is capable of any desperate measure to threaten and blackmail other African countries. We know - and the South Africans themselves confirmed it - that their nuclear programme is actively promoted by the assistance and co-operation which they receive from some Western countries, and lately from Israel, countries which have not hesitated to supply technology and equipment to South Africa although it had refused bluntly to be a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and although it has not disguised its intentions. Two years ago, South Africa's preparation to detonate a nuclear explosion became an open secret, yet even that fact did not persuade their Western collaborators - who otherwise were and still are the apostles of non-proliferation - to cut off all nuclear dealings with South Africa. Now that South Africa has actually detonated a low-yield nuclear explosion, my delegation, and indeed Africa, will hold the suppliers of materials and technology to South Africa - namely the United States, United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel - responsible for the grave consequences.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

The responsibility of the Security Council is clear in this matter. Paragraph 63 (c) of the Final Document of the tenth special session - a paragraph which I had the honour personally to negotiate with the five permanent members of the Security Council individually - says:

"In Africa, where the Organization of African Unity has affirmed a decision for the denuclearization of the region, the Security Council of the United Nations shall take appropriate effective steps whenever necessary to prevent the frustration of this objective." (resolution S-10/2, para. 63 (c))

Resolution 33/63 adopted by the General Assembly on the recommendation of this Committee last year, states in its operative paragraph 4:

"Requests the Security Council to exercise a close watch on South Africa and to take appropriate effective steps to prevent South Africa from developing and acquiring nuclear weapons, thereby endangering international peace and security;" (resolution 33/63, para. 4)

My delegation will demand immediate effective action by the Security Council to counter this great challenge to the desire of the international community, as universally expressed at the special session, to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race and to proceed to nuclear disarmament.

Indeed, my delegation this morning, at the plenary meeting of the General Assembly, is submitting a draft resolution which will call for immediate investigation of the reported South African test and which also would require the Security Council to take effective immediate steps in this respect.

With respect to nuclear disarmament negotiations, my delegation is not unmindful of the bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union which resulted in the SALT II agreement. We applaud the conclusion, belated as it was, of that agreement and we hope that it will be ratified. However, nobody sees SALT II as a disarmament measure; its value lies in the promise of providing the basis for more far-reaching agreement on the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons which we hope will take place in SALT III.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

The wider issue of nuclear disarmament negotiations should be addressed with greater urgency in the Committee on Disarmament. In this connexion, reference has been made during the course of the debate in this Committee of an initiative submitted to the Committee on Disarmament by a group of socialist countries. My delegation sees the initiative as positive, even if it needs to be related closely to the consensus reached at the special session. In the view of my delegation, the Committee on Disarmament should endeavour to agree on the stages at which it can set up ad hoc working groups to negotiate

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

specific issues such as a possible agreement on freezing of the level of arsenals; cessation of further production of fissionable materials for nuclear weapons and explosive devices; agreement to place existing stockpiles of fissionable materials under international safeguards, and agreement on measures for the dismantling of present nuclear arsenals.

Permit me now to turn to another priority item - the question of an agreement on the elimination of all chemical weapons. Among others, the latest resolution on this matter underscored the urgency of a chemical weapons ban and urged the Committee on Disarmament to undertake at the beginning of its 1979 session negotiations with a view to elaborating an agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of chemical weapons.

The level of discussion of this subject during the 1979 session of the Committee was very high. Initiatives by delegations and experts made useful contributions to the debates and to the clarification of the various issues. So also were the visits arranged by two members of the Committee to chemical plants in their countries. In the light of these useful discussions it would have been logical for the Committee to have approved the proposal by some of its members to set up an ad hoc working group for negotiations.

It is therefore regrettable, in the view of my delegation, that despite the obvious necessity for such a procedure, agreement could not be reached to set up such a working group. We note the relatively detailed information on the present status of the bilateral negotiations which has been imparted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States, but we regret that the rather late timing of the report detracted from the seriousness with which it would have been considered by the Committee on Disarmament. The information contained in that joint report served only to strengthen our conviction that there is indeed sufficient basis for real and immediate negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament on a chemical weapons convention.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

It is paradoxical that the Soviet Union and the United States, which have failed to provide a joint initiative on either chemical weapons or a comprehensive test ban treaty, managed to submit a joint proposal entitled "Major Elements of a Treaty Prohibiting the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Radiological Weapons". We welcome the initiative, and we hope that negotiations will be initiated by the Committee on Disarmament at the appropriate time, when governments have given the joint proposal the careful examination it deserves.

Last year my delegation commended the initiatives submitted to the General Assembly on an International Convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. We viewed these initiatives as contributing to the process of giving assurance to non-nuclear-weapon States that they would not be the victims of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. I wish to reiterate, however, that my delegation does not see negative security guarantees as a substitute for the elimination of nuclear weapons, or even for the total prohibition of their use. The most effective guarantee for the security of non-nuclear-weapon States is nuclear disarmament, and, pending that, a general ban on the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. If we must consider a stop-gap measure, then it has to be in the form of an international convention whose legal force will be unquestionable.

The inadequacies of any other form of arrangement, such as unilateral declarations or resolutions of the General Assembly, are obvious. It is in consideration of these inadequacies that the General Assembly called on the nuclear-weapon States to conclude effective - and I stress the word effective - and binding arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States that they will not be victims of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. My delegation therefore hopes that the Committee on Disarmament, which is a negotiating organ, will concentrate its attention on the conclusion of an effective and legally binding instrument. Since it is not a deliberative organ, the Committee on Disarmament, in my delegation's view, is not the place to negotiate draft resolutions. Work of that kind can be done in the First Committee.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Turning to the question of conventional weapons, my delegation has taken note of the report of 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. We regret that the Conference did not complete its task. Nowhere is the result of this Conference awaited with such anticipation as in Africa where the racist minority régimes continue to kill innocent people by the use of some of these weapons. It is the hope of my delegation therefore, that a second session, which has been suggested, and which we hope the General Assembly will approve, would enable the Conference to adopt legally binding instruments which will prohibit, or, at least, effectively restrict the use of specific conventional weapons which are deemed to be excessively inhumane. We hope also that the Conference will agree on an effective follow-up procedure which will permit future development of work on this subject. It should be borne in mind that any meaningful agreement by this Conference will undoubtedly give an impetus to real measures of disarmament in the area of conventional weapons generally - perhaps including the much talked-about question of the transfer of conventional weapons.

One of the areas for disarmament efforts which is currently being explored is the regional approach, to which several representatives have made reference in the course of our debate. Reference has particularly been made to the Conference on European Security and Co-operation, which has contributed to the promotion of mutual confidence among European States. It seems to my delegation that the regional approach may hold promise for disarmament efforts provided - and this has to be stressed - that certain basic facts are clearly understood. First, that the universal quest for general and complete disarmament cannot be broken down, as it were, into regional compartments, with each region then deciding what measures it wants or it does not want to undertake. Such an attempt will surely distort the universal programme for disarmament, and will de-emphasize the priority areas which have been established by the international community.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Secondly, it must be clearly understood that the countries in a region are the best judges of regional requirements and regional measures to meet such requirements. Any initiative therefore for regional measures of disarmament will have to emanate from the countries in the region concerned. Furthermore, if regional efforts are to contribute effectively to the universal disarmament effort, then the United Nations will have to assume its responsibility, whenever requested, to assist a region in the maintenance of its peace and security.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Linked to the regional approach is the concept of confidence-building measures to which the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany made extensive reference in his statement. The experience gained in Europe has no doubt encouraged the effort to universalize the idea, although - and I am grateful to him for having made this clear - not necessarily the measures found convenient for the European region. But the more events unfold in various parts of the world, the more caution my delegation would advocate in the approach to this problem. Confidence-building measures are both the cause and the effect of trust among States. A minimum of such trust must exist among States in a region before they can even contemplate undertaking confidence-building measures in the hope of increasing such trust. In a region where there exists no trust whatsoever between States, in a region where one State is clearly bent on destabilizing the entire region, in a region where that same State is known to hold all others in the region openly to ransom, it will be premature to think of possible methods and means of increased trust. A situation of continuous and ever-growing threat to the security of regional States calls first and foremost for concerted international efforts to remove the threat to the security of that region. The United Nations institutions responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security must be ready in the first place, as a prelude to consideration of regional confidence-building measures, to lay the necessary groundwork.

The huge proportion of world resources consumed by the military sector as compared to the amount devoted to economic and social development continues to shock responsible observers. As I mentioned earlier, in 1978 alone military expenditures were reported to amount to \$450 billion, which is an increase of \$50 billion over the 1977 level. This was at a time when the world economic outlook was very grim, especially in the developing countries, and when the amount available for international economic co-operation continued to decline. It must be said in all candour that the developing countries themselves were not immune from the increase in military expenditure. That is most unfortunate. Thus the diversion of enormous resources and energy, both human and material, from peaceful economic and social pursuits to the

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

wasteful armaments race continues, even as the Disarmament Decade proclaimed by the United Nations in 1969 draws to a close. It is no surprise, therefore, that the Development Decade proclaimed at the same time is also drawing to a close with none of its objectives accomplished. If the military must continue to have all it wants, then social and economic requirements will continue to be starved of the resources which are required for those sectors of human development. Indeed the close interrelationship between disarmament and development has now come to be generally accepted. The study currently being carried out on disarmament and development should, my delegation believes, provide proposals for making this link concrete.

At its thirty-third session the General Assembly, on the recommendation of this Committee, adopted resolution 33/62. In that resolution the Assembly took note of the preparations for the strategy for the Third United Nations development decade and stressed the need to continue to promote the link between the strategy for development and the strategy for disarmament, in view of the close relationship between disarmament and development. It is the view of my delegation that steps should be taken to proclaim the 1980s a disarmament decade, simultaneously with the proclamation of the Third Development Decade. The strategy for the disarmament decade should include, we believe, the elaboration, within the first year of the decade, of a comprehensive programme of disarmament by the Committee on Disarmament, to be adopted, of course, by the General Assembly. It should also include the active pursuit of negotiations on disarmament measures with a view to completing the priority items, if possible, during the decade. The Nigerian delegation believes that the strategy should also contain specific arrangements for the transfer of resources from military to economic and social purposes. Since the Disarmament Commission, to its credit, did manage to complete its consideration of the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament during its session earlier this year, my delegation feels confident in proposing that the Disarmament Commission at its next session be required to prepare a draft resolution on the declaration of the 1980s as a disarmament decade. We hope that such a draft will be ready for submission to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session so that the Assembly will be enabled to adopt the proposal for the disarmament decade to be embodied in the said resolution.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

The reactivation of the Disarmament Commission has proved to be one of the positive results of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. My delegation therefore believes that the First Committee, and hence the General Assembly, should henceforth be selective in assigning tasks to the two organs which were created as a result of that special session. I am referring to the deliberative organ, which is the United Nations Disarmament Commission, and the negotiating organ, which is the Committee on Disarmament. My delegation believes that the multilateral negotiating organ - that is, the Committee on Disarmament - can only fulfil its potential if it is not saddled with matters of a deliberative nature. We therefore hope that in the course of the adoption of resolutions, the First Committee will be careful not to burden the Committee on Disarmament with too many items which could in fact best be discussed in the deliberative forums which are available to the United Nations.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

I should like to conclude my statement by expressing the satisfaction of my delegation at the momentum generated by the special session in some areas that are related to disarmament. We have noted that several studies, which can help in clarifying issues and, one hopes, in facilitating future negotiations, have been commenced. We have also noted that the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies has assumed its responsibilities in an efficient and effective manner. We look forward to seeing the Board's report on its first year of operation. Various programmes for promoting public awareness on disarmament have been undertaken, including the celebration of Disarmament Week. The Fellowship Programme on Disarmament designed to broaden knowledge on disarmament issues among governmental advisers has been launched. Indeed, the first group of fellows has been following the proceedings of this Committee. My delegation looks forward also in this connexion to receiving the first report of the Secretary-General on the Fellowship Programme. If necessary, my delegation will want to speak again and to express its views on the reports on these various programmes which, we hope, will soon be submitted by the Secretary-General.

Mr. Chairman, it is left to me now to tell you how happy we are at seeing you presiding so effectively over the deliberations of this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we adjourn the meeting, I should like to state that some questions have come up with respect to opening the list of speakers for inscription with respect to draft resolutions. The list is open. What I should like to say is that delegations may inscribe their names for speaking on any of the items listed here, but when the officers of the Committee meet to decide it will be merely on the closure of the list of speakers, and I assure delegations that there will not be a great deal of time. Thus, they should take advantage of this opportunity to inscribe their names as far as possible in advance to speak on draft resolutions after our debate ends on 5 November.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.