

CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

DEPT. OF POLITICAL AND
SECURITY COUNCIL AFFAIRS
DISARMAMENT AFFAIRS DIVISION
CCD/PV. 585
REFERENCE LIBRARY
20 February 1973
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FIFTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva
on Tuesday, 20 February 1973, at 3.00 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. W. H. Barton

(Canada)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Argentina:

Mr. V.E. BERASATEGUI

Mr. E.A. PAREJA

Brazil:

Mr. P.N. BATISTA

Mr. F.M. PERRI

Bulgaria:

Mr. O. MITEV

Burma:

U WIN PE

U THAUNG IWIN

U NYUNT MAUNG SHEIN

Canada:

Mr. W.H. BARTON

Mr. R.W. CLARK

Mr. D.R. MACPHEE

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. M. VEJVODA

Mr. J. STRUCKA

Mrs. V. BASETLIKOVA

Egypt:

Mr. H. KHALILAF

Mr. M. ABOUL-NASR

Mr. A.E. KHAIRAT

Mr. S.A. ABOU-ALI

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. GEBRU

Hungary:

Mr. I. KOMIVES

Mr. F. GAJDA

India:

Mr. P.K. BANERJEE

Mr. M.K. MANGALMURTI

Mr. G. SHANKAR

Italy:

Mr. N. DI BERNARDO
Mr. E. GIUFFRIDA
Mr. P. BRUNI
Mr. L. RUSSIANI

Japan:

Mr. M. NISIBORI
Mr. H. MATSUMOTO
Mr. Y. HAMADA

Mexico:

Mr. A.G. ROBLES
Mr. M. MARIN
Mrs. M. PRIETO

Mongolia:

Mr. M. DUGERSUREN
Mr. J. CHOINKHOR

Morocco:

Mr. M.A. KHATTABI
Mr. M. RAHALI

Netherlands:

Mr. M.J. ROSENBERG POLAK
Mr. E. BOS

Nigeria:

Mr. J.D.O. SOKOYA
Mr. A.A. OLUMIDE

Pakistan:

Mr. N.A. NAIK
Mr. N. MIRZA
Mr. M.J. KHAN

Poland:

Mr. W. NATORF
Mr. S. TOPA
Mr. A. CZERKAWSKI
Mr. H. PAC

Romania:

Mr. C. ENE
Mr. O. IONESCO
Mr. M. MANEA
Mr. A. SASU

Sweden:

Mr. L. ECKERBERG

Mr. U. REINIUS

Union of the Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN

Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN

Mr. V.P. ABARENKOV

Mr. V.P. KALININ

United Kingdom:

Mr. H.C. HAINWORTH

Mr. D.F. DUNCAN

Mr. J.T. MASEFIELD

Mr. R. HOULISTON

United States of America:

Mr. J. MARTIN

Mr. R. KIRK

Mr. R.W. DREXLER

Mr. P. SEMLER

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. CVOROVIC

Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. ILKKA PASTINEN

Alternate Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. R. BJORNERSTEDT

Special Consultant

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

Communiqué of the meeting

The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament today held its 585th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of H. E. Ambassador W. H. Barton, representative of Canada.

The Chairman made a statement.

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General conveyed to the Conference a message from the Secretary-General.

After the closing of the public meeting, statements were made by the representatives of the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mexico and Italy.

The following document was submitted:

"Letter dated 11 February 1973 from the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the Co-Chairmen of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament transmitting the resolutions on disarmament adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session" (CCD/393).

The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 22 February 1973, at 10.30 a.m.

*

*

*

The CHAIRMAN (Canada): I declare open the 585th plenary meeting of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. In accordance with the established practice on the resumption of the work of the Conference, the first part of today's meeting will be open.

I should like now, with your permission, to say a few words as Chairman of today's meeting. First, I should like to welcome all members of all delegations to this first session of the Conference for the year 1973. In particular, I am sure I speak on behalf of everyone, in extending a warm welcome to the new leaders of delegations who are with us for the first time. Although I personally have not yet had an opportunity to meet all of the delegates who have served in this Committee before, I look forward to my association with them and with the other new delegation leader, Ambassador Nicolo Di Bernardo of Italy.

I am also pleased to welcome among us Mr. Ilkka Pastinen, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General at our Conference, and the new Alternate Representative, Mr. Rolf Björnerstedt, who has long been involved in disarmament efforts through his service in the United Nations Secretariat. I am gratified also to be able to acknowledge the presence of Mr. William Epstein, who, despite his retirement as Director of the Disarmament Affairs Division of the United Nations Secretariat, will be a consultant to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General during this session.

As a newly-arrived delegate to this Conference, may I be permitted to express the hope that this session will be a productive one. The value of this Committee in contributing towards improved international security through arms control and disarmament is measured, to a considerable extent, by the success we achieve in negotiating effective international agreements, and it is most important that we maintain the momentum which has produced three major agreements in the past five years.

I now take pleasure in calling on Mr. Ilkka Pastinen as Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Mr. ILKKA PASTINEN (Special Representative of the Secretary-General):

I have been instructed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to convey to this Committee a message which reads as follows:

(Mr. Ilkka Pastinen, Special Representative of the Secretary-General)

"The reconvening of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament offers me the opportunity to state once again the deep and inalterable commitment of the United Nations to the cause of disarmament. In this connexion, I wish to express some thoughts on the questions that the Committee will undoubtedly consider during its 1973 session.

Last year, when I had the opportunity of addressing the Committee in person, I noted a number of positive developments in the general political situation, in particular the meetings between leading statesmen aimed at strengthening the foundations of peace. Since then, the movement towards détente in the world has gained further ground. In Viet-Nam, a long and agonizing war is now at an end. In Europe, the relaxation of tensions, sustained by a number of important agreements, has opened favourable prospects for the future. As a result, the process towards a conference on European security and talks on force reductions in Europe has made progress during the last few months.

All this is encouraging proof of a trend which, in my Introduction to the Annual Report on the Work of the Organization, I characterized as "the new 'balance of prudence', the evident decline of the readiness of great Powers to confront each other, the tendency to downgrade the military aspect of power in their relations, and the discernible emergence of an era of negotiation, dialogue and contact...". The development of this trend provides the basis for further efforts towards disarmament. And it should be emphasized that progress in disarmament is a necessary component of the process of détente.

Since I last addressed you, in the field of arms control and disarmament, the SALT agreements, signed during the Moscow summit meeting in May 1972, represent a major achievement. The Treaty on Limitation of ABMs and the Interim Agreement on Offensive Weapons are important steps towards the halting of the nuclear arms race and towards the fulfilment of the obligations laid down in article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. I view them as initial achievements in a continuing process and I hope that the two major nuclear Powers will not relent in their efforts until wider agreements have been reached.

The more favourable political climate that now exists should help the Committee in its efforts to achieve further progress. I firmly hope that the momentum which has led to the achievement of a number of important multilateral arms control agreements between 1963 and 1971 can and will be sustained and produce further concrete results.

(Mr. Ilkka Pastinen, Special Representative of the Secretary-General)

As you know, the General Assembly, at its twenty-seventh session, devoted considerable attention to the major aspects of disarmament problems and adopted a large number of resolutions. These covered a wide area of subjects, including the convening of a world disarmament conference, the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, and general and complete disarmament. In particular, you will have noted that the Assembly requested the Committee to renew its efforts towards reaching agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons and the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests.

The question of chemical and biological weapons has been under active consideration in the Committee for a number of years. Last year the Committee constructively considered ways and means to achieve progress on the question of elimination of chemical weapons. A draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons, a work programme regarding negotiations on prohibition of such weapons, as well as a number of other relevant working papers, were tabled at the last session of the Committee. The discussion was comprehensive and detailed, and I believe that the stage has now been reached where it would be of evident usefulness for all concerned to move on to concrete negotiations, in working towards the complete realization of the objective of effective prohibition of chemical weapons, as stated in General Assembly resolution 2933 (XXVII). This is also an obligation under article IX of the Convention on the Prohibition of Biological and Toxin Weapons, which has now been signed by about one hundred States and can be expected to enter into force during the current year. I should like also to note that the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Seabed and the Ocean Floor entered into force in the course of 1972.

On cessation of nuclear-weapon tests, the General Assembly adopted three resolutions^{1/} which all stressed the importance and urgency of the problem. One of these resolutions^{2/} requested the Committee to give first priority to its deliberations on a treaty banning underground nuclear-weapon tests and to submit a special report to the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session on the result of the Committee's work on this matter.

1/ 2934 A, 2934 B, 2934 C (XXVII).

2/ 2934 B (XXVII)

(Mr. Ilkka Pastinen, Special Representative of the Secretary-General)

It remains my strong conviction -- which I expressed in some detail last year -- that a comprehensive test-ban treaty is an indispensable step in the efforts to halt the nuclear arms race. Without repeating all the arguments which militate in favour of achieving such a ban without further delay, I wish to point out once more that a comprehensive test-ban treaty would strengthen the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which remains the key element of the efforts of the international community to keep nuclear arms under control. Considering, furthermore, that the question of cessation of nuclear-weapon tests has been on the agenda of the General Assembly since 1957, and that in 1963 the parties to the Partial Test Ban Treaty pledged themselves to seek to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time, I wish to express the hope that the year 1973, which marks the tenth anniversary of the Partial Test Ban Treaty, would also mark a turning point in the efforts to achieve a comprehensive nuclear-test ban.

Although I have dealt with only some specific aspects of disarmament -- those which flow directly from pertinent General Assembly resolutions approved last year -- I am well aware that the Committee's task is a more comprehensive one, as reflected in its mandate, its agenda and its deliberations.

I am confident that the Committee will continue its constructive work and will make every possible effort to engage itself in concrete negotiations on the most urgent issues before it, and with a view to achieving new agreements.

To all participants I extend my best wishes for success in this endeavour."

The CHAIRMAN (Canada): I thank the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for his statement, which, I am sure, we have all listened to with appreciation. The objectives set for us by the Secretary-General will, I hope, guide our efforts during this session, and I am sure I speak for all members of the Committee in requesting the Special Representative to convey to the Secretary-General our thanks for his message.

We have now concluded the public part of the meeting. I therefore suggest that we have a five minute recess after which the Conference will resume its work in private.

*

*

*

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my pleasure at being back in Geneva with all my old friends in the Committee. I would also like to assure you that you are not the only one that welcomes your presence here, but it is clear that we all welcome you. We have given proof of our regard by arranging for you to serve as Chairman of your first meeting. We wish you success in your efforts among us.

It is also a great pleasure to welcome to this Committee Ambassador Di Bernardo of Italy. We look forward to working with the distinguished Ambassador.

I am happy to see our Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Ilkka Pastinen, who does so much to ease our burdens and make our work effective.

It is a privilege to welcome the Alternate Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Björnerstedt, and to wish him well in the new position which he so richly deserves.

I am delighted to see Mr. William Epstein with us, and I know that we are all glad he is here. Finally, I would like to thank the charming Mrs. Gill and all of the Secretariat for the many services which they are going to render us and which they have rendered in the past.

*

* *

As we gather today at the opening of the 1973 spring session of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, I am impressed by the fact that we are meeting at a particularly significant time. Complex problems which nations have been approaching for many years are now being pursued in a wide variety of international forums. This fact is a tribute to the continuing efforts of the community of nations to create a viable and durable structure which is rooted in the rule of law and reason, rather than in force. As President Nixon said in his inaugural address of January 20, "let us build a structure of peace in which the weak are as safe as the strong, in which each respects the right of the other to live by a different system, in which those who would influence others will do so by the strength of their ideas, not by the force of arms."

This is not, nor can it be, an easy task. If the past has taught us anything, it is that there is no short cut to lasting security. The most enduring arrangements have come from perseverance in grappling with the difficult issues which lie at the heart of international problems, and from a determination to avoid facile solutions

(Mr. Martin, United States)

or short-term advantage. Time and steady efforts are required if we are to identify and examine the key elements of any problem and to find practical, equitable solutions which will enhance the security of all.

In this Committee, as in other forums, the search for stable and lasting arrangements is not easy. We have had to grapple over the past years with issues so complex that they seemed to defy solution. Notwithstanding the obstacles, however, the Committee has found solutions. The results are known to all: the Limited Test Ban Treaty, the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Seabed Treaty, and most recently the Biological Weapons Convention.

With regard to the last-named Convention, and pursuant to President Nixon's decisions in 1969, I am very pleased to note that, except for small laboratory research quantities for strictly defined defensive purposes, the United States has completed destruction of all of its stocks of biological and toxin agents and of all of all associated munitions. All research and development in this field have been confined solely to defensive measures since late 1969. Facilities, where once highly secure biological warfare activities were conducted, have been converted to major health and environmental missions and are now open. The Directorate of Biological Operations at Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, has been converted to a centre for toxicological research under the Food and Drug Administration. The Biological Defense Research Laboratories at Fort Detrick, Maryland, have been disestablished and, with the exception of one facility to be used by the Surgeon General of the United States Army for totally unclassified medical research, are being used by the National Cancer Institute for research in its "Conquest of Cancer Program".

With these past accomplishments firmly in mind, the United States welcomes and, indeed, looks forward to the opportunity to continue the serious work which is before us.

The issue of chemical weapons has been a priority agenda item for the Committee. Conscious of obligations set forth in article IX of the Biological Weapons Convention, The Committee has accomplished much significant work in this area.

As you are all aware, last year many delegations submitted working papers dealing with such topics as the toxicity of chemical substances and the identification, definition and classification of chemical agents. These papers also covered aspects of the problems of verification. Other papers dealt with the domestic legislation of several countries on chemical substances, and problems and procedures relating to

(Mr. Martin, United States)

the destruction of chemical weapons. In addition, a number of delegations made major plenary interventions on chemical weapons arms control issues. Valuable work was also accomplished at the informal meeting of chemical experts in early July.

During the past recess, we have had time to reflect on our over-all progress, on our accomplishments in particular areas, and on the tasks still before us. In our view, the work to date has revealed the complexity of these tasks and the amount of work yet to be done.

The relationship between scope and the verification of any agreement on chemical weapons seems to be of particular interest to members of the Committee. In August of last year, our distinguished colleague from the United Kingdom, Mr. Godber, noted the need for establishing a proper proportion between the intended scope of an agreement and the means available for satisfying the parties that its provisions will be fully respected. For our part, we share this view and I recall that others touched on the same subject during our meetings last year.

Last spring, several countries tabled a draft treaty calling for a ban on the development, production, and stockpiling of chemical weapons and their destruction, relying solely on national means of verification. This approach, modelled closely on the Biological Weapons Convention, did not seem to us and to some other members of the Committee to deal adequately with several issues, particularly that of verification. Some delegations recalled, for example, that the subject of biological weapons was separated from that of chemical weapons in view of the general recognition that the two areas posed substantially different problems from the military, political, and practical points of view. Thus, the use of the Biological Weapons Convention as a model for a treaty on chemical weapons presents many difficulties.

The relationship between scope and verification is a key portion of any arms control agreement. But in the context of chemical weapons, this element takes on special importance. The production and peaceful use of chemicals abound in the modern world. We have learned that in some cases it requires but a small step to divert to non-peaceful uses chemicals which are an integral part of the modern industrial process. Therefore, we should be clear in our own minds how an arrangement on chemical weapons would in fact be implemented. Also, we must have a firm understanding of what, from a practical point of view, can be achieved through various verification measures.

With regard to verification, several delegations have referred to some sort of mixture of national and international means. Some have suggested the use of institutionalized international machinery. Several have stressed the benefits which might be gained from economic data-monitoring arrangements. Still others have suggested almost exclusive reliance on national means.

(Mr. Martin, United States)

We have, in this Committee, already succeeded in sorting out and identifying key issues in the chemical weapons area. At the same time, however, we seem to have just begun to come to grips with some of the implications of the various verification measures which have been put forward. Our delegation sees a number of issues that would warrant further attention. These include what degrees of assurance of compliance could be achieved from various verification measures; and, what practical and political problems and implications are involved.

These are only a few of the questions which, it seems to us, require fuller analysis. Thus, notwithstanding the serious and useful work already accomplished in this area, more remains to be done. We look forward to discussing these matters with you during this session.

I should like to conclude this portion of my intervention by reiterating that the United States is fully committed to the goal of achieving effective controls on chemical weapons.

Another very important question to which this Committee has deservedly devoted much time and effort is the cessation of all nuclear weapons tests. The discussions of this matter have been very helpful. We expect that the important work of the Committee in this respect will continue during the current session.

Last year, the United States restated its support for an adequately verified comprehensive test ban. We continue to believe that only adequate verification provides the necessary confidence to sustain an arms control agreement of the importance of a comprehensive test ban.

The United States also tabled a working paper last summer which set out the framework for our approach to the problem of test ban verification. We noted the progress that has been made, some of which has been of unquestionable importance.

I should like to describe briefly some of the principal areas where further progress is currently being made. The multinational seismic co-operation study of events above mb 4.0 conducted under the aegis of Lincoln Laboratories is nearing completion. We anticipate that the results will be distributed to all interested parties after the participating groups meet this spring.

Progress is being made in establishing an international communications system, which will make a vast amount of data available for seismic analysis. When this system becomes operational around June 1974, other countries will be able to

(Mr. Martin, United States)

participate in it. One way to participate would be to use new or existing ground stations to tap the flow of raw data to be communicated by satellite. Such data could be used by countries to conduct their own analyses. In addition, they could also request the data analyses prepared by the Seismic Data Analysis Centre in Alexandria, Virginia.

We are also going ahead with our programme for selectively upgrading certain sites of the World Wide Standard Seismic Network. This involves relocating some seismic instruments and, in some cases providing better instrumentation. Data received from new or improved arrays will contribute to the research programme for improving identification of more low-magnitude events and identification of events whose seismic signals are mixed with signals from other events.

Evidence of the progress we are making should by no means obscure the fact that the difficulties facing us are not solved. Our working paper defined the areas in which problems persist. As we have indicated in the past, the United States is devoting substantial resources to help find a solution to those problems. In this endeavour our technical people are already working closely with the scientists of other countries. We look forward to additional opportunities to broaden and expand international co-operation in this area. We plan to report to the Committee as new progress is made in our research.

In another vital arms control area, important and constructive steps are also being taken. Since the adjournment of the Committee last summer, three more countries have become parties to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty -- the Philippines, Thailand and Australia. This testifies to the continuing vitality and importance of that Treaty. A total of nearly eighty countries are currently parties to the Treaty, and almost thirty other countries have signed but not yet ratified it. We are also encouraged by the progress that has been made toward the conclusion of the safeguards agreement between IAEA and EURATOM. We hope that the countries concerned will soon move toward their respective ratifications of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and that additional States will accede to the Treaty.

You will recall that Ambassador Leonard and I both discussed the question of conventional arms during recent sessions of the Committee. In doing so, we recognized the very real problems involved in dealing with weapons that exist in virtually every country of the world, especially when these weapons provide the basic

(Mr. Martin, United States)

security of most countries, and when the enormous variety of such weapons makes it particularly difficult to frame balanced and equitable measures of control. Yet, while there has been no nuclear conflict since 1945, there have been many conflicts, involving conventional arms, often of great intensity. Therefore, however justified may be the priority that this Committee has given to nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, the development of restraints on conventional weapons is also an urgent matter.

Many questions should be considered: How can we achieve more restraint in the acquisition of conventional arms? How can we assume more responsibility with regard to the supply of arms in areas of tension? How can we maintain political and military stability at lower levels of expenditure? These are, I think, questions worthy of discussion in the Committee, where countries of all sizes and from all regions of the world are represented.

While this Committee can take justifiable pride in its accomplishments, it cannot rest on the past. We, as its members, must be responsive to the challenges of the present and the future and do the work that remains to be done. We must dedicate ourselves to continuing our efforts to achieve effective arms control arrangements.

Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Before beginning our statement, we should like to welcome all participants in the session of the Committee on Disarmament which is now opening. We particularly welcome our new colleagues in the Committee -- yourself, Mr. Chairman, and Ambassador Di Bernardo, the representative of Italy. We wish you, Mr. Chairman, and Ambassador Di Bernardo every success in your new sphere of activity as representatives to the Committee on Disarmament.

We are also pleased to welcome in our midst the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Ilkka Pastinen, and the newly-appointed Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Björnerstedt. We wish Mr. Björnerstedt every success in his new post.

We are glad to see among the Secretariat Mr. Epstein, who has been our colleague since the Committee on Disarmament first began its work.

*

*

*

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

Another regular session of the Committee on Disarmament is beginning its work today. The Committee is resuming its work in an encouraging international situation. Agreements on ending the war and restoring peace in Viet-Nam were signed on 27 January. These agreements mark an important historical event -- a victory of the forces of reason, peace and progress. The multilateral consultations in Helsinki on preparations for an all-European conference are a positive factor in international relations. We believe that an all-European conference will lead to a further improvement of the situation in Europe and of the international climate as a whole. The preparatory consultations for negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Europe which have begun in Vienna constitute another important event of recent times. The second round of the Soviet-American talks on strategic arms limitation has begun. As we all know, the first stage of the talks has led to the conclusion of important agreements on the limitation of strategic arms. The Soviet side is endeavouring to ensure that the talks on this problem are no less constructive and useful.

Next month the Committee on Disarmament will enter upon the twelfth year of its existence and activities. In fact, the Committee has become an international institution, an integral part of modern international life. The stability and continuity of the work of the Committee on Disarmament are an indication of the urgent necessity of conducting, on a permanent basis, consultations, discussions and negotiations on a problem which concerns the vital interests of all the States and peoples of the world. The armaments race continuing in the world has adverse effects on international life as a whole. It engenders a threat to peace and consumes enormous material and intellectual resources which could otherwise be used to accelerate economic and social progress for the benefit of the peoples. Disarmament and international security are two indissolubly linked problems of our time.

The pace of work in the Committee on Disarmament and the absence of adequate progress in the solution of fundamental disarmament problems can hardly be a source of satisfaction. At the same time, it must be recognized that the Committee has achieved some positive results in its activities -- consensus on a number of measures for arms limitation, on the basis of which some important international agreements were concluded. The thoroughness and seriousness of the consultations on disarmament problems held in the Committee provide grounds for expecting that agreement will also be reached on other measures in this sphere. All this quite

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

naturally draws the attention of peace-loving forces in all parts of the world to the work of the Committee on Disarmament.

The Soviet Union, which celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of its foundation at the end of last year, has always shown great interest in the problem of disarmament and has initiated many proposals in this connexion. In the address he delivered to the joint ceremonial session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, devoted considerable attention to disarmament problems as an important element in the efforts of the USSR to ensure international peace and security. Mr. Brezhnev's address included the following statement:

"The Soviet Union has been working for disarmament since the earliest years of its existence. In the past decade, it has proved possible to conclude, with our country's most active participation, a series of important treaties on such matters as the banning of nuclear weapon tests, non-proliferation of these weapons, prohibition of bacteriological weapons and so forth. It stands to reason that all these are but the opening pages of the chronicle of disarmament. We call on all governments, on all the peoples of the world, to fill the succeeding pages of this chronicle together, up to and including the last page, that of general and complete disarmament".

In accordance with the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament and the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly requesting the Committee to consider individual disarmament problems, the current session of the Committee will have to hold discussions, consultations and negotiations on a wide range of important and urgent questions awaiting solution. One such question to which the United Nations General Assembly and the Committee on Disarmament have devoted considerable attention is the complete prohibition of chemical weapons. General Assembly resolution 2933 (XXVII) requests the Committee "to continue negotiations, as a matter of high priority, with a view to reaching early agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and for their destruction". The resolution stresses the importance of working towards the complete realization of the objective of effective prohibition of chemical weapons and urges Governments to work to that end.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

The Committee has before it the draft convention on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons submitted by the socialist States on 28 March 1972. The discussion of this problem in the Committee in 1972 has shown that many States members of the Committee on Disarmament are greatly interested in conducting business-like and constructive negotiations on the basis of a specific draft agreement. A number of delegations were in favour of using the draft convention submitted by the socialist countries as a basis for such negotiations. A whole series of suggestions and specific proposals was advanced for the solution of particular problems relating to the prohibition of chemical weapons.

A definition of the scope of the prohibition and the elaboration of a system of control to ensure the observance of that prohibition are among the most important aspects of the problem of the prohibition of such weapons. The willingness of States to prohibit chemical weapons as such is the basis and the indispensable condition for reaching agreement on these questions.

A factor contributing to the solution of the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons is the signature and ratification by a considerable number of States of the Convention on the prohibition of bacteriological and toxin weapons. This international instrument already bears the signatures of over a hundred States. The general approach to the solution of certain problems which also arise in connexion with the prohibition of chemical weapons is reflected in this document. The Soviet Union has begun the procedure for ratifying that Convention in accordance with its Constitution. There is reason to believe that this agreement will soon enter into force. Thus, another international instrument concerned with disarmament will become operative, with the result that biological and toxin weapons of mass destruction will be eliminated from the life of human society.

Some States substitute for participation in international agreements on disarmament questions the adoption of unilateral declarations directed towards the solution of individual problems of arms limitation and disarmament. Unilateral declarations by States concerning the implementation of individual disarmament measures, however useful they may be, cannot serve as a substitute for international agreements on arms limitation and disarmament which lay down mutually binding international treaty obligations for States.

Thus, the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons must be given a prominent place in the work of the current session of the Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

Every effort must be made to achieve agreement between States in their positions on the solution of this very pressing problem. The Soviet delegation looks forward with great interest to hearing concrete and constructive suggestions from the members of the Committee concerning ways and means of achieving rapid progress in solving this problem.

The prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons is directly related to the question of the accession of all States to the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare. The abovementioned resolution of the United Nations General Assembly on chemical and bacteriological weapons (2933/XXVII) invites all States that have not yet done so to accede to or ratify the Geneva Protocol and calls anew for the strict observance by all States of the principles and objectives contained therein. This appeal expresses the public concern in all the countries of the world at the fact that such an important international agreement as the Geneva Protocol has not yet been ratified by the States whose participation in that agreement is a vital necessity. The participation of all States, and primarily of militarily important States, is essential for such agreements as the Geneva Protocol.

An important task for the Committee on Disarmament is to reach agreement on measures of nuclear disarmament. The attention of the Committee, of the United Nations General Assembly and of world public opinion has for many years been directed to the question of the cessation of nuclear weapon tests. This question is directly related to the solution of the problem of preventing the danger of nuclear war and to the elimination of nuclear weapons altogether. The position of the Soviet Union on the question of the cessation of nuclear tests has been stated on many occasions both in the Committee on Disarmament and at sessions of the United Nations General Assembly. The USSR is wholeheartedly in favour of the complete and immediate solution of that problem, on the assumption that nuclear tests, including tests under ground, must be stopped everywhere and by all. A large number of States, including all the nuclear Powers, must participate in solving this important and complex problem. Only the implementation of this measure with such participation can bring about a final solution of the problem and will lead to the truly comprehensive cessation of nuclear weapon tests which has been repeatedly urged by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

With regard to the problem of ending underground nuclear tests, verification of compliance by States with an agreement on such cessation must be based on the use of national means of control. Modern science and technology can adequately ensure such control. International co-operation in exchanging seismic data would be of great importance in this matter. The USSR is willing to carry out such exchanges within the framework of an agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapon tests. The exchange of seismic data would be an additional means of verifying the discontinuance of such tests.

Thus, it is essential that all the nuclear States should participate in negotiations on the cessation of nuclear tests, including underground tests. Only under these conditions can progress be achieved in this matter. The Soviet side is prepared to co-operate in the solution of this problem.

Proposals have repeatedly been advanced of late urging unilateral action by the nuclear Powers with regard to the cessation of nuclear weapon tests. Yet appeals for unilateral action in the area of arms limitation and disarmament which would result in military or military-political advantages for some States and would consequently disturb the existing correlation of forces and weaken the security of other States cannot promote the solution of disarmament problems and the strengthening of international security, whatever the intentions and motives of those making such appeals.

Since the solution of many problems relating to nuclear disarmament requires joint action by all States possessing nuclear weapons, the Soviet Government introduced in 1971 a proposal to convene a conference of the five nuclear Powers. It was suggested that such a conference should consider both the whole complex of measures for nuclear disarmament and individual measures in this sphere. The question of convening such a conference is still topical.

An important issue relating to the problem of nuclear disarmament is to prevent the use of nuclear weapons as the most destructive and lethal means of the mass annihilation of people. The long history of discussions in United Nations bodies and in other forums on the prohibition of the use of such weapons shows that this problem can and must be considered and solved in direct connexion with the renunciation of the use of force in relations between States. At its twenty-seventh session, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution initiated by the Soviet Union, containing a solemn declaration of the States Members of the United Nations concerning their renunciation of the use or threat of force in international relations in all its forms and manifestations, in

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. This resolution also contains a recommendation to the Security Council to take, as soon as possible, appropriate measures for the full implementation of that solemn declaration of the General Assembly. Referring to this General Assembly resolution, in his above-mentioned address, Mr. L.I. Brezhnev made the following proposal:

"In pursuance of this United Nations resolution, we declare that the Soviet Union is prepared to agree upon and appropriately to formalize reciprocal commitments with any of the nuclear Powers on the non-use of force, including the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons against one another".

The statement made by the Soviet side in connexion with the General Assembly resolution on this question is a definite step designed to reduce and to eliminate from the life of nations the danger of a nuclear missile war, and of any war whatsoever. The willingness of the USSR to reach agreement on the question of the non-use of force and the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and to formalize appropriate reciprocal commitments with any of the nuclear Powers, opens up broad prospects for the solution of this most important international problem which affects the security of all States. We presume that the Security Council, which bears specific responsibilities in connexion with the above-mentioned General Assembly resolution, will in turn adopt measures to bring into effect the renunciation by States of the use of force and the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. There is no need to emphasize that strict observance by all States of the solemn declaration of the General Assembly on this matter would contribute substantially to consolidating the cause of peace and to strengthening international security.

A series of other disarmament problems, such as the dismantling of foreign military bases in the territories of other countries, the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces, the reduction of military budgets, the complete demilitarization of the sea-bed, the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world and so forth, are also awaiting solution. The Soviet side has advanced specific proposals on these and other problems, but so far there has been no progress towards their solution. It is essential to hold consultations and discussions in the Committee on Disarmament on the aforementioned questions, also in order to reach agreement on new disarmament measures and on their implementation. Individually and taken as a whole, these measures should contribute to the attainment of the objectives of general and complete disarmament.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

The Soviet side notes with satisfaction that the resolution adopted by the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly on a world disarmament conference (2930/XXVII) is a new step towards the implementation of this important measure. The establishment by the General Assembly of a special committee to consider questions concerning the holding of a world conference provides a practical basis for its convocation. The Soviet Union is of the opinion that a world disarmament conference would draw the attention of States and the general public to disarmament problems and would contribute to progress in this area. Its convocation should not in any way detract from or diminish the importance of other forms and channels of negotiation on these problems and certainly should not cause any slackening of the efforts of the Committee on Disarmament to reach agreement on measures for the limitation and cessation of the arms race and for disarmament. Moreover, the holding of a world conference would considerably stimulate negotiations on disarmament problems in all international forums and bodies, including the Committee on Disarmament. The success of such a conference depends on the joint efforts and good will of States. The Soviet Union hopes that in the final count all the nuclear Powers will adopt a constructive attitude towards the question of convening the conference and will contribute to its positive results.

These are the considerations that the Soviet delegation to the Committee on Disarmament would like to advance at the opening of this session of the Committee. We express the hope that in the course of this session we shall be able to make progress in solving the problems of disarmament and of the limitation and cessation of the arms race, which places a heavy burden on the shoulders of the peoples of all countries — large and small, developed and developing.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): It is a source of deep satisfaction to me to have been given the privilege of speaking once again -- this will be the sixth time -- at the opening meeting of a session of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

I should like at this time to extend my warmest greetings to all the distinguished members present, both of the Committee and of the Secretariat. In particular, allow me to convey to the new representative of Canada, Ambassador Barton, my delegation's satisfaction at seeing him take the chair at this meeting, the first in which he has been called upon to participate in the work of the Committee, and to extend once again to the new representative of Italy, Ambassador Di Bernardo, a sincere welcome. I should also like to say how pleased we are that we shall be able to continue to count on the valuable co-operation of Ambassador Pastinen as the Special Representative of the Secretary-General; on the co-operation of an international official who is undoubtedly one of those with the most experience and knowledge of disarmament matters -- Mr. William Epstein -- who will now be with us in his new capacity of Special Consultant; and on the co-operation of Mr. Björnerstedt, who will be joining us at the head of the CCD Secretariat, whose competence and efficiency I have personally been able to witness on various occasions at United Nations Headquarters and who will be acting as the Alternate Representative of the Secretary-General. The conditions prevailing in the world today, at the beginning of the twelfth session of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, are undoubtedly much more favourable than last year.

The long hoped-for end of the Viet-Nam war has greatly helped to restore international tolerance, understanding and harmony. So far as our own sphere of activity is concerned, we venture to hope that the benefits which may result from it will include the complete disappearance of any reservations about the scope of the Geneva Protocol, which was so clearly defined by the General Assembly in its

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

resolution 2603 A (XXIV) of 16 December 1969, and at the same time a general acceptance of the urgent need for reaching agreement on a convention to ensure the elimination of all chemical weapons.

Besides the case of Viet-Nam, there are various other signs which indicate an encouraging movement towards international détente. In this respect, it is sufficient to refer to the preparatory work which is being carried out in Vienna for a conference on reductions of armed forces in Central Europe; the talks that have been held with a view to another conference, to consider questions connected with European security, and the renewal here in Geneva itself, within a week, of SALT II, that is to say, the second phase of the bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on what we would like to be not only limitations but also reductions of the strategic nuclear-weapon systems of the two super-Powers.

For its part, the United Nations General Assembly, in spite of the difficult conditions in which, as usual, it had to work, due both to the increased number of items on its agenda and to the shorter time at its disposal, managed to adopt ten constructive resolutions about disarmament matters. I consider it appropriate to refer, if only in passing to the contents of some of them:

(1) Resolution 2935 (XXVII) concerning Additional Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, in which the Assembly, among other things, welcomed with satisfaction "as a preliminary measure" the solemn declaration made by the Government of the People's Republic of China on 14 November 1972, which read as follows:

"China will never use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear Latin American countries and the Latin American nuclear-weapon-free zone, nor will China test, manufacture, produce, stockpile, install or deploy nuclear weapons in these countries or in this zone, or send her means of transportation and delivery carrying nuclear weapons to traverse the territory, territorial sea and territorial air space of Latin American countries".

(2) Resolution 2930 (XXVII), entitled "World Disarmament Conference", in which the Assembly, by "more than one hundred votes in favour and none against, emphatically repeated the conviction it had expressed in the preceding year about the responsibility of the United Nations, the vital interest of all peoples and the obligation of all States as regards the taking of effective measures of disarmament, and more particularly, nuclear disarmament, and decided to establish a Special Committee on

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

the World Disarmament Conference to examine all the views and suggestions expressed by Governments on the convening of that Conference and to present a report to the Assembly at its twenty-eighth session.

It is greatly to be regretted in this connexion that there is at present little likelihood of the Committee's being able to carry out its work successfully or even to meet before the next session of the Assembly. The responsibility for this lies mainly with three of the nuclear Powers. In fact, the initial refusal of two of them to be members of the Committee led to a similar attitude on the part of the other two. Later, the fifth of these Powers, despite the situation which had been created in this way, objected to the idea that the Committee should be made up exclusively of States which did not possess nuclear weapons, although in the circumstances that was the only hope of the Committee's being able to carry out its mandate.

(3) Resolution 2932 B (XXVII), on general and complete disarmament, which I hope to have an opportunity to refer to again in one of my next statements and in which the Assembly appealed to the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union to make every effort, in the SALT II talks, to expedite the conclusion of further agreements, including "important qualitative limitations and substantial reductions of offensive and defensive nuclear-weapon systems".

(4) Resolution 2932 A (XXVII), the purpose of which was to emphasize some of the most serious consequences of napalm and other incendiary weapons and to deplore their use in armed conflicts, to commend to the attention of all Governments and peoples the report on the subject prepared by the Secretary-General with the help of qualified governmental consultant experts, and to request States Members to make any comments on that report which they considered relevant for submission to the Assembly at its twenty-eighth session. Inasmuch as this topic is, so to speak, sub judice, I will, for the time being, confine myself to expressing the opinion that once all these comments have been received by the Assembly, we ought not to exclude the possibility of the Assembly's referring the topic back to us for treatment similar to that which we have given to biological and toxin weapons and which it is highly desirable that chemical weapons should receive in the near future.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

We believe that there would be very sound reasons for adopting this approach, for the Secretary-General's report makes really gruesome reading, and the acts described in its pages suggest a return to the barbarism of the blackest times of human history. They are such that the Assembly could, we think, quite properly request the Committee on Disarmament to prepare immediately a draft convention for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of napalm and other similar incendiary weapons and their final removal from the arsenals of all States.

As to the various resolutions of the Assembly in which specific tasks are entrusted to this Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, I shall confine myself to briefly examining two of them which undoubtedly concern the two questions which, this year as in previous years, deserve the highest priority in our work: the cessation of nuclear-weapons tests and the elimination of chemical weapons.

1. Cessation of nuclear-weapons tests

Our position with regard to the cessation of nuclear-weapons tests is the same as that expressed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations at the Committee's opening meeting on 29 February 1972, when he stated the following conclusions:

"No other question in the field of disarmament has been a subject of so much study and discussion as the question of stopping nuclear-weapon tests. I believe that all the technical and scientific aspects of the problem have been so fully explored that only a political decision is now necessary in order to achieve final agreement'... It is my firm belief that the sorry tale of lost opportunities that have existed in the past should not be repeated and that the question can and should be solved now."

It is precisely because this is our position that we find that of the three resolutions approved on this topic by the General Assembly the one which most faithfully reflects our own thinking is 2934 C (XXVII).

The preamble to this resolution reaffirms the Assembly's deep apprehension concerning the harmful conclusions of nuclear weapon tests both for the acceleration of the arms race and for the health of present and future generations of mankind; it deplores the fact that neither the twenty-one successive resolutions -- there are now twenty-four -- adopted by the General Assembly, nor the undertaking entered into by the original parties to the Moscow Treaty, have so far had any

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

effect in bringing about the general and complete prohibition of such tests, and reference is made to the two resolutions adopted previously, in 1962 and in 1971 respectively, in which all tests of nuclear weapons, without exception, were condemned. In the operative part of the resolution, which begins by reiterating "with the utmost vigour" the condemnation of the tests in question, the following two points deserve special attention.

The first is that the Assembly found it necessary for the first time to transfer from the preamble to the operative part of the resolution the paragraph in which it reaffirms its conviction that "whatever may be the differences on the question of verification, there is no valid reason for delaying the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban of the nature contemplated in the preamble to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water".

The second is that, in renewing its urgent appeal to the Governments of nuclear-weapon States "to bring to a halt all nuclear weapon tests at the earliest possible date, and in any case not later than 5 August 1973" (a date which, as is well known, will mark the tenth anniversary of the signing of the treaty on the partial prohibition of tests, or Moscow Treaty), the Assembly introduced, as compared with the preceding year's resolution, the innovation that, if the cessation in question cannot be brought about through a permanent agreement, it should at least be effected "through unilateral or agreed moratoria".

2. Elimination of chemical weapons

As in the case of the cessation of nuclear weapon tests, there is very little or nothing new which can be added to what has already been said and repeated on any number of occasions, both in this Conference and in the United Nations General Assembly, on the obvious necessity and desirability of immediate steps being taken to bring about the total elimination of chemical weapons.

Nevertheless, at the risk of repeating myself, I consider it necessary to say once again what I said last November in the First Committee of the Assembly, when I observed that the sterility of our work during the past year might perhaps be attributed to the fact that the Committee on Disarmament had taken a wrong direction in this matter. We believe, in fact, that if a similar procedure had been adopted in the case of microbiological and toxin weapons -- the second of which, it must not be forgotten, are partly chemical weapons -- we would probably still have been trying, in the year 2000, to draw up the convention the text of which was completed at our 1971 session and which is annexed to Assembly resolution 2826 (XXVI).

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

With respect to the basic problem of control, we are convinced that if, in order to check the observance of the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of weapons of such terrible destructive power as that possessed, as we have been told here on various occasions, by biological weapons, and to make sure of their elimination, the actual Powers possessing such weapons considered it sufficient to have such an elementary system of control as that defined in articles V, VI and X of the Convention to which I have just referred, we do not see why, as we have already pointed out on many occasions, it would not be enough to have a similar system, with certain additions and improvements, based, in accordance with suggestions made by the Group of Twelve of this Committee since 1970, "on a combination of suitable national and international measures complementing and supplementing each other reciprocally".

There are, besides, two other points which we think should be very much borne in mind in this connexion: that, as in the case of microbiological weapons, the use of all chemical weapons without exception has been prohibited since 1925 by the Geneva Protocol; and that, in this age of gigantic biological nuclear and thermonuclear arsenals, nobody to our knowledge has ever claimed that chemical weapons can either change or imperil the strategic balance.

It is also extremely important to remember, first, that, as I pointed out at the beginning, the hostilities in Viet-Nam, the only place where certain types of chemical weapons were being used, have been brought to an end; and, second, that, well before this long-hoped-for relief was provided, the judgement of the most highly qualified scientists and experts in military strategy was conclusive and unequivocal: all were in agreement that the use of chemical agents of any kind whatsoever -- lethal, incapacitating, irritant or defoliating -- could, in the last analysis, only be to the detriment of humanity, international peace and security and even, if properly understood, the interests of the very State which might happen to use them.

I should like to recommend to those who may wish to check the accuracy of what I have just said that they read the volume published barely four months ago, in October 1972, by the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, which reproduces the statements made during the hearings that the Committee devoted to the Geneva Protocol in March 1971, as well as a number of related documents. Among the eminent specialists who took part in those hearings, I shall mention

(Lh. Garcia Kooles, Mexico)

only three, together with the author of one of the studies contained in the publication in question: Dr. Mathew Meselson, Professor of Biology at Harvard University; Dr. Arthur W. Galston, also a Professor of Biology, in this case of Yale University; Dr. Donald G. Brenann, a member of the Hudson Institute, a mathematician and specialist in national security affairs, and Dr. Archibald S. Alexander who, for several years has been an Advisor to the Armaments Control and Disarmament Board of the United States. The emphatic and well-documented opinions of all these men provide a solid basis in support of conclusions such as those which I presented briefly a few moments ago.

My remarks on this subject adequately explain the pleasure with which we welcomed the General Assembly's reiteration in operative paragraph 2 of its resolution 2933 (XXVII) of the request, addressed by it at its twenty-sixth session to the Committee on Disarmament that "as a matter of high priority" the latter should continue negotiations with a view "to reaching early agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and for their destruction".

My delegation believes that we should give very serious attention to the early accomplishment of this urgent task which has been entrusted to us by the Assembly. In our opinion, in order to carry out this task, it will be necessary for the Committee to modify its recent approach to the question, to put an end to the period of academic exploration of all the foreseeable and unforeseeable hypotheses and to decide to follow a procedure similar to that followed in drawing up the microbiological convention. It does not seem to us that this would involve any undue haste, since it must not be forgotten that the elimination of chemical weapons has been under study since the date on which the consideration of biological weapons was begun, that is, for about four years.

3. Conclusions

The two questions which were given top priority in 1972, and which should be given the same priority in 1973 in the Committee's work have now been studied exhaustively in all their aspects.

The only thing needed, as the Secretary-General rightly said a year ago in referring to the cessation of nuclear tests, is to ascertain whether the two Super-Powers are prepared to take the political decision which is necessary in each case. We believe that it should not take more than three or four weeks to reach a conclusion on this very specific point. We feel that we are entitled to require that they define their present respective positions with absolute frankness.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Should it unfortunately prove that both super-Powers, or even one of them, is still unwilling to take this political decision, it seems to us that the Committee, instead of wasting any more time on academic deliberations, should suspend its consideration of those questions and leave it to the Assembly to allocate responsibility as appropriate.

Meanwhile, we would be better employed here in reviewing, in informal meetings, the great variety of suggestions concerning disarmament measures which have been submitted to the Committee in the course of its eleven years of work, with the object of selecting from among them some specific topics to which we could devote our immediate efforts with some prospect of achieving positive results.

In illustration of this suggestion, I might mention that, in our opinion, one of these topics might be the question of the reduction of military budgets. This is something which -- in different forms and in different contexts -- has been repeatedly proposed by many States members of the Committee belonging to the three groups of which it is composed. One of the first examples of this was General Assembly resolution 380 (V) adopted on 17 November 1950 under the title "Peace through Deeds", in which the Assembly determined that "for the realization of lasting peace and security it is indispensable that every nation agree to reduce to a minimum the diversion for armaments of its human and economic resources and to strive towards the development of such resources for the general welfare, taking duly into account with due regard to the needs of the under-developed areas of the world". Proposals to the same end were later submitted on various occasions, both by the Soviet Union and by the Western Powers and by many of the non-aligned States.

It should also be remembered that in 1964 the two nuclear super-Powers pursued a policy of "mutual example" or "reciprocal unilateral action", which, although not based on a formal agreement, led to a reduction in the military budgets of both of them.

The importance of once more exploring this question, which, moreover, received only preliminary and sporadic consideration in the past, may be greater today than ever before, since, as is well known, the sums squandered throughout the world for military purposes have increased during the last decade by approximately 70 per cent. The importance of considering this question is even more obvious if one seriously reflects upon conclusions such as those included in the recent report entitled

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

"Disarmament and development" prepared in 1972 by an international group of experts presided over by the distinguished representative of Sweden in our Committee, Mrs. Alva Myrdal, in which it is proved once again that world military expenditure now amounts to the astronomical sum of \$200,000 million. The report notes that the major part of this expenditure, more than four fifths of the total, is made by a very small number of countries -- there are barely six of them, and stresses the contrast between military research, on which \$25,000 million is spent annually and research in the field of health, to which only \$6,000 million are devoted.

The same report rightly points out that, within the United Nations, disarmament and development still stand separated from one another, since the Organization has agreed to try to achieve each of these objectives, regardless of the pace of progress in approaching the other. The States have also agreed that national and international efforts to promote development should be neither postponed nor allowed to lag merely because progress in disarmament may be slow.

In addition, the group of experts made the following very pertinent points, which I shall end my present statement by quoting:

"However, disarmament and development can be linked to each other because the enormous amount of resources wasted in the arms race might be utilized to facilitate development and progress Our conviction therefore is that the goals of reducing military expenditure and of furthering economic and social development are primarily a question of political will, of political co-operation and international solidarity".

Mr. DI BERNADO (Italy): Allow me to express my deep gratitude for the kind words that you, Mr. Chairman, and other distinguished colleagues have addressed to me on my first appearance in this assembly. The Italian delegation has been very active in this Committee since the very beginning of its work, and my predecessors have always endeavoured to contribute actively and effectively to the success of the Committee's initiatives, as well as to the elaboration of many drafts which later became important international instruments. I am fully aware of the complexities of the questions we have to deal with and of their implications for the community of nations and for humanity at large. I will do my best to keep to this tradition and hope to make the best possible contribution to the success of our work.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.