

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

FORTIETH SESSION

Official Records*



MAY 19 1987

FIRST COMMITTEE
32nd meeting
held on
Friday, 8 November 1985
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 32nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia)

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE
(continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Dubey (India)
Mr. Martynov (Byelorussian SSR)
Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan)
Mr. Cisse (Mali)
Mr. Comissario (Mozambique)
Mr. Ram (Fiji)
Mr. Garcia Iturbe (Cuba)
Mr. Garcia Robles (Mexico)
Ms. Mauala (Samoa)
Mr. Ekeus (Sweden)
Mr. Nengrahy (Afghanistan)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2.730, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/40/PV.32
11 November 1985

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 to 69 and 145 (continued)

STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE

The CHAIRMAN: I shall first call on the representative of India as Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development to present the report of that Committee (A/40/51).

Mr. DUBEY (India), Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development: At its thirty-ninth session, the General Assembly adopted without dissent resolution 39/160, according to which it decided "to convene an International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development". In the resolution, the Assembly also defined the purposes of the Conference and set up a Preparatory Committee for it. The Preparatory Committee met in New York from 29 July to 9 August of this year. I have the pleasure and honour of presenting the Preparatory Committee's report to the First Committee in document A/40/51.

The mandate given to the Preparatory Committee was to "formulate and submit ... to the General Assembly, at its fortieth session, recommendations as to the provisional agenda, procedure, place, date and duration of the Conference."

As the Committee's report shows, the Preparatory Committee has been able fully to discharge its mandate. In fact, it has gone beyond that mandate and made a series of recommendations on other vital aspects of the preparation of the Conference.

Within the brief span of the two weeks' duration of the session, the Preparatory Committee reached agreement on a full set of rules of procedure for the Conference. Its recommendation on this point is contained in paragraph 15 (a)

(Mr. Dubey, Chairman, Preparatory
Committee for the International
Conference on the Relationship
between Disarmament and Development)

of its report. The Committee was also able to reach agreement on the provisional agenda of the Conference, which is contained in paragraph 11 of its report.

As regards the dates, duration and venue of the Conference, the Committee has recommended that the General Assembly give favourable consideration to holding the Conference in Paris for a duration of three weeks in June and July 1986. The recommendation on the venue was based on an indication given to the Preparatory Committee by the French delegation that France was prepared to host the International Conference in Paris. Since then, we understand that this indication has been translated into a formal invitation for the Conference to be held in Paris. The French Government has also suggested that the dates for the Conference should be 15 July to 2 August 1986. I am sure I am echoing the sentiment of the entire Committee in expressing our deep gratitude to, and appreciation for, the French Government's invitation. This gesture is fully in keeping with, and will be a fitting climax to, the commendable initiative taken by the French Government, and particularly by President Mitterand, for the convening of this Conference.

(Mr. Dubey, Chairman, Preparatory
Committee for the International
Conference on the Relationship
between Disarmament and Development)

Apart from making recommendations on the provisional agenda, rules of procedure, date, duration and venue of the Conference, the Preparatory Committee has also made suggestions - agreed upon by consensus - on the structure and final issue of the Conference and on participation in it. As members will see in the report, the Conference, if our recommendations are finally approved, will have plenary meetings, a credentials committee, a committee of the whole and three working groups, one for each of the substantive agenda items. The final issue of the Conference will take the form of a final document, to be called a declaration, and of such other documents as may be agreed upon.

It has also been recommended that the Conference be held at a high political level. The Conference is going to be a major international political event of 1986; it will provide a historic opportunity to debate and reach conclusions at a high political level on one of the burning issues of our time, an issue which affects almost all aspects of contemporary life. One therefore expects that participation in the Conference will be at the ministerial level, preferably at the level of Foreign Ministers. One hopes too that a number of Heads of State or Government will find it possible to come to the Conference and give guidance and provide direction for its deliberations.

In section G of its report, the Preparatory Committee suggests that it be authorized to hold an additional session with the possibility of resuming it if necessary to make substantive preparations for the Conference. It also requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations to appoint a Secretary-General of the Conference and makes suggestions on the role and functions of the Secretary-General of the Conference.

Finally, it makes recommendations on the documentation for the Conference and

(Mr. Dubey, Chairman, Preparatory
Committee for the International
Conference on the Relationship
between Disarmament and Development)

on convening a panel of eminent personalities active in the field of disarmament and development in order to channel their input for the benefit of the Conference.

As regards documentation, the Preparatory Committee had to take account in making its recommendations of the very limited time available for preparation for the Conference. Therefore, the stress is on drawing upon documents already prepared or under preparation. The need for updating existing material has also been recognized. At the same time, it is inconceivable that such a major world Conference should be held without necessitating the preparation of at least a few new documents or papers. The Preparatory Committee has therefore taken cognizance of that fact, but has emphasized that this should be done on a strictly selective basis. The responsibility for this has been left entirely with the Secretary-General of the Conference.

It goes without saying that the success of the Conference will depend a great deal on the active participation of Governments in the preparatory process. In a situation where the secretariat may not have time to assist participating Governments to the necessary extent, a lot will depend on how well-prepared the Governments themselves come to the substantive session or sessions of the Preparatory Committee. I therefore urge representatives to impress upon their Governments the need to prepare fully for the Conference, to formulate their national positions well before coming to the next session of the Preparatory Committee and to ensure effective participation at both the technical and the political levels. It will be very difficult to work on the draft of the final document without a full and clear-cut articulation of national positions right at the beginning of the next substantive session of the Preparatory Committee.

Because of the importance of full participation by member Governments in the substantive preparations for the Conference, the Preparatory Committee has

(Mr. Dubey, Chairman, Preparatory
Committee for the International
Conference on the Relationship
between Disarmament and Development)

recommended that its future sessions be open-ended. That will take care of the problem that has been encountered in reaching agreement on the representation of various regional groups in the Preparatory Committee. I urge all Governments to take advantage of that recommendation on open-ended participation and to participate in the substantive preparations for the Conference.

In my opening statement at the last session of the Preparatory Committee, I stated that "I regard the preparatory process for the Conference as being almost as important as the Conference itself". I made that remark because of my acute awareness that one of the principal purposes of the Conference will be to arouse world-wide consciousness of the implications of the main issue to be discussed there. For that purpose, the concerned sections of the world community, such as the research and academic communities and non-governmental organizations, should be fully associated with the preparatory process. Determining how that association can be brought about at the international level will be one of the main responsibilities of the Secretary-General of the Conference in consultation with the other officers. At the national level, I would suggest that in as many countries as possible national committees or panels be established to prepare for the Conference. Such panels would consist of representatives of the Government, of research and academic institutions and of non-governmental organizations, and opinion-makers. The association of such national committees or panels with the preparatory process for the Conference and, finally, with the Conference itself, will go a long way towards ensuring the success of the Conference.

The Preparatory Committee succeeded in fully discharging its mandate in what may be regarded as record time entirely because of the co-operation of the member countries and the assistance I received from the other Committee officers. I should like to place on record my deep sense of gratitude to them.

(Mr. Dubey, Chairman, Preparatory
Committee for the International
Conference on the Relationship
between Disarmament and Development)

Finally, I commend the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee to this Committee and to the General Assembly for their approval. They will take the form of a draft resolution, which has already been submitted. I appeal to the First Committee and to the General Assembly to take a decision on this item as a matter of urgency, because that would give the Secretary-General of the Conference a few more weeks of precious preparatory time.

Mr. MARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Scientific and technological progress is one of the important factors in the development of society. It is largely thanks to such progress that man has been able to travel the long road from the first primitive tools to assist him in his work to the conquest of outer space and the penetration of the world of matter. In the last few decades, the role of the scientific and technological revolution has gone even further. Thanks to peaceful co-operation in applying the discoveries of science and technology, enormous possibilities are opening up for success in the solution of the social and economic problems facing mankind. Science and technology are laying the foundations for substantial growth in the economic potential of States.

In the new draft of the programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, put before the population for general discussion, it is noted that science will come into its own as a direct productive force. For example, preliminary estimates in the Byelorussian SSR show that during the current five-year period national income will grow by 32.5 per cent, largely through the application of the results of scientific and technological progress. The use of that potential has special significance for Byelorussia in the light of its shortage of labour resources, a result of the loss of one quarter of its population in the Second World War.

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

In connection with the problems of scientific and technological progress, the States members of the Warsaw Treaty at a recent meeting of the Political Consultative Committee in Sofia declared:

"Thanks to the achievements of the revolution in science and technology and to the continuing internationalization of mankind's economic life, it has become possible to implement international programmes of research and development and to devise new equipment and techniques capable of considerably enhancing labour productivity. It is important, however, to know what these programmes will be used for.

"The participants in the meeting are convinced that, under existing conditions, international co-operation in science and technology should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and that it should be given a global character. This would be the surest guarantee that the new achievements of human genius will not become a bone of contention among nations but will be used collectively in the interest of all." (A/C.1/40/7, pp. 4 and 12)

Unfortunately, scientific and technological progress can also have another side - the creation of increasingly sophisticated means of destruction. In this connection, during the past few years the international community has been devoting increasing attention to the problem of preventing the further utilization for military purposes of new inventions and accomplishments in the scientific and technological sphere. This problem is voiced increasingly frequently in the statements of delegations, is the subject of General Assembly resolutions and has been dealt with in a number of research studies. It is to that question that the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR wishes to devote its statement.

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

It is correct to say that there is now no area of the arms race in which scientific and technological progress has not had the most damaging effect. Here we are talking not only about the vastly increased growth in the destructive capacity of the various types of armaments, which is dangerous in itself, but also of the serious consequences of a fundamental qualitative nature.

The growing utilization of the latest inventions and accomplishments for military purposes has the most direct effect on the transformation of the military strategic situation in the world and on the formulation of strategic doctrines and conceptions. We must point out in this regard that over the years the consequences of the militarization of scientific and technological progress have become increasingly global. The most eloquent confirmation of this threatening tendency is the dangerous consequences for stability, peace and security in the world of the possible extension of the arms race into space. The Byelorussian delegation dealt with this problem in detail in its specific statement in the First Committee on 30 October and emphasized the cardinal importance of the need not to allow the militarization of space.

Scientific and technological developments in the sphere of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction are, of course, among the most dangerous because certain militaristic circles are directing this towards the achievement of absolute strategic supremacy. This development is being focused by them on ways of giving to various types of nuclear and other weapons characteristics that would make it possible to use them for a first strike - in fact, in order to restore to nuclear weapons their capacity as a practical instrument for pursuing an aggressive policy.

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

In the 1981 Yearbook of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) there is a list of the following requirements for a first-strike weapon:

"It is essential to strike quickly, effectively and without warning to destroy the greater part of the enemy's potential for retaliatory strike. To do this, it is essential to have an offensive weapon which can either strike at its target very quickly or be moved up close to it undetected. To do that, a highly accurate and reliable weapon is needed with the capacity to effect a first strike against the target."

Such characteristics certainly belong to the inter-continental ballistic missiles known as the MX, the Trident, the Midgetman nuclear missile system, mobile ICBMs, the B1-B and Stealth strategic bombers.

To sum up, such qualitative development by creating more accurate, advanced and precise weapon systems can lead to the elimination of the technical limitations which previously rendered nuclear weapons less suitable as a practical instrument for the aggressive manifestation of political and military might. This danger is greatly enhanced by the plans to create a cosmic shield for offensive nuclear potential.

The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, recently stated:

"The real facts of our time are that the level of the development of science and technology has made possible the emergence of a completely new situation at the beginning of an entirely new phase in the arms race.

However, if the arms race enters upon a new phase and if practical use is made for these purposes of the latest achievements of science and technology, might not one of the sides be tempted to use a presumed advantage against the other side in order to untie their hands and take the fatal step?"

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

There have been alarming reports of the elaboration of qualitatively new types of nuclear weapons - for example, enhanced electro-magnetic impulse nuclear weapons and other variants of the so-called third generation of nuclear weapons. The neutron weapon has, for some years now, given rise to strong protests from public opinion and an overwhelming number of States. There have been dangerous developments also in the chemical-weapon field: the dark, looming shadow of binary weapons brings in its train major negative consequences to which the Byelorussian delegation has already referred in its statement of 5 October. In destructive terms, conventional weapons, as a result of the heightened accuracy and increased destructive power thus given to them, are approaching the level of weapons of mass destruction.

The new accomplishments of the scientific and technological revolution are being maliciously used to establish the basis for the development of unprecedented types of weapons of mass destruction - for example, the "ethnic" weapon, selectively striking at different races and nationalities. The methods of genetic engineering can put in the hands of those with inhuman tendencies a weapon much more terrifying than nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

The abuse for military purposes of the solution of the problem of heredity control may turn into a tragedy for millions of the inhabitants of the earth and for human civilization as a whole. Infrasound and radiotechnical weapons may move from the realm of science fiction and tomorrow become a nightmare in reality.

It is precisely for this reason that the problem of the prohibition of the development and production of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons is acquiring ever greater relevance and topical importance. As is well known, the Byelorussian delegation has devoted the most careful attention to this matter and is the initiator of a number of General Assembly resolutions calling for a halt to the dangerous unfolding of events and proposing concrete measures to achieve that end. At this session of the General Assembly the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will continue its efforts along these lines.

Together with the foregoing, the militarization of scientific and technological progress also creates alarming consequences in the sphere of verification. The swift and profound changes in the development of military hardware may render the task of controlling new types of weapons and, consequently, arriving at agreements on their limitation, reduction and prohibition particularly difficult, if not impossible. Examples of such types of weapons that greatly complicate the difficulties of verification include "Midgetman" mobile missile, cruise missiles, binary chemical weapons and others.

It should not be forgotten that vast amounts of material resources are being gobbled up by the militarization of scientific and technological progress. These amounts are growing with each passing year. As an illustration I offer the following point. The "Manhattan project" cost \$15 billion; the implementation of the "star wars" project will, according to estimates of American scientists, require in the next few years four times more and, in the long run, hundreds of

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

billions of dollars may be spent on it. The trend towards constantly increasing costs of new weapons systems further aggravates the problem of the relationship between disarmament and development.

Great damage is being done to the social and economic development of mankind also by the allocation of immense intellectual resources to the military sphere. For example, in 1980, according to figures provided by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, out of 3 million scientists and engineers working world wide in scientific laboratories, about 500,000 were specially working on the development of new weapons systems.

It should be borne in mind that the colossal amounts of money being expended on the creation of new weapons is creating a dangerous reverse link: they become a stimulus promoting the growth of the military-industrial complex in certain countries leading it to insist on ever new rounds of the qualitative arms race, with the most damaging consequences for mankind.

All of this leads to the inevitable question: Can it be said that the growing use of scientific and technological achievements for military purposes helps strengthen the security of individual States or of mankind as a whole? The answer is that it obviously does not. The Byelorussian SSR shares the opinion on this matter of the delegation of Sweden, which in June this year at the Conference on Disarmament emphasized the following:

"In the nuclear age it is impossible to guarantee security by the upgrading of technology in military hardware. It is essential to elaborate political solutions through negotiations, and not by unilateral efforts to develop technology." (CD/PV.311)

An analogous viewpoint was expressed by a number of other delegations in the First Committee at this session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

Acute concern at the disastrous consequences of the use of scientific and technological progress for the development of new types of weapons has been mounting in widening circles of public opinion, including scientists. The most varied segments of society have been calling for the use of scientific and technological progress exclusively for peaceful purposes. The appeal of the Papal Academy of Sciences is typical in this regard. In its Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear War, the following is stated: "It is the duty of scientists to help in preventing the distortion of their achievements."

The further improvement of weapons has always played a significant role in the military sphere. Now, at a time when the mechanical build-up of weapons can no longer provide decisive supremacy to any side, the qualitative aspect of the arms race has acquired a particularly dangerous significance as the principal factor used by the reactionary forces in order to acquire military supremacy and, consequently, as a factor threatening peace and stability.

In view of the foregoing, it is essential completely to shut off channels for the utilization for military purposes of the new achievements and discoveries of science and technology. The States of the socialist community have repeatedly proposed appropriate measures to this end. In 1975, on the proposal of the socialist States, including the Byelorussian SSR, the Declaration on the Use of Scientific and Technological Progress in the Interests of Peace and for the Benefit of Mankind was adopted in resolution 3384 (XXX). The General Assembly has since then confirmed the importance of that Declaration in a number of resolutions adopted on the initiative of the Byelorussian SSR. In 1982 the Byelorussian SSR co-sponsored resolution 37/77 B, on "Renunciation of the use of new discoveries and scientific and technological achievements for military purposes".

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

There is also a relevant body of experience of international legal instruments which contain provisions limiting the qualitative development of weapons: the Treaty on the prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water, the Treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems, the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction and the Treaty on the limitation of underground nuclear-weapons tests (SALT II), which has not yet been ratified.

In developing this experience, it is essential to proceed further towards the speediest conclusion of international agreements excluding from the arms race whole areas of activity. It is essential that the conclusion of agreements on the inadmissibility of the militarization of space, the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapons test, the prohibition of the neutron weapon and others would to a very significant extent avert the creation of new types of weapons. An important step in this direction would be the ratification of the already signed treaties in the field of the limitation of the arms race.

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

There is also the possibility - before the conclusion of appropriate agreements for arms limitation and disarmament - of limiting their build-up and qualitative improvement. Attainment of this objective could be facilitated by a freeze on nuclear arsenals, the declaration of moratoriums on nuclear explosions, the renunciation of the production and deployment of binary and other types of chemical weapons, as well as the reduction of military budgets.

In the sphere of conventional armaments, it would be of great importance to reach agreement on the freezing of their levels and the levels of armed forces, and also on the prohibition of the development of new types of conventional weapons, which, in terms of their destructive effect, are comparable to weapons of mass destruction. This would help to bring about a shift towards the serious reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments.

The preventive approach is also highly promising. We note with satisfaction that the value of that approach in the context of efforts to curb the arms race has been recognized by many delegations. Here again there is a definite body of experience. Examples include the successful operation of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects, the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques (ENMOD), and of the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil thereof. But experience also shows how difficult it is to reach agreements, particularly on the elimination of armaments which have already come into being. The final phase of the preventive approach would be the complete renunciation by States of the utilization for military purposes of the latest discoveries and achievements of science and technology.

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

In conclusion, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR calls upon all States to consider ways of resolving the question of guaranteeing the utilization of the scientific and technological progress exclusively for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of mankind and, in particular, to take steps to prohibit the development and production of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. The time has now come to set about this task seriously.

Mr. SHAH NAWAZ (Pakistan): In his address to the fortieth anniversary session of the United Nations General Assembly on 23 October 1985, the President of Pakistan stated:

"Nuclear proliferation has so far been dealt with in a global context or within the framework of the special interests of the two super-Powers. I believe that, at the present stage, a major impetus to proliferation emanates from regional perspectives. I suggest that the United Nations should examine the regional perspectives on nuclear non-proliferation with a view to devising effective and equitable means to prevent the spread of nuclear arms."

(A/40/PV.47, p. 7)

The President's suggestion takes into account the different perspectives and problems obtaining in various regions of the world demanding appropriate treatment and suitable remedial measures relevant to each situation. This approach could make an important contribution to the objective of global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

Like most other countries, Pakistan accords the highest importance and priority to the goal of complete nuclear disarmament. In the Conference on Disarmament, the Disarmament Commission and this Committee, Pakistan has submitted several proposals by which the cause of nuclear disarmament can be advanced. Our goal is the complete prohibition of the use and possession of nuclear weapons. Our

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

hope is that the Geneva negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union will result in significant reductions in their nuclear weapons and in the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

The spread of nuclear weapons will, inevitably, complicate the task of nuclear disarmament. It would also increase the risk of a nuclear conflict by design, accident or escalation.

Twenty years ago, there was a general consensus on the rationale for non-proliferation. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) was supposed to have given expression to this consensus. The Treaty was to have been a bargain involving, on the one hand, commitments by the non-nuclear-weapon States not to acquire nuclear weapons or nuclear explosive devices and, on the other, commitments by the nuclear-weapon Powers to promote nuclear disarmament and the peaceful uses of nuclear technology on a non-discriminatory basis.

Doubts arose about the universal acceptance of the NPT during the negotiating process. Several non-nuclear-weapon States - the so-called threshold Powers - expressed dissatisfaction over the commitments given by the nuclear-weapon States to achieve nuclear disarmament and to extend peaceful nuclear co-operation. They also demanded credible interim arrangements to assure the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Developments over the past 15 years have, if anything, accentuated the inequality inherent in the NPT. Today, more than ever before, the nuclear-weapon States rely on nuclear deterrence. Their nuclear arsenals have grown progressively larger and more sophisticated. Restrictions on peaceful nuclear co-operation have increased, at times in direct contradiction to the letter and spirit of the NPT. Moreover, the non-nuclear-weapon States have yet to be assured, in a credible way, against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Meanwhile, several threshold States have moved closer to actual nuclear weapons capability.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

While it is encouraging that a large number of non-nuclear-weapon States have found it possible to accede to the NPT, it must be noted that they have also expressed unhappiness over the manner in which the Treaty has been implemented so far. Their continuing self-restraint, in the circumstances, is commendable.

The recent NPT Review Conference, which Pakistan attended as an Observer for the first time, has recommended certain measures to strengthen the objectives of the Treaty. Some of those recommendations deserve full international support. In particular, Pakistan believes that the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty will contribute, immeasurably, to the objectives of nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. Pakistan calls for a moratorium on all nuclear testing by all States until a test ban treaty has been concluded.

My delegation also believes that, in many respects, the recommendations of the NPT Review Conference fail to respond to the political realities and to the real causes and motivations which threaten the nuclear non-proliferation régime.

The global approach to nuclear non-proliferation, reflected at the NPT Review Conference, assumes uniformity of motivations for non-accession to the Treaty and, accordingly, prescribes uniformity in the response to non-parties. Yet the differences are far more significant than the superficial similarities in the reasons for non-accession to the Treaty would suggest. In this context, the Conference's recommendations for further restrictions on peaceful nuclear co-operation may, in certain cases, prove to be counter-productive.

It is true, of course, that nuclear capability, present or potential has emerged as a factor in the security calculations of States. This is due largely to the continued reliance of the great Powers on nuclear weapons as a means of preserving their security and as a symbol of their status.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

While we bear that in mind, the search for the answers to the non-proliferation dilemma must begin with the following question: does the reluctance of the threshold Powers to assume legal non-proliferation commitments arise from living in a political world in which nuclear-weapon capability is a sign of manhood, or are their positions related to their more immediate security threat perceptions or situations they actually confront?

Among all the so-called threshold States, hardly one or two at present could possibly aspire to the status of global nuclear Powers. Fortunately, that is not their declared desire or stated reason for non-acceptance of legal non-proliferation commitments.

The main reasons for non-accession by various States to the Non-Proliferation Treaty at present appear to be as follows: first, an urge for equality with nuclear-weapon States, especially those in the immediate neighbourhood posing real or imaginary threats; secondly, a fear of the nuclear capabilities and intentions of other regional States; thirdly, a fear of the overwhelming conventional-weapon superiority of neighbouring countries; fourthly, a desire for regional domination or hegemony or reaction to such a desire.

All those perspectives arise from special problems and situations in particular areas of the world. It is difficult, therefore, to address those problems and situations, in their diversity, in a global arrangement such as the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Even if the imbalances in the rights and obligations of nuclear and non-nuclear States inherent in the Non-Proliferation Treaty were to be redressed, even if progress were to be made towards nuclear disarmament, some of the non-parties might not be persuaded to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty unless and until their own immediate security concerns and perceptions were addressed simultaneously. Therefore, a more positive attitude towards assuming legal commitments for non-proliferation on the part of States non-parties to the

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

Non-Proliferation Treaty could perhaps be found within the context of their own regions and through appropriate responses to their perceived problems and threat perceptions.

One such response is the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world. Pakistan continues to support the nuclear-weapon-free zone concept as a valuable means of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and building mutual confidence among regional States.

Yet, in the light of the experience gained in recent years, particularly the specific problems faced in some regions - for example, in Africa, the Middle East, the South Pacific and even Latin America - we favour exploring more comprehensive approaches involving interaction among regional States and between them and the nuclear Powers, so as to find answers to the legitimate security concerns of all. Such arrangements should seek to respond to the problems and perspectives which provide the impetus to nuclear proliferation in various parts of the world. The elaboration of such arrangements could begin with an examination of the specific motives and fears of particular States in various regions and seek to respond to them in the most appropriate and equitable way through regional arrangements and, where necessary, global action.

For example, the nuclear motivations of Israel or South Africa are unrelated to any threat of nuclear attack from the great Powers or any overwhelming conventional arms superiority of neighbouring States. The Pretoria régime has developed its nuclear option as a means of imposing its unjust policies on its own people and neighbouring States and maintaining political hegemony in the region. In the special cases of South Africa and Israel it is evident that at the advanced stage of their nuclear programmes even the acceptance of International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards and the cessation of nuclear co-operation may not prevent them from acquiring the capability to destroy their neighbours.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

In the case of States seeking to impose a regional hegemony what is required is a political response at the international and regional levels. At the international level, the Security Council must resolve to deter those States from threatening their neighbours with nuclear weapons. At the regional level, the threatened States must adopt concerted measures to deter any attempt at regional hegemony.

On the other hand, if the problem confronted by a State is the threat it perceives from nuclear weapons deployed near its borders, that should evoke a response of understanding from the nuclear-weapon State or States concerned. That response could be in the form of removal of the nuclear weapons so deployed and appropriate assurances against the use or threat of the use of such weapons.

In cases where positions of regional States are related to mutual fears about nuclear capabilities and intentions - as is the case in South Asia - it would be most appropriate to devise bilateral or regional arrangements to set at rest such fears and threat perceptions. It would be most tragic, for example, if a non-nuclear-weapon State were to justify the development of nuclear weaponry as a riposte to the existing capability of a nuclear-weapon State, for such reasoning would surely set off a chain reaction of its own until its irreversible logic turned every capable country into a nuclear-weapon State.

Similarly, political and confidence-building measures are required to mitigate fears generated by overwhelming conventional arms capabilities of neighbouring States.

It is evident that in most regions more than one of the above factors would influence security perspectives. For example, such perceptions may derive both from the nuclear-weapon deployments of nuclear Powers and regional suspicions. The non-proliferation arrangements should address each of those factors.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

Until such time as the international community is able to give serious attention to the positions of the threshold Powers and to construct appropriate responses, the danger of proliferation will remain undiminished in our world. Pakistan feels that now is the time to try new approaches which could hold out a greater promise of success.

It is natural that Pakistan should be most immediately concerned about the danger of nuclear proliferation in its own region. Our awareness that this is a matter of life and death for us and our neighbours in the region has lent immediacy and purposefulness to our efforts to avert the danger that looms on our horizon by timely initiatives. They have taken the form of several proposals, which include the creation of the South Asia nuclear-weapon-free-zone and special bilateral arrangements with our neighbour India, which were spelt out in President Mohammad Zia-ul-Haq's address to the commemorative meeting of the General Assembly on 23 November. As the President said:

"Pakistan is prepared to enter into any agreement or arrangement with India on the basis of sovereignty and reciprocity to keep our area free of nuclear weapons. We would welcome any ideas, participate in any consultations, attend any conference, in order to achieve this objective."

(A/40/PV.47, p. 8-10)

We believe that effective arrangements for keeping our region free of nuclear weapons can best be made on the basis of mutual trust and understanding among the countries of South Asia. Our proposals, therefore, take into account the security preoccupations of all those States. If we in South Asia can carry those proposals forward to their logical conclusion, our success in establishing a nuclear-weapon-free régime in our region could be contagious. We could set an example and become pioneers of a new approach to genuine and universal nuclear non-proliferation. Today our region, tomorrow our world, could become free from the curse of nuclear weapons.

Mr. CISSE (Mali) (interpretation from French): My delegation has always adhered to the idea that the strengthening of solidarity in the area of disarmament would serve the cause of international peace and security, and that the resources released through a reduction of arms expenditures would contribute to the growth and stability of the world's economy, and in particular, that of the developing countries. This basic idea is at the heart of the relationship between disarmament and development and should not be considered as a pure abstraction, as a Utopian view of today's world, this world full of power egocentrism and hegemonistic designs, this world of war and antagonisms.

It is true that every year our Committee repeats resolutions which, since they reproduce once again unrealized proclamations, are but wishful thinking. This negative mechanism has always weakened the work of the Political Committee and it has detracted from the lustre of the debates and the profundity of United Nations thinking.

However, it is vital to face the facts, namely, the contradictions which are tearing the world's economy apart between the growing poverty of underdevelopment and the imbalanced opulence of overdevelopment, the growing gap between the affluent North and the South, which has barely emerged from its colonial night, the structural crisis in the economy of an interdependent world, where reality can escape only those who indulge in elementary economic egocentricity or blatant political blindness.

As I have said before in this Assembly, without underestimating the extent of the arms race, which is a competition leading mankind to his destruction, underdevelopment too is increasingly assuming the nature of a serious threat to international peace and security. For if the third world remains hungry, the developed world cannot for long continue to live by the superiority of its weapons or with the steady deterioration in terms of trade.

(Mr. Cisse, Mali)

Interdependence of interests is therefore a fact of life. We must take it into account as a sure and lasting foundation for peaceful, equitable, stable and fruitful relations between nations. However, the interdependence of interests calls not only for restructuring international economic relations between developed nations and the less advantaged nations. It also concerns their mutual security and calls for a positive definition of the relationship between disarmament and development.

It is becoming urgent to release the considerable resources which are devoted to destruction in order to use them for peaceful purposes, for development, and ultimately for the security of all nations.

As stressed by the Secretary-General in his message on the occasion of the historic day of the United Nations:

"The observance of the fortieth anniversary of the coming into force of the United Nations Charter has attracted the largest congregation of Heads of State or Government that has ever taken place. Their participation signifies a clear affirmation of the central place of the United Nations in the international system and of its indispensability for maintaining peace and promoting human advancement.

"... When leaders of nations engage themselves earnestly in examining the outcome of international effort over four decades and formulating its requirements for the future, it is a sign at least of a strong current of internationalism running through all societies. It implies a recognition of the interdependence of nations and the essentiality of a multilateral approach to the solution of global problems."

It is in this context that my delegation would like to refer specifically to the report on the relationship between disarmament and development (A/40/618) and to express its appreciation of the tireless efforts of the Secretary-General in

(Mr. Cisse, Mali)

methodically and rationally piecing together and combining the many aspects of this disarmament-security-development triptych. My delegation is gratified by the ideas he has presented which have done much to throw further light on the workings of that triangular interrelationship, and rightly to stress that underdevelopment is a non-military threat to the security and prosperity of nations. My delegation also notes with satisfaction and great interest the measures taken in the framework of the United Nations system.

With particular reference to the report of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development (A/40/51), my delegation would like to say that it fully supports the work that has been done and to renew to the host country, France, our congratulations for its generous proposal. The delegation of Mali unreservedly supports the draft resolution which will be introduced by France on behalf of the co-sponsors, one of which is Mali.

Our Committee should authorize the Preparatory Committee to hold one, and if necessary, two additional sessions, each of two weeks' duration, open to all States, and devoted to a consideration of the substantive questions on the agenda of the Conference.

The draft resolution refers to certain concerns which should be unanimously supported by our Committee.

In that connection, my delegation believes that the Paris Conference, which will be a historic event in every sense, should evaluate the implications of the level and extent of military expenditures, particularly those of the nuclear-weapon States and other militarily important States; implications for the world economy, for the international economic and social situation and for the developing countries in particular. It should prepare concrete recommendations, and in particular study ways and means of releasing additional resources for development, particularly that of the developing countries.

(Mr. Cisse, Mali)

Many delegations have already stressed, and eloquently so, the importance today more than ever before of the relationship between disarmament and development. On this fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, more political will should therefore be displayed with a view to freezing all elements which negate peace and laying new reasonable foundations for peaceful coexistence so as to promote socio-economic well-being and balanced security.

These problems in international relations in the world today reveal the need for a change in mentality. They call for the acceptance of and positive competition between our differences and, in the end, mutual confidence. It is obvious that such confidence is unthinkable in a context of continuously increasing arms expenditures, which more and more defy the imagination and stand in the way of development, stability and social progress, especially in our underdeveloped countries. That is why, in the view of my delegation, we should encourage the new process of peace which has been initiated at the international level through a definition of the relationship between disarmament and development.

At the regional level, the Summit Conference of the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, which held its twentieth regular session in Addis Ababa from 12 to 15 November 1984, in resolution AHG/Res. 126 (XX), called for the consideration, as a first stage, of the imposition of a 5 per cent tax on military budgets so as to create additional resources to finance the development programmes of third world countries. It also invited all member States of the African continent to study and undertake regional disarmament measures as provided for in resolution 37/100 F.

(Mr. Cisse, Mali)

It also invited the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity, in co-operation with the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research and the United Nations Department of Disarmament Affairs, to make all arrangements necessary for the convening of a regional conference on security, disarmament and development in Africa. As members know, that regional conference was held in Togo, from 13 to 16 August 1985. It adopted the Lomé Declaration on security, disarmament and development in Africa and a Programme of Action on peace, security and co-operation in Africa. In short, the Lomé Declaration and Programme of Action reflect a state of mind, a position and a specific political will all aimed unswervingly towards the objectives of peace, harmony, progress, security and development.

The ethical dimension of the way in which those objectives are perceived may vary without altering the universality of their basis. In other words, it is not a philosophical, ideological or political negation of the diversifying impact of the human condition. Today more than ever before, the dialectic of war and peace must never thrust us into a dilemma. Let us fix upon the history of man, at least in this fortieth anniversary year of our world Organization, to reconcile man with himself and to foster the relationship between disarmament and development. This is today a crucial matter for my country, Mali, for Africa and for the international community.

Mr. Chairman, owing to the common interests and ideals shared by our two countries, Indonesia and Mali, and to the excellent relations we maintain between us, I take this opportunity to convey to you the heartfelt congratulations of my delegation for the outstanding ability and effectiveness with which you are guiding our work. Our appreciation goes also to the other Committee officers and to the Secretariat staff, who are assisting you in carrying out your important work at this vital point in our debate.

(Mr. Cisse, Mali)

My delegation wished, at this vital point in our debate, to share its views, its convictions and its thoughts.

Mr. COMISSARIO (Mozambique): A few days ago, my delegation spoke during the general debate in this Committee. Today, I should like to express my Government's position on the question of the Indian Ocean.

The importance of the Indian Ocean to its littoral and hinterland States has been clearly recognized during the long consideration of the issue by our Organization. The fact is that for centuries the Indian Ocean has played the vital role of linking and bringing together countries and continents.

The adoption by the General Assembly in 1971 of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace (resolution 2832 (XXVI)) fully corresponded to the will of the international community to turn that ocean into a place of co-operation, progress and understanding among countries and nations. However, we have been witnessing the increasing deployment in the Indian Ocean of nuclear weapons as well as the installation of new military bases, in disregard of that legitimate aspiration.

The immediate effect of that ever-growing militarization and nuclearization of the Ocean is the heightening of the climate of tension and instability in the region and the strengthening of the well-known nuclear collaboration between the Western countries and the South African racist régime. We are thus confronted with negative factors which run counter to and are a violation of the relevant decisions and resolutions adopted by the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Non-Aligned Movement and the United Nations.

Some countries have not co-operated with the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean in its endeavours to have the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace implemented. We believe that it is those countries that are responsible for the lack of consensus on issues on the agenda of the Ad Hoc Committee. We hope

(Mr. Comissario, Mozambique)

that the continuing negotiations conducted by the Ad Hoc Committee within the United Nations will lead to the full implementation of resolution 39/149, thus permitting the convening of the Colombo Conference in the first half of 1986.

My country regards the adoption of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace as a transcendental achievement. The Declaration constitutes a basis for the realization of the just legitimate aspirations of all peace-loving countries, particularly those of the region. That is why my country has been advocating the adoption of the following measures concerning the Indian Ocean: an end to the modernization of existing military bases and the cessation of the installation of new ones; the elimination of all military bases and nuclear weapons; and the denuclearization of the Ocean. We are convinced that the implementation of those measures would constitute a significant step in the process of the implementation of resolution 2832 (XXVI).

The overwhelming majority of the peoples of the littoral and hinterland countries of the Indian Ocean have suffered first hand the horrors of colonialism and foreign domination. As free and independent countries they are today engaged in the struggle against hunger, poverty, illiteracy, endemic disease and all the other effects of underdevelopment.

Our peoples cherish peace, and in peace they wish to strengthen their ties of friendship and co-operation in all fields. They are struggling for peace and progress and for the preservation of their independence. That is why they want the Indian Ocean to be a zone of peace.

We therefore appeal to Member States to join the Ad Hoc Committee in its efforts to ensure the holding of the International Conference on the Indian Ocean in 1986. We believe that that Conference will constitute an important step in the global efforts aiming at transforming the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace, as envisaged in resolution 2832 (XXVI).

Mr. RAM (Fiji): This fortieth anniversary of the United Nations coincides with the fortieth anniversary of the horrors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, where atomic bombs were used for the first time. While the drafters of the United Nations Charter had hoped to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, ironically, four decades later the greatest threat facing the world is extinction by a nuclear holocaust. Thus, no country, however large or small, can remain unconcerned about the spiralling arms race, especially in nuclear weaponry.

While the efforts so far to halt, scale down and eventually eliminate nuclear weapons have not succeeded, this year we have witnessed a few encouraging signs. Since the primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament rests with the two super-Powers, which between them control 95 per cent of the world's nuclear weapons, we welcomed the announcement on 8 January of this year that the United States and the Soviet Union had agreed to bilateral negotiations. They have now completed three rounds of discussions. We also welcome the forthcoming summit meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev in Geneva and hope it will lead to real progress towards an effective disarmament process.

It is also encouraging that the Third Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), recently held in Geneva, adopted its Final Document by consensus. It illustrates the universal determination to eliminate nuclear weapons.

My delegation believes that there is now compelling urgency to conclude the comprehensive test-ban treaty. It is an important first step towards the goal of general and complete disarmament, and further delays should not be tolerated.

We also share the widely held view that a practical way of moving towards disarmament is the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. In our own region, the leaders of the South Pacific Forum, at their meeting in Raratonga, endorsed and

(Mr. Ram, Fiji)

opened for signature the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty on 6 August of this year, the fortieth anniversary of Hiroshima Day. Fiji has signed that Treaty and was also the first country to ratify it.

As the Forum communiqué indicated, the endorsement of the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty reflects the deep concern of all Forum members at the continuing nuclear arms race, the risk of nuclear war and their wish to keep the South Pacific region free from nuclear confrontation. The Parties to that Treaty undertake not to manufacture, receive, use, test or station nuclear explosive devices in the South Pacific. That Treaty, we believe, is an important contribution to disarmament and arms control by significantly extending the zones already established by the Antarctic and Tlatelolco treaties.

While endorsing the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty, the Forum leaders agreed that consultations should be held with the nuclear-weapon States on the three draft protocols before they were finalized. We sincerely hope that those States will become parties to the protocols.

One of the main reasons for adopting a South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty was the deep desire of all Forum members that no nuclear tests be conducted anywhere within our region. While all the independent and self-governing countries of the South Pacific strongly oppose all nuclear testing in all environments, we are especially distressed by the continuing nuclear testings in our region by France, in defiance of the wishes of the people of our region. France has been trying to assure us of the safety of its nuclear testing programme in the Pacific. However, as the representative of Austria so aptly stated only two days ago:

"The issue under consideration is not how to continue nuclear-weapon tests, nor how to conduct them at the lowest levels...; it is also not one of carrying out nuclear-weapon tests in a not too densely populated area, with

(Mr. Ram, Fiji)

politicians watching them so as to certify their safety. The one and only issue under consideration is how to put an end once and for all to all nuclear tests, by all States, in all environments, and for all time." (A/C.1/40/PV.28, p. 36)

We fully share that view and urge all nuclear-weapon Powers to respond urgently and positively to that call.

We are also concerned about the French decision to increase its military presence and activities in our region in New Caledonia. In our view, that increase could lead to instability in our region. We therefore urge France to reconsider its decision on this matter.

Mr. GARCIA ITURBE (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Today my delegation will refer to the agenda items relating to the prevention of the arms race in outer space and the link between disarmament and development.

For some years now the question of the prevention of the arms race in outer space has been one of the major concerns of virtually the entire international community. Tangible evidence of this is provided by the very sizeable votes cast on General Assembly resolutions on this item, with more than 100 votes in favour each time. Another element which confirms the truth of what I am saying lies in the development of our general debate in which most delegations have included among their subjects the demand for the prevention of the arms race in outer space. It could hardly be otherwise.

Ever since the beginning of the 1960s when man conquered outer space, new infinite possibilities have been opened up for science and the use of space for the benefit of mankind.

(Mr. García Iturbe, Cuba)

Thus, the Cuban Government and people are firmly convinced of the enormous benefits for all nations of the world if outer space were kept well removed from the arms race and used it exclusively for peaceful purposes. As an example of our interest in the matter, we wish to recall that within the framework of international co-operation programmes of the socialist countries, particularly the Inter-Cosmos Programme, and thanks to the collaboration of the Soviet Union, in 1980, for the first time, a son of Cuba and Latin America was privileged to be a crew member of a space mission - a mission which carried out various experiments and conducted wide-ranging research and studies with a direct bearing on our economic development.

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

While few countries have been able to participate directly in space missions, owing to a lack of necessary resources and development, and until now have not been involved in peaceful research programmes, of which the overwhelming majority of the international community is fully aware, it would be most useful and pertinent to keep outer space free of the risks of the arms race by establishing broad international co-operation, something which would benefit all countries, particularly the developing countries, and using outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes in such a way as to meet the needs of economic and social development.

It is with this in mind that my delegation recognizes the merit of the latest interesting initiative of the USSR which, in our opinion, properly combines the two fundamental elements pertaining to outer space: the need to prevent the spiralling arms race and to develop international co-operation for peaceful purposes.

My delegation has no doubt as to the meaning of the vote last year on the adoption of resolution 39/59 by 150 votes out of the 158 Member States of the United Nations. While no vote was cast against it, it became apparent that there was one country, which was not joined by even its closest allies, whose actions and objectives were clearly and overwhelmingly rejected by the international community.

That country is the United States, the creator and godfather of the new militaristic adventure, an eloquent manifestation of its impotent desire for supremacy and power; it is alone in isolation in its refusal to have outer space used exclusively for peaceful purposes in order to continue with the development of its warmongering plans.

My delegation hopes that concrete results in keeping with the interests of all countries will be reached on the question of the prevention of the arms race in outer space, which is one of the component parts of the bilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States.

(Mr. García Iturbe, Cuba)

Similarly, while we welcome the fact that this year the Conference on Disarmament managed to agree on the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee to study this question, we shall work towards having this body reconstituted next year with a mandate allowing for the start of a search for concrete disarmament measures on this question.

For all those reasons, my delegation will seek to have this year's resolution to be adopted by the General Assembly cover, as it did last year, actions needed to meet the very just aspirations at this time: that outer space, the common heritage of mankind, will be used exclusively for peaceful purpose and for international co-operation and that it will never under any circumstances be a new environment for the arms race.

With regard to agenda item 69, "Relationship between disarmament and development", I wish to reiterate my country's position that any funds released as a result of agreements should derive from effective disarmament measures and the reduction of military spending, otherwise the fund will not be linked to development.

Furthermore, Cuba wishes to point out here the need for the adoption of practical disarmament measures for the benefit of development and to emphasize the relationship between the budget deficits of some countries, the high interest rates they maintain and, also, the reverse flow of resources that has caused the current situation in which many countries are confronted with an external debt and which underscores the imperative need to achieve a new international economic order and the cancellation of that debt.

There is nothing more vital for world peace than achieving that the funds daily invested for destruction be instead devoted to construction and to ridding the countries of the world from the obligation to pay that external debt.

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

In this connection I shall cite President Fidel Castro, who said:

"The flag of peace has great power in the world, among all thinking people in Europe and in other industrialized countries. The way we present things is to associate the struggle of the third world for its economic interests with world peace, since the interest we are paying on debt is being invested in weapons, in military expenditures, in the arms race, in rearmament. What is all that money that is being taken away from our children, resulting in their not eating, their not having medication or anything else and in families being without employment, being spent on?"

We all know what the answer is. All that money is the billions of dollars spent annually on the frantic arms race going on in the world.

With the resources currently being devoted in a single day to military expenditures, it would be possible to finance for one year the malaria control programme in its entirety. The world invests in five hours of military expenditures the equivalent of the entire annual United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) budget for the care of children.

The training of United States military personnel costs twice the budget for the education of 300 million school-age children in South Asia. The expenditures on public health throughout the world amount to approximately only 60 per cent of military expenditures.

The cost of one prototype modern bomber is the equivalent of the salaries of 250,000 teachers for a whole year, or the cost of the construction and outfitting of 75 hospitals each with 100 beds. The price of a Trident nuclear submarine is what it would cost to keep in school for a whole year 16 million children in the developing countries, or the equivalent of the construction costs of 400,000 housing units for 2 million people. For the cost of a modern tank, one could build 1,000 classrooms for 30,000 children in the third-world countries.

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

Cuba considers that the convening of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development is highly important, for it would make it possible to carry out an in-depth analysis of the problems facing mankind owing to the way in which material and economic resources have been squandered on the manufacture of armaments for the benefit of the few and also provide an opportunity to devise formulas seeking to overcome this situation and at the same time to bring about a more humane and constructive use of such resources.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Today it is my honour to introduce four draft resolutions. The first one is contained in document A/C.1/40/L.35, sponsored by the delegations of Ecuador, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sweden and Yugoslavia, on agenda item 50, entitled "Cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons".

The draft includes many points that are the same as those that were before the Assembly last year, which became resolution 39/52. Thus, for example, it emphasizes that this matter has been under consideration for more than 25 years and that it is a basic objective of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament, to the attainment of which the Assembly has repeatedly assigned the highest priority. It also stresses that on eight different occasions the Assembly, which is the most representative organ of the international community, has condemned nuclear tests in the strongest terms and has stated its conviction that the continuance of nuclear-weapon testing will intensify the arms race, thus increasing the danger of nuclear war. The draft also reiterates the statement that has been made in various previous resolutions that "whatever may be the differences on the question of verification, there is no valid reason for delaying the conclusion of an agreement on a comprehensive test ban". Furthermore, the draft includes some new paragraphs in the preamble which deal with very recent events that have taken place since the adoption of the last resolution on the subject. Thus, a paragraph recalls that the Secretary-General, addressing a plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 12 December 1984, after appealing for a renewed effort towards a comprehensive test-ban treaty, "emphasized that no single multilateral agreement could have a greater effect on limiting the further refinement of nuclear weapons and that a comprehensive test-ban treaty is the litmus test of the real willingness to pursue nuclear disarmament".

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Another new paragraph is the penultimate paragraph of the preambular part, which notes that:

"the Third Review Conference of the parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, in its Final Declaration approved in September 1985, called on the nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty to resume trilateral negotiations in 1985 and on all the nuclear-weapon States to participate in the urgent negotiation and conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty as a matter of the highest priority in the Conference on Disarmament."

The innovations contained in the draft are even more significant in the operative part. Here we have two paragraphs which, if faithfully observed, could have a decisive influence on the attainment of the objective which we have been pursuing for so long. The first of these two paragraphs is operative paragraph 5, according to which, were the resolution to be adopted, the Assembly would appeal to all States members of the Conference on Disarmament, in particular to the three depositary Powers of the two treaties mentioned - the Partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963 and the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968 - "to promote the establishment by the Conference at the beginning of its 1986 session of an ad hoc committee to carry out the multilateral negotiation of a treaty on the complete cessation of nuclear test explosions".

The second of the two paragraphs to which I have referred is operative paragraph 6, which contains a recommendation of the Assembly to the Conference on Disarmament that it "instruct such ad hoc committee to establish two working groups which will deal, respectively, with the following interrelated questions: working group I - structure and scope of the treaty; working group II - compliance and verification".

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

The draft resolution concludes in a way very similar to the resolution of the thirty-ninth session, in calling upon States depositaries of the Moscow Treaty and the Non-Proliferation Treaty "to bring to a halt without delay all nuclear test explosions, either through a trilaterally agreed moratorium or through three unilateral moratoria, for which they would then proceed to negotiate the establishment of appropriate means of verification".

The second draft resolution which I shall now very briefly introduce is contained in document A/C.1/40/L.49 and is sponsored by the delegations of Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Peru, Sri Lanka and Yugoslavia. Like the aforementioned draft resolution, but in a much more succinct way, it deals with the cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons. The preambular part refers to the commitment entered into by the nuclear-weapon Powers in the Partial Test Ban Treaty "to seek to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time and to continue negotiations to this end". It also recalls the relevant provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty as well as the fact that, for 20 years now, the Assembly, in resolution 2028 (XX) unanimously adopted on 19 November 1965, stressed the need that, in order to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the Treaty "should embody an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers".

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

After referring to the provisions of article II of the partial test ban Treaty of 1963, which describes the procedure for the consideration and possible adoption of amendments to the Treaty at a conference of the Parties, this draft resolution ends with a single operative paragraph, by which the Assembly would recommend that States Parties to the Treaty

"carry out urgent consultations among themselves as to the advisability and most appropriate method to take advantage of the provisions of its article II for the conversion of the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty into a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty."

The third of the four draft resolutions is draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.43, sponsored by the delegations of Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, Sweden, Yugoslavia and Mexico, which deals with agenda item 65(h), and is entitled "Climatic effects of nuclear war, including nuclear winter". The draft resolution notes that the conclusions of the compilation of appropriate excerpts of the relevant national and international scientific studies on the subject, produced by the Secretary-General in accordance with the General Assembly's request in resolution 39/148 F confirm that nuclear winter and other climatic affects of nuclear war pose an unprecedented peril to all nations, even those far removed from the nuclear explosions, which would add immeasurably to the previously known dangers of nuclear war.

The draft resolution also notes that those conclusions clearly show that international efforts to carry out further systematic research are necessary. Therefore, after thanking the Secretary-General for the compilation, it calls upon him

"with the assistance of a group of consultant experts chosen by him, bearing in mind the advisability of wide geographical representation and of their

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

qualifications in a broad range of scientific fields, to carry out a study on the climatic and potential physical effects of nuclear war, including nuclear winter, which will examine, inter alia, its socio-economic consequences."

The draft resolution also requests the Secretary-General to transmit that study to the General Assembly in time for consideration at its forty-second session in 1987.

The fourth and last of the draft resolutions which it is my privilege to introduce now is draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.61, sponsored by the delegations of Bahamas, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Mexico. It comes under agenda item 49, entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 39/51 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)".

In its preamble the draft resolution again notes that in the Latin American nuclear-weapon-free zone there are some territories which, although they are not sovereign political entities, are in a position to benefit from the Treaty of Tlatelolco through Additional Protocol I, and it adds that

"it would not be fair that the peoples of some of those territories were deprived of such benefits without being given the opportunity to express their opinion in this connection".

The draft resolution concludes with three operative paragraphs, the last of which provides for the inclusion of the item on the provisional agenda for the forty-first session of the General Assembly. The preceding two paragraphs faithfully reflect the feelings of all of Latin America when they state that the General Assembly:

"Deplores that the signature of Additional Protocol I by France, which

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

took place on 2 March 1979, has not yet been followed by the corresponding ratification, notwithstanding the time already elapsed and the pressing invitations which the General Assembly has addressed to it;

"Once more urges France not to delay any further such ratification, which has been requested so many times and which appears is all the more advisable, since France is the only one of the four States to which the Protocol is open that is not yet party to that instrument".

Ms. MAUALA (Samoa): May I begin, Sir, by expressing the great pleasure of my delegation at seeing you in the Chair of this important Committee. We are very familiar with, and greatly appreciate, your skill and personal dignity. We know you will continue to guide our work expertly, with your well-known warmth and good humour.

The existence of nuclear weapons and the threat they pose to the survival of mankind have been a stark reality for over 40 years. All the human goals we strive for can be rendered meaningless in minutes. It is imperative, therefore, that a concerted effort be made by the States which possess nuclear weapons to negotiate effective arms control and disarmament agreements.

We accordingly welcome the resumption of the bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union, aimed at achieving early and radical reductions in their respective nuclear arms. We should all give our strongest encouragement and support to those negotiations, but we feel we are entitled to expect real and significant results.

An essential step towards removing the danger posed by nuclear weapons is to end all nuclear testing. A comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty, which would prohibit all nuclear test explosions by all States in all environments for all time, is urgently needed.

(Ms. Mauala, Samoa)

Samoa has once again co-sponsored the Australia-New Zealand resolution on the urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. The resolution urges the Conference on Disarmament to establish an ad hoc committee at the beginning of its 1986 session to begin negotiations on a comprehensive test ban in accordance with a programme of work which is elaborated in the resolution. The resolution provides for important and necessary work to be undertaken in the Conference on Disarmament. We urge that it be supported and endorsed by all members of the Assembly.

We note also that the Final Declaration of the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons contained a call on the nuclear-weapon States to resume negotiations on a comprehensive test ban as a matter of urgency. We join with others who have spoken in the First Committee in appealing to all nuclear-weapon States to respond to that call.

We also express our satisfaction at the successful outcome of the Review Conference, which signified the continued validity and importance of the Non-Proliferation Treaty as a vital international agreement which is effectively preventing nuclear proliferation.

Another important achievement during 1985 was the endorsing and opening for signature, by the Member States of the South Pacific Forum, of the Treaty for a South Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone. The Treaty covers a significant portion of the surface of the earth. The zone it establishes is contiguous with zones established by two other major Treaties - the Treaty of Tlateloco and the Antarctic Treaty.

(Ms. Mauala, Samoa)

The conclusion of the Treaty reflects the great importance that all the self-governing and independent States of the South Pacific attach to keeping our region of the world nuclear free. We want our shores, our seas and our skies unsullied.

We therefore deplore the fact that France continues to conduct nuclear testing at Mururoa. France's actions are rejected by all the self-governing and independent States of the Pacific. As we pointed out in our general debate statement, the total and blatant disregard by France of the repeatedly expressed opposition of the Pacific peoples continues to be a source of great agitation, distress and frustration in our region. We once again call on France to stop its nuclear testing in our part of the world.

The nuclear-weapon States have been asked to accede to the Protocols of the South Pacific Treaty. It is our earnest hope that they will add their strength to this important arms control treaty by acceding to the relevant Protocols.

In this regard we are very pleased that China has welcomed the decision to establish the South Pacific nuclear-free zone. We also welcome China's decision to join the International Atomic Energy Agency and to participate in work on the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty when it is begun in the Conference on Disarmament.

There is another reason why we, as a small developing country, wish to see nuclear testing cease. It is because of the enormous economic resources which are committed to such programmes and to armaments in general, both nuclear and conventional.

The cruel reality is that there seems to be no shortage of funds to fuel the security interests of countries while not enough is available for the economic advancement of those small countries which so badly need resources to develop. We

(Ms. Mauala, Samoa)

are therefore pleased that there will be international consideration of the vital issues of disarmament and development at a United Nations Conference to be held in Paris next year.

Samoa has also co-sponsored a draft resolution submitted to this Assembly by Australia on the notification of all nuclear-test explosions. We feel very strongly that, until a Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty is in operation, all people have a right to know when nuclear tests are being conducted, where they are being conducted and the yield of those tests.

The nuclear-weapon States do not have the right to continue to carry out this damaging activity and we feel the very least they should do is to publicly explain those actions.

Mr. EKEUS (Sweden): At this late hour I will be very brief, but I will touch upon two different items.

First of all, I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.29, on the United Nations Study on concepts of security, on behalf of the sponsors Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, China, Colombia, Ecuador, Finland, Philippines, Romania, Uganda, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and my own country.

The draft resolution refers in its preamble to document A/40/553, which contains the report of the Group of Experts which was appointed to carry out this study. The Permanent Representative of Sweden, Ambassador Anders Ferm, who served as the Chairman of the Group of Experts, shared his views about the report with the First Committee in a statement on 6 November 1985. I shall therefore at this juncture not dwell on the contents of this report.

Concerning the draft resolution, the operative part takes note of the report and expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General and the Group of Experts. The study and its conclusions are commended to the attention of all Member States.

(Mr. Ekeus, Sweden)

In the fourth operative paragraph all Member States are invited to inform the Secretary-General of their views regarding the study not later than 30 April 1986.

As is usually the case with United Nations studies, the Secretary-General is requested to reproduce the report as a United Nations publication and to give it the widest possible distribution. Furthermore, the Secretary-General is requested to prepare a report for the forty-first session of the General Assembly containing the views received from Member States regarding the study.

The general thrust of the draft resolution is procedural, aiming at offering all Member States an opportunity to present their views on the study. The possibility to comment would seem to be especially important for those Member States which did not have the opportunity to participate in the Group of Experts.

It is, therefore, the sincere hope of my delegation that this draft resolution will be adopted without a vote.

I should also like to take up another item at this juncture. As the Committee knows, the Chairman of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies for 1985 is Dr. Rolf Björnerstedt of Sweden, I have asked to speak to introduce the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/40/L.28, dated 6 November 1985 and entitled "Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies", which is sponsored by Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Mexico, Sri Lanka, Yugoslavia and my own country.

Members of the First Committee will be aware that the Advisory Board has four functions, one of which is to act as the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR). According to the statute of UNIDIR, approved by the General Assembly in resolution 39/148 H, the Board should consider each year the proposed annual budget estimates of UNIDIR together with the comments and recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administration and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ).

(Mr. Ekeus, Sweden)

In order that ACABQ may make its observations in the light of the most up-to-date situation regarding the expected income of UNIDIR arising from voluntary contributions, ACABQ considers the proposed budget of UNIDIR early in September and its report becomes available some two weeks later. In order to take into account the comments and recommendations of ACABQ, the Advisory Board would have to be able to meet in the latter part of September, that is to say after the regular session of the General Assembly has started.

In accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, paragraph 34, explicit authorization by the Assembly is needed for a subsidiary organ to meet at Headquarters after the commencement of the regular session. The purpose of paragraph 1 of the draft decision is to give that explicit authorization for 1986, when the Advisory Board hopes to meet in New York from 22 to 26 September.

As this situation seems likely to occur in succeeding years unless some other arrangements can be made, it seems sensible also to request the Committee on Conferences to consider the pattern of future meetings of the Advisory Board. That request is contained in paragraph 2 of the draft decision.

I respectfully commend this draft decision to the Committee for adoption at the appropriate time, without a vote.

Mr. NENGRAHARY (Afghanistan) (interpretation from French): As this is my first statement at this session, I wish to begin by beginning my general remarks on a number of First Committee agenda items by congratulating you, Sir, on your unanimous election to the chairmanship of the Committee. Your experience and record as a professional diplomat and your guidance of our work thus far ensure that we shall achieve the desired results. We also congratulate the other Committee officers.

On 24 October 1985 the United Nations reached its fortieth anniversary. It was built by men of good will on the ruins of the Second World War to enable mankind to do all in its power to save the world from the scourge of war. To be sure, there has been no third world war, but we must not disregard the fact that in the past 40 years there have been several regional wars. The reasons for and sources of these hotbeds of tension are clear, and we should not be blind to them. The aggressive and interventionist policies of those in imperialist circles against the militarily and economically weak States, interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States, the economic exploitation of nations, the declaration of various regions so-called zones of vital interest, military intervention and presence beyond national boundaries on the pretext of forming "multinational peace-keeping forces", and the use of plots and sabotage against peoples which choose an independent path of political, social and economic development - it is these that are at the root of the disasters which deprive thousands of men, women and children of their right to live in peace.

If we look back to the first years of the United Nations we can see clearly that the General Assembly, with its first resolution, adopted in 1946, emphasized disarmament in general and the elimination of nuclear weapons from national arsenals in particular. That position was not adopted by chance. The sad experience of the Second World War, the use by the United States in 1945 of the

(Mr. Nengrahary, Afghanistan)

first atomic bombs against the defenceless populations of the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the consequent suffering of those people gave the international community every reason to come out in favour of disarmament and give priority to the elimination of nuclear weapons.

Mankind's hopes at the time of the creation of the international Organization have not been met; we now face the threat of nuclear war posed by the intensified nuclear arms race.

Those in imperialist circles have tried to foster such doctrines as negotiation from a position of strength and the erosion and ultimate eradication of all social and economic systems that reject the capitalist model. To secure military supremacy they have begun to carry out long-term plans to develop new nuclear weapons for the quantitative and qualitative enhancement of their nuclear arsenals. The following are examples of this: the development of more effective and heavier nuclear warheads; the development of nuclear warheads with explosive and thermal effects; the diversion to well-thought-out military purposes of ionizing radiation techniques; and the development of new strategic nuclear weapons systems of the basic types, that is land-based intercontinental missiles, new long-range, high-accuracy submarine-based missiles such as the Trident C-5, the refinement of the B-52 strategic bomber and the manufacture of the new modified B-1, and long-range land-, air-, and sea-based cruise missiles.

The deployment of new medium-range nuclear weapons involves the stationing of new United States nuclear weapons systems in Western Europe, from which they could reach strategic targets on Soviet territory.

The large-scale accumulation of these weapons of mass destruction compels us to work seriously to find ways out of this situation. All States, great and small, strong and weak, have a common interest in reversing the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, and in preventing a nuclear holocaust.

(Mr. Nengrahy, Afghanistan)

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan welcomes all efforts made in good faith to that end. We fully support the constructive proposal of the Soviet Union regarding a 50 per cent reduction in strategic nuclear weapons, which was made publicly by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, during his official visit to France earlier this year. We welcome the Soviet initiative to halt unilaterally the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe.

We attach great importance to constructive multilateral and bilateral negotiations on appropriate agreements to halt the dangerous process of nuclear armament. In that connection, we welcome the resumption of bilateral negotiations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States and their joint declaration of 8 January 1985 that the negotiations would deal with a range of questions pertaining to strategic and intermediate-range nuclear space weapons and that all those questions were to be considered and resolved as a package. The Afghan delegation considers that this move is an important step forward and will facilitate agreement on preventing an arms race in outer space and ending the arms race on Earth.

The conclusion of a general and complete nuclear-test-ban treaty would make it possible substantially to limit the modernization of nuclear weapons, would lead to reductions in nuclear arsenals and would help strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation régime. We share the view that such a treaty would make a major contribution to the consolidation of strategic stability and peace on Earth. We favour the resumption of the trilateral negotiations on the complete prohibition of tests, which were broken off unilaterally by the United States. In its statement in the First Committee last year, my delegation stressed that pending the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty there should be a moratorium on such tests.

(Mr. Nengrahary, Afghanistan)

In this connection, we welcome the courageous decision of the Soviet Union to announce a moratorium on all nuclear explosions from 6 August 1985. It has been stated that the moratorium will remain in force as long as the other major nuclear-weapon State refrains from conducting nuclear tests. The United States, however, not only failed to respond positively to the Soviet initiative but carried out tests only a few days after the announcement of the decision. We vigorously condemn the negative attitude of United States imperialism to the common efforts of peoples and countries that cherish peace to promote nuclear disarmament and prevent a nuclear war.

We reaffirm our support for the Soviet proposal whereby the Soviet Union and the United States would immediately declare a bilateral nuclear freeze. This Soviet initiative enjoys the full support of the international community. We consider that such a freeze would facilitate agreement on reductions of certain types of weapons. We must not permit those in imperialist circles to succeed in destroying the approximate balance and parity that exist between the nuclear arsenals of the Soviet Union and the United States, for such an act would inevitably lead to a new qualitative and quantitative escalation in the arms race.

The aspiration of the United States to superiority over the Soviet Union met with a natural response from the latter, leading to a restoration of the general balance of forces but at a higher and more terrifying level.

The Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was held this year in Geneva. The Final Document, adopted by a consensus, gives us the opportunity to redouble our efforts to strengthen the non-proliferation régime by encouraging universal adherence to it and committing ourselves to complying strictly with the provisions of the Treaty.

(Mr. Nengrahary, Afghanistan)

We are gravely concerned by the irrepressible desire of Israel, South Africa and certain fascist military régimes to acquire nuclear weapons. We continue to believe that those régimes, characteristically, might not hesitate to use nuclear weapons in the event of new hostilities breaking out.

(Mr. Nengrahary, Afghanistan)

We support the right of non-nuclear-weapon States and of those which do not have such weapons on their territory to adequate security guarantees. We hope that the elaboration of international legal instruments can be completed to satisfy the just demands of those States. Once more we welcome the unilateral commitment of the Soviet Union to sign bilateral agreements with non-nuclear-weapon States on the non-use of nuclear weapons against them.

One of the ways in which we can erect barriers to the proliferation of nuclear weapons is the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world. We welcome the conclusion of the Treaty by which the countries of the South Pacific have declared that region a nuclear-weapon-free zone. It is essential to encourage the establishment of such zones based on regional agreements elaborated in accordance with the models of treaties pertaining to the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America and the South Pacific.

The commitment to adopt confidence-building measures could make an appreciable contribution to new progress in disarmament. In this context, it would be better to adopt procedures and modalities to ensure compliance with the provisions of nuclear disarmament agreements, bearing in mind that those procedures and modalities will be effective only if they enjoy the support of all the parties concerned.

For some years now, certain imperialistic and militaristic circles have been working on the massive production of what is called a "clean bomb". I should like to refer here to the development of the neutron bomb, which is to be deployed in various parts of the world and in Europe in particular. We regret that the conclusion of an international convention - the convention which was submitted for negotiation by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries - was not possible in the Conference on Disarmament.

(Mr. Nengrahary, Afghanistan)

I shall now turn briefly to the prevention of an arms race in outer space and the use of outer space for peaceful purposes. Outer space, which has been opened up for man's peaceful activities, is now in danger of becoming a park for the most advanced weaponry. The imperialist adventurers are not satisfied with the massive accumulation of such weapons on earth; they are now trying to extend the arms race into outer space. The so-called strategic defence initiative of the United States - for which billions of dollars have been appropriated - has posed a new threat to human civilization.

So as to mask the real intention behind that programme, the United States has engaged in a vast propaganda campaign about the defensive nature of the "star wars" programme. We share the view that by implementing that programme the idea is to render outmoded and obsolete not all nuclear weapons, but only those of one of the parties, that is, the defensive potential of the Soviet Union and thereby give the United States a first-strike capability and oblige the other party to take its own measures to restore strategic parity. Outer space would thereby become the theatre of a new arms race.

Appropriate steps must be taken before it is too late to stop that from happening; it is the duty of us all urgently to prevent it from happening. In this regard, my delegation firmly supports the new concept advanced by the Soviet Union, that is, "star peace" instead of "star wars". We must preserve space exclusively and for all time for peaceful purposes in the interest of all mankind. We must work with a sense of responsibility to bring about the complete cessation of the arms race and to enable each human being to live in a world free of the most sophisticated and refined weapons.

The CHAIRMAN: According to established practice, statements in the exercise of the right of reply are usually made at the end of the day whenever two meetings are scheduled on the same item. However, since there is no afternoon meeting scheduled, I shall now call on representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. JESSEL (France) (interpretation from French): I have asked to be allowed to exercise my right of reply because this morning two speakers - the representatives of Fiji and Samoa - implicated my country in respect of nuclear tests. If I understood the representative of Fiji correctly, he concluded by saying that the solution of this problem was the cessation of all tests, in all environments, and by all States. I agree with him and entirely share that view. In my statement last Tuesday in this Committee I took up this problem by saying that, for the French authorities, the solution to the problem of nuclear tests should be placed again within the framework of nuclear disarmament; I also referred to the conditions under which such a process could be envisaged and begun.

Mr. RAM (Fiji): I am pleased that the representative of France has responded to our statement; it indicates that his delegation is sensitive to what we say here at the United Nations. I hope the next logical step will be for his Government to take into account what all the independent and Self-Governing Territories of our region have been reiterating for so long, especially with regard to the French nuclear tests in our region.

The CHAIRMAN: Having heard the last speaker for this meeting, the Committee has concluded the second phase of its work devoted to statements on specific disarmament items and continuation of the general debate.

On Monday, 11 November, in accordance with the programme of work and timetable, the Committee will embark on the third phase of its work devoted to

(The Chairman)

consideration of and action on draft resolutions under all disarmament items, namely, agenda items 48 to 69 and 145. From 11 to 22 November a total of 20 meetings have been allocated for that stage of the Committee's work and the Committee should conclude consideration of those agenda items by Friday, 22 November 1985.

On the basis of consultations with the officers of the Committee, I shall now outline a programme of work for the next phase, and in particular for the coming week.

From Monday, 11 November, to Wednesday, 13 November, meetings will be allocated for the introduction of and comments on draft resolutions. In this context, since the Committee has now completed four weeks of general debate and statements on specific disarmament items, I urge delegations to limit the number and length of their statements.

I would also request delegations wishing to introduce or comment on draft resolutions during the meetings allocated for this purpose to inscribe their names on the speakers' list as early as possible.

Beginning on Thursday, 14 November, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions on the disarmament items.

(The Chairman)

At this stage, I should like to point out that, altogether, 73 draft resolutions and one draft decision have been submitted on disarmament items. Quite a large number of them have already been circulated as official documents, and it is my understanding that by the end of today a total of approximately 65 draft resolutions will be available and that the remainder will be distributed on Monday morning.

In view of the large number of draft resolutions that have been submitted, I think it would be advisable if time were set aside for adequate consultations. Accordingly, I propose that on Monday the Committee hold only one meeting - in the morning - thus allowing for the utilization of Monday afternoon for consultations among delegations, just as is the case for this afternoon.

With respect to action to be taken on the draft resolutions, members will recall that at the organizational meeting on 9 October I stated my intention to follow the useful device of clustering draft resolutions which has evolved in the course of the past two years. The Bureau of the Committee will be studying all the draft resolutions with a view to grouping them into appropriate clusters, and I think I shall be in a position to provide the Committee with suggestions and further information on the matter during the early part of next week. I also intend at Monday morning's meeting to indicate to the Committee the draft resolutions on which the Committee will take action on Thursday, 14 November - in other words, the draft resolutions in the first cluster - thereby giving delegations sufficient time to seek any instructions they may deem necessary.

I shall attempt to proceed in like manner in the future, giving sufficient advance notice concerning the draft resolutions to be taken up subsequently.

May I take it that the suggested programme of work is acceptable to the Committee and that we may proceed accordingly?

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.