

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records *



UN/SA COLLECTION

FIRST COMMITTEE
40th meeting
held on
Friday, 23 November 1979
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 40TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31, 32, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 120 AND 121 (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Gurinovich (Byelorussian SSR)
Mr. Mihajlovic (Yugoslavia)
Mr. Singh (India)
Mr. de La Gorce (France)
Mr. Lidgard (Sweden)
Mr. Fisher (United States of America)
Mr. Mulloy (Ireland)
Mr. Petrovsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 31, 32, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40,
42, 43, 44, 45, 120 AND 121 (continued)

Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The sponsors of the draft resolution entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons" in document A/C.1/34/L.6 have done the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic the honour of inviting it to present the draft resolution for the consideration of the First Committee at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. The sponsors of this draft, so far, are the delegations of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, the German Democratic Republic, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. We would all welcome any delegation which wishes to become a sponsor, anyone who shares the views and considerations contained in the draft resolution on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons.

The immediacy and urgency of the task of preventing the emergence of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction is quite obvious and has been repeatedly indicated in United Nations resolutions, and this is something which has been pointed out in the first four paragraphs of the preambular part of the draft resolution. In order to save time, we shall not expound on them in any detail, but it should be stressed that considerable attention has been focused on this problem in the unanimously adopted decisions of the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament.

Further, in the preambular part, reference is made to the work of the Committee on Disarmament on this subject. Furthermore, the sponsors of the draft resolution have noted with satisfaction the introduction of the joint Soviet-American proposal of fundamental elements of a treaty on the prohibition of the development, manufacture, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons, and they supported the draft resolution in document A/C.1/34/L.7/Rev.1.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

We believe that the task of the earliest possible conclusion of an international agreement on the prohibition of the development, manufacture, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons to be one of great urgency, since that is one of the new forms of weapons of mass destruction.

The operative part of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.6 contains a request that the Committee on Disarmament actively continue negotiations, with the assistance of qualified governmental experts, with a view to preparing a draft comprehensive agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons and, where necessary, specific agreements on particular types of such weapons. This formulation takes fully into account previous United Nations decisions and the positions of various groups of States; that is to say, it provides for preparing both a comprehensive and specific agreements.

There can be no doubt on the merits and advantages of a comprehensive agreement, because that is the most radical means of preventing the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. At the same time, specific agreements on particular types of weapons of mass destruction could also be effective instruments, and these could be concluded as the need arose. Such a flexible and broad decision provides additional possibilities for using scientific and technological progress exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of the economic and social progress of the peoples of the world.

The sponsors of the draft resolution attach great importance to the urgent appeal contained in operative paragraph 3 that all States refrain from any action which could adversely affect the talks that I have mentioned. We note with satisfaction that an approach of this kind is backed by every group of States and we express the hope that this appeal will be heeded by all countries without any exception.

Further, the operative part of the draft resolution includes provisions, which are traditional in these cases, to transmit to the Committee on Disarmament all documents relating to the discussion of this item by the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session and to submit

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelosurrian SSR)

a report on the results achieved to the General Assembly for consideration at its thirty-fifth session.

The sponsors have held consultations with a broad range of delegations from other countries which have made it clear that the draft resolution has the broadest possible support, because it reflects the general desire to prevent the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction. However, in the course of consultations we were, unfortunately, not able fully to satisfy individual delegations which were opposed to a comprehensive agreement, despite our great efforts to achieve a compromise. In a world which is already over-armed - and this includes weapons of mass destruction - there should be no room for the development and manufacture of new means of mass destruction that could be even more dangerous than existing weapons and which could lead to a new twist in the whole spiral of the arms race, temporarily disturb the existing balance of forces in the field of armaments, undermine efforts to call a halt to the arms race and bring about disarmament, and increase the danger of military conflicts in which weapons of mass destruction would be used with catastrophic consequences for mankind.

As we know, even without the use of weapons of mass destruction in previous wars there was a constant increase in the number of victims among the civilian population: for example, in the First World War it constituted 5 per cent; in the Second World War, 50 per cent; in the course of the aggression against the Korean People's Democratic Republic it amounted to 84 per cent, and in that against the Vietnamese people it exceeded 90 per cent. What would be the percentage if weapons of mass destruction were actually used, considering their vastly more destructive powers?

In conclusion, I should also like to stress that the practice and results of previous rounds of talks on disarmament questions have made it abundantly clear that it is easier to come to agreement on the undesirability of the emergence of new types of weapons and their use than to banish already existing types of armaments from military arsenals. Our proposal is

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

very comprehensive and takes into account the various approaches to solving the problem of preventing the emergence of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction: that is to say, it provides for the conclusion of both a comprehensive and specific agreements. It is a step towards curbing the arms race. We expect it to be adopted by consensus, and hope it will be put into effect by the Committee on Disarmament without undue delay.

Mr. MIHAJLOVIC (Yugoslavia): In the past few days the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.15 on the review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session, and of A/C.1/34/L.4 on disarmament negotiations, as well as some other delegations, have exerted concerted efforts with a view to arriving at a text that will enjoy the fullest support. As a result of those negotiations, I have the honour of introducing an amended and modified draft resolution which bears the symbol A/C.1/34/L.15/Rev.1.

However, before commenting on the amendments and changes I wish to draw the attention of representatives to some omissions and mistakes that appear in the revised text.

The revised text does not contain new second and third preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 3 contains three words that should be deleted. I shall come to each of these separately.

(Mr. Mihajlovic, Yugoslavia)

Since the text, as available this morning, does not contain the new preambular paragraphs, I shall read them in extenso, and I am told that they will appear in a newly revised document on Monday. The new second preambular paragraph is as follows:

"Recalling that disarmament has become an imperative and most urgent task facing the international community and that all the peoples of the world have a vital interest in the success of disarmament negotiations".

The new third preambular paragraph reads:

"Calling attention to the measures qualified in the special session's Programme of Action as being most urgent and feasible within a short period of time and to the task to bring about effective agreements".

The new seventh preambular paragraph draws attention to the need to "make sustained progress in all negotiations dealing with disarmament and arms limitation issues", while the ninth preambular paragraph is a modified version of the original sixth preambular paragraph and recalls "the Programme of Action of the tenth special session" instead of the "issues dealt with at the tenth special session" as in the original version.

Operative paragraph 2 (a) now contains, in the second line, after the words "Committee on Disarmament", an additional phrase which reads, "and in a limited or regional framework", while the rest of the sentence remains unchanged. In paragraph 2 (b), the word "unanimously" is replaced by the words "by consensus", and at the end the following words are added: "taking into consideration all relevant proposals".

From operative paragraph 3, the words "on a regular basis" have been deleted, and the following has been added at the end of the paragraph:

"in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Final Document of the tenth special session".

The text of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.15/Rev.1, amended and modified in this way, has taken into account the basic positions of the sponsors as well as the demands of other delegations that the new text

(Mr. Mihajlovic, Yugoslavia)

should reflect, as faithfully as possible, the recommendations and decisions embodied in the Final Document of the tenth special session.

In conclusion I should like to take this opportunity to express, on behalf of the sponsors, our gratitude to all delegations which have contributed to the successful outcome of the negotiations and to express the hope that the revised draft resolution will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. KRUTZSCH (German Democratic Republic): In connexion with the introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.15/Rev.1 by the representative of Yugoslavia, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic would like to make the following statement. Taking account of the necessity for the process of arms limitation and disarmament to be accelerated, the German Democratic Republic submitted to this Committee a draft resolution on negotiations on disarmament in document A/C.1/34/L.4 of 31 October 1979, which was introduced on 9 November.

A number of sponsors submitted draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.15, which was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia on 15 November. A comparison of these two documents reveals much similarity regarding both their goals and their content. My delegation, therefore, signalled its preparedness to try to combine them. The relevant talks were successful, and we wish to express our appreciation of this fruitful co-operation with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.15.

In the interests of uncomplicated proceedings, my delegation also agreed that the document resulting from the talks should be submitted as draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.15/Rev.1, of which the German Democratic Republic is a sponsor.

We take this opportunity to thank all delegations which, in the talks, expressed themselves favourably on the German Democratic Republic's draft resolution, and we should like to ask them to give their support to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.15/Rev.1. Since, in the process of the preparation of this text, account has already been taken of the observations of other delegations on the two original texts, we believe that it should be possible to achieve consensus.

In these circumstances, my delegation will not insist on a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.4.

Mr. SINGH (India): My delegation has decided to make a separate statement on agenda item 39 on the question of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, both in view of the great importance that India attaches to this question and because a crucial stage has been reached in the implementation of the Declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI).

It would be useful to recall that the Declaration adopted by the General Assembly on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace emerged as a result of the Lusaka non-aligned summit meeting which was held in September 1970. The littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean most of which had won their freedom from colonial rule after the Second World War, had decided to create a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, from which great Power rivalries and military presence would be excluded, enabling those States to concentrate on the task of national reconstruction free from external interference and influence. The call for the removal of great Power military presence from the Indian Ocean was also an expression of the determination of the peoples of littoral and hinterland States to preserve their hard-won independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

In 1971, when the General Assembly adopted the Declaration, the Indian Ocean represented one extensive area in the world, unlike the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, which was relatively, though by no means entirely, free of great Power military presence and rivalry. Ironically, in spite of the expressed wishes of the littoral and hinterland States, great Power military presence, instead of decreasing, has actually increased since that time. Force, or the threat of use of force, against the littoral and hinterland States has been employed. Interference in the internal affairs of these States has increased in total disregard of the principles of peaceful co-existence and of the inalienable right of every nation to decide its own political and social system. An alarming tendency has also been displayed by some great Powers to seek the denial of the right of the peoples of the littoral and hinterland States freely to dispose of their natural wealth and resources.

(Mr. Singh, India)

A pretext has been used by certain circles to justify the presence of great Powers in the Indian Ocean, namely, the alleged deterioration of peace and stability in the Indian Ocean. We believe that the majority of the littoral and hinterland States reject the implication that the great Powers can find any basis in law or morality for assuming the right to act as the policemen of the world.

In spite of the negative assessment of developments my delegation has been obliged to make, we acknowledge that there have been some encouraging signs of a possible reversal of policy on the part of the great Powers as to their military presence in the Indian Ocean. I refer to the bilateral talks between the United States and the Soviet Union aimed at "the limitation of their military presence in the Indian Ocean" held at the end of 1977 and at the beginning of 1978. Although those talks were unfortunately suspended in March 1978, we welcomed the fact that in June this year, at their meeting at Vienna, the Presidents of the United States and of the Soviet Union agreed that the two sides would discuss the resumption of those negotiations. We regret that the negotiations have not yet been resumed, in spite of the Vienna communiqué. We should like to emphasize that the bilateral talks between the United States and the USSR have so far been limited in scope and nature and do not fully meet the objectives of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean, which envisages the total elimination of great-Power military presence.

The other encouraging development with regard to the implementation of the Declaration was the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States, which was held in July this year. Mr. B. J. Fernando of Sri Lanka has already informed this Committee of the results of the meeting in his statement of 12 November. I take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Fernando for the remarkable and exemplary manner in which he conducted that meeting, which led to its eventual success.

The Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States provided an important opportunity for the harmonization of the views of those States with regard to the implementation of the Declaration. A considerable degree of consensus emerged at the Meeting, as is reflected in the report contained in document A/34/45. *This in itself was an achievement, since there were genuine differences of views*

(Mr. Singh, India)

and perceptions with regard to certain principles and the respective national security interests of various littoral and hinterland States. What emerged, however, was the fact that all the littoral and hinterland States were united in their determination to work for the implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

The Final Document adopted by the Meeting of Littoral and Hinterland States sets out a number of provisions where the major responsibility for implementing the Declaration has rightly been placed on the great Powers. This does not mean that the littoral and hinterland States do not share a responsibility for its implementation. Those States clearly have the obligation of denying any facility that would further great Power military presence in the Indian Ocean or promote great Power rivalry. Similarly, the littoral and hinterland States have the responsibility of settling disputes with one another peacefully and of conducting their mutual relations on the basis of the United Nations Charter.

Delegations would have noticed that in the Final Document of the Meeting of Littoral and Hinterland States, there was no consensus on the original paragraph 18 (b). India was among those which rejected that subparagraph, since it introduced elements that were extraneous to the Declaration on the Indian Ocean. We should like to reiterate our position that the Declaration does not require adherence by the littoral and hinterland States either to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or to multilateral agreements with regard to non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Similarly, the Declaration does not call for the application of the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) or any other safeguards on the nuclear facilities of the littoral and hinterland States. We also do not interpret the Declaration as calling for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone covering the territories of the littoral and hinterland States. The Declaration in fact calls for the removal by the great Powers of all nuclear weapons from the Indian Ocean.

The Final Document has entrusted to the expanded Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean the task of undertaking the preparatory work for the Conference on the Indian Ocean, including consideration of appropriate arrangements for any international agreement that may ultimately be reached for the maintenance of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace as referred to in operative paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI). In accordance with operative

(Mr. Singh, India)

paragraph 3 of that resolution, the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, the permanent members of the Security Council and other major maritime users of the Indian Ocean were called upon to enter into consultations with a view to implementing the Declaration. It is my delegation's conviction that neither the preparations for the Conference nor the consideration of appropriate arrangements referred to in the Final Document can be undertaken without the participation of all the permanent members of the Security Council. In this context, we should like to repeat that the major responsibility for implementing the Declaration lies with the great Powers.

I should now like to refer to the two draft resolutions contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean (A/34/29). Draft resolution A reiterates the principles and provisions contained in previous General Assembly resolutions for the implementation of the Declaration. Draft resolution B, inter alia, would invite the permanent members of the Security Council and major maritime users of the Indian Ocean to serve on the expanded Ad Hoc Committee. It also would decide to convene a Conference on the Indian Ocean during 1981 at Colombo for the implementation of the Declaration.

As I have just stated, preparations for the Conference without the participation of the permanent members of the Security Council would not be possible. We would therefore strongly urge the States concerned to accept the invitation to join the Ad Hoc Committee, so that we can proceed towards the transformation of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace.

(Mr. Singh, India)

This development not only would strengthen international peace and security but, in the long run would be in the interests of the great Powers themselves. In this interdependent world they are as much in need of international co-operation as the weaker States. We are sure that the entire international community is interested in consolidating the transition from the old order based on domination to a new international order based on co-operation among nations founded on the principles of independence, sovereign equality and social justice.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to remind members once again that we have entered another phase of our work in which we are dealing with action on certain draft resolutions. While I agree that there may be a very fine line of distinction between taking part in a debate and making a statement, I should like to ask that as far as possible members refrain from giving this the aspect of a debate in making a statement on the draft resolutions with which we are now dealing.

Mr. de La GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): In its statement in the general debate in this Committee the French delegation announced the submission of a draft resolution on the establishment of an international institute for disarmament research under the auspices of the United Nations. I have the honour today of introducing that draft resolution (A/C.1/34/L.37) on behalf of its sponsors: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, the Netherlands, Pakistan, the Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom, Uruguay, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

The draft resolution is designed to implement the provisions of General Assembly resolution 33/71 K, adopted last year by consensus. In the preambular section of that resolution the General Assembly noted that negotiations on disarmament must be based on objective in-depth studies and that, in addition to the work being done in this field by the United Nations Centre for Disarmament, it is advisable to undertake more forward-looking research within the framework of the United Nations, in accordance with the criteria of scientific independence.

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

It was in that spirit that the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies prepared the recommendations set out in the report submitted by the Secretary-General in accordance with General Assembly resolution 33/71 K. That report and the provisions of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.37 contain the main features of our proposal, namely: the research institute would be established within the framework of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), as an interim arrangement, for the period until the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament; and the Secretary-General is requested to hold consultations with UNITAR regarding the establishment of the institute. Of course, UNITAR was first consulted on this proposal, in particular with regard to the terms of the present draft resolution. The solution suggested is an interim arrangement to be valid until the second special session on disarmament. At that session the question would no doubt be considered in the light of the experience acquired and we hope that a final arrangement would be endorsed.

The establishment of the international institute for disarmament research within the framework of UNITAR seems to us to be justified for a number of reasons. First, the new impetus towards research on disarmament that would be created by the establishment of the institute is compatible with the statute of UNITAR, which states that it is:

"established by the Secretary-General as an autonomous institution within the framework of the United Nations for the purpose of enhancing, by the performance of the functions described hereafter, the effectiveness of the United Nations in achieving the major objectives of the Organization, in particular the maintenance of peace and security and the promotion of economic and social development." (E/4200, annex I)

Furthermore, article IV of the statute empowers the Executive Director of UNITAR to set up such advisory bodies on training and research as may be necessary.

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

In addition, the structure of UNITAR lends itself to a gradual development of the institute's scope. The experience gained in the preliminary stage may lead to the necessary adaptations.

Scientific independence is a basic element of the proposal as it was submitted to the General Assembly under resolution 33/71 K. It is in that spirit that the Advisory Board stressed that provision, and we feel, in this connexion, that UNITAR provides a particularly appropriate framework. UNITAR's experience in training will facilitate the recruitment of a limited number of young specialists, as mentioned by the Advisory Board. Finally, the fact that the institute will be included within UNITAR will ensure its progressive development and will limit the administrative costs that would inevitably arise were it to be set up as an entirely new body. Thus, the financing of the institute will come under the UNITAR budget. We feel that operational expenses can be held at a relatively low level and that the permanent staff should be small. The French Government plans to make a substantial contribution to this undertaking and we hope that other Member States will do likewise. Indeed, we feel that an institute for disarmament research should have a place among the group of United Nations bodies working for disarmament, and that it can play a highly useful role. It will examine, usually on a long-term basis, the present and future problems for the cause of disarmament created by developments that affect the international community and technological progress. Such work will be in keeping with the duty of the United Nations not to let itself be taken unawares and will enable it to prepare for and carry out with foresight the task of disarmament.

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

All this will be done without duplicating studies being carried out by the Centre for Disarmament, in keeping with negotiations which have already begun; nor will the future be in any way mortgaged. That is why the delegations that have sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.37, including my own, hope that the draft resolution, like the one adopted in 1978 on the same subject, will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): In his statement in this Committee on 29 October the Swedish Foreign Minister gave a fairly comprehensive presentation of the motives and considerations that had led us to propose that the institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament be studied. Therefore, in introducing today the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.30 on behalf of the sponsors - Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Uruguay, Yugoslavia and my own country - I can confine myself to a few observations.

First of all, this draft resolution should not be viewed as a product of criticism of the work of existing institutions, such as the United Nations Centre for Disarmament, but as providing for general consideration of institutional requirements in the light of current developments in the field of disarmament, the growing disarmament agenda and the complexities of the issues involved, as well as the more active participation by a large number of Member States in United Nations disarmament efforts.

Increasing demands have to be met for such purposes as the promotion, substantive preparation, implementation and control of the process of disarmament.

Secondly, I should like to underline that what the sponsors of this draft resolution have in mind is not any form of change in the existing intergovernmental deliberative or negotiating bodies; but the study should cover the question whether there is need for a reform of the institutional arrangements relating to the management of disarmament affairs and, if so, how it could best be structured.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

It is not the intention of the sponsors to pre-empt the outcome of the envisaged study. As is stated in the text of the draft resolution, however, it should be comprehensive; it should assess present requirements and future estimated needs in the United Nations management of disarmament affairs. Furthermore, it should outline the possible functions, structure and institutional framework for meeting those requirements and needs, including the legal and financial implications. Recommendations should also be formulated for possible later decisions on the matter.

In the draft resolution the Secretary-General is requested to carry out such a study with the assistance of qualified governmental experts. The group of experts should be of a representative character and thus comprise not too small a number of experts. Furthermore, to ensure that the views of member Governments are taken into account by the group of experts, the Secretary-General is recommended to seek such views on some key issues.

In the opinion of the sponsors, it would seem natural that the views of member Governments be solicited at an early stage of the work of the group. Enough time must be given to the experts to produce substantial results. It would therefore seem appropriate that two years be allowed for the group to complete its study. This would also give the General Assembly, at its next special session devoted to disarmament, an opportunity to consider these institutional matters in depth and, if so required, to take action.

I should like now to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.34 regarding a study on the relationship between disarmament and development. I do so on behalf of the sponsors, namely: Canada, Egypt, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Jamaica, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, the Philippines, Romania, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and my own country. I shall be very brief in my introduction, since my Under-Secretary of State, Mrs. Thorsson, in her statement on 31 October, highlighted document A/34/534, which contains the interim report of the Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

The draft resolution is mainly of a procedural character. In operative paragraph 1 it takes note of the interim report I have just mentioned. There is, however, one important substantive paragraph to which I should like to draw attention, namely, operative paragraph 2, in which the Secretary-General is requested to take appropriate action to provide the resources and expertise necessary successfully to complete the study in accordance with paragraph 23 of the interim report.

In that paragraph it was stated that the volume of the new research material which would form the basis of the final report had strengthened the Group's conviction that strong support from suitably qualified research consultants in the United Nations Centre for Disarmament would be indispensable to the successful execution of its mandate. It was specifically stated that a minimum of three such consultants, one for each of the main areas of investigation, would be required for the period January 1980, when the completed research projects start to arrive in the Centre, to September 1981, when the Group expects to complete its final report.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

As regards the amount of work that would be required to carry it out, I would recall that Mrs. Thorsson mentioned in her statement that between 4,000 and 5,000 pages of research reports would be analysed and evaluated in order to establish a basis for the Group's conclusions and recommendations.

In operative paragraph 3 the appeal made in the corresponding resolution last year is again addressed to Governments to make available data and information relevant to a meaningful completion of the study in question.

And finally, in operative paragraph 4, the General Assembly would decide to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-sixth session an item entitled "Final report of the Secretary-General with respect to the study on the relationship between disarmament and development".

It is the sponsors' hope that these two draft resolutions can be adopted without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: On Wednesday the Committee decided to take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.6, L.12/Rev.1, L.20, L.21, L.22, L.25, L.27, L.28, L.31 and L.32. Since we have been unable to obtain the use of a voting room this morning but will have one this afternoon, I propose to deal with the three draft resolutions which their sponsors have asked be approved without a vote: that is, draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.6, L.20 and L.21. Then this afternoon we shall proceed to deal with the other draft resolutions.

Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): I regret that I must respectfully request a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.6.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): We support the request of the representative of Ireland, and we also request a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.21.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain at this stage the votes they intend to cast on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.6.

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): The Polish delegation is firmly convinced that an early conclusion of a comprehensive agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons would play a major role in halting the qualitative arms race, which is generally recognized as one of the most dangerous phenomena of our times.

In the course of the debates in this Committee and in other forums, many delegations have emphasized that it is unquestionably easier to ban weapons which are at the research stage than to eliminate those which have already found their way into the arsenals of States. We believe that the international community has a vital interest in taking effective measures which would prevent the development of new weapons of mass destruction. We may add that, in accordance with the forecasts of scientists as reflected in the discussions in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and in the Committee on Disarmament, in which experts from several countries, including Poland, participated, there is a real danger of the emergence of new types of weapons of mass annihilation which may be no less and perhaps even more effective in their destructive capabilities than nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

It is therefore indeed imperative to erect a workable barrier against the use of the latest scientific and technological achievements for the purposes of war. The Polish delegation is of the opinion that the far-reaching, comprehensive approach to the problem of the prohibition of new weapons of mass destruction suggested in the draft resolution in question would serve this purpose well. It aims at an agreement on binding obligations to prohibit the development and production of all new weapons of mass annihilation and at the same time envisages the possibility of preparing specific agreements on particular types of such weapons.

We shall, therefore, vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.6.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The United States delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.6, dealing with the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons.

Our abstention should not be interpreted as a lack of concern on the part of the United States that the potential threat of new weapons of mass destruction that we face today might become a real threat at some time in the future. We clearly recognize the importance of preventive arms control and believe in this context that the question of new weapons of mass destruction should be kept under continuous review. The idea, however, of attempting to conclude an omnibus treaty covering all new types of weapons of mass destruction in general would not, in our view, lead to a realistic solution of the problem.

As we have stated on other occasions, if we dealt in a loose or even vague manner with principles not currently understood, or relationships among known principles which have not yet been conceived, we should

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

ultimately discover, I fear, that we had merely created the illusion of having dealt with the potential problem of new weapons of mass destruction. Further, if such an omnibus treaty were to be given the verification procedures necessary to make it more than an illusion, we believe that it would threaten to obstruct scientific development in areas where this would be neither necessary nor advisable.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

In our view, the approach of an omnibus treaty would inevitably lead to contentious debates over the designation of new weapons as new weapons of mass destruction. In recent years we have already seen some attempts to distort the concept of new weapons of mass destruction, in particular with respect to certain nuclear weapons which, horrible though all of them are, had already been known for over 20 years. For these reasons the United States has consistently opposed approaching this problem by negotiating a general, comprehensive agreement.

It seems important to note here that in the three decades - over 30 years - since the United Nations approved a broad definition of weapons of mass destruction in 1948, no new types of such weapons have emerged. Nor, to our knowledge, is evidence available to indicate any immediate threat of such a development. I might add in this regard that during the period in which the Committee on Disarmament has dealt with this matter the number of experts speaking on the subject in the Committee and the significance of their presentations have both diminished.

General Assembly resolution 32/84 B, which was supported by the United States, urged States to refrain from developing new types of weapons of mass destruction. It also requested that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament keep under review the question of the development of such weapons and consider the desirability of formulating agreements on the prohibition of any specific new weapons that might be identified.

Consensus language was subsequently reached in the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament with regard to new types of weapons of mass destruction. None the less, it has unfortunately not proved possible to agree to continue this consensus approach at the thirty-third or the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. One group of Governments continues to urge that States make a binding commitment not to develop, produce or stockpile any new types of weapons of mass destruction, but without any clear definition of the agreement's scope or limitations and without adequate or effective provisions for verification or compliance.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

The United States continues to hold to the approach set forth in General Assembly resolution 32/84 B: that is, that the best approach to precluding effectively the threat of potential new weapons of mass destruction is the negotiation of individual agreements on specific new types of weapons as they are identified. We can support, of course, the compromise approach reflected in the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and in General Assembly resolution 33/66 A.

Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): On behalf of the nine States members of the European Communities I wish to make the following comments on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.6 on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons.

As the Committee is aware, in 1978 two separate draft resolutions were presented on this subject. Last year the Nine voted for resolution 33/66 A and abstained in the vote on resolution 33/66 B. Both resolutions covered similar ground but differed in the details of their approach to the solution of the problems involved. The voting reflected these differences.

Rather than confront the General Assembly once again with two separate drafts the sponsors of last year's resolution 33/66 A refrained from submitting their own text at this session. Instead, they undertook through consultations to seek the elaboration of a single text which could be adopted by consensus. In this way it was hoped that unanimity would be achieved in this Committee on this important issue. These consultations did not, however, prove successful in establishing agreement on a single text. That this is so is very much a matter of regret.

Clearly, there is no dispute within this Committee on the need to prohibit any and all new weapons of mass destruction which are identified. The point at issue is simply the choice of means in seeking most effectively to pursue that objective. The Nine, together with many other States, believe that new weapons of mass destruction and their technologies, if they are to be effectively and permanently prohibited, must be the subject of separate, verifiable controls. This fundamental consideration, however, has

(Mr. Mulloy, Ireland)

not received sufficient emphasis in the present draft resolution.

Moreover, the special importance given in operative paragraph 1 of the draft to the negotiation of a single blanket prohibition on the development and manufacture of new weapons of mass destruction does not appear, in our view, to be warranted. A comprehensive agreement could not in the first place adequately distinguish between peaceful research without any military implication and areas of research which could effectively be given military application. Its verification would, furthermore, require detailed international supervision of disparate civil research activities in many States with a view to determining whether particular research areas could lead to the development of new weapons of mass destruction. That is neither feasible nor realistic.

Not least, those engaged in peaceful academic or industrial research expect that their efforts should not be impeded. In the absence of verification - and it is generally accepted that a comprehensive prohibition could not be verified - confidence and certitude in the long term would be traded for optimism in the short term and the door would be opened to suspicion, recrimination and divisive debate unhelpful to larger disarmament objectives.

While not believing that a generalized prohibition offers a practical solution to the problems involved, the Nine fully recognize the need to continue international discussions with a view to identifying potentially dangerous developments in science and technology so that the necessary controls can be introduced at an early stage. Already such discussion has encouraged efforts towards the prohibition of radiological weapons, and elements of a draft prohibition of such weapons are to be referred by this session of the General Assembly to the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva for negotiation. Further discussion may produce equally useful results leading to the conclusion of individual verifiable agreements where dangerous new weapons possibilities are seen to emerge. This appears to us to be the most realistic, practical and productive approach to the problems involved.

Each weapon and weapons system has its own particular characteristics, which require detailed, separate negotiation. Only through the conclusion

(Mr. Mulloy, Ireland)

of separate agreements, rather than a blanket prohibition, can we ensure that adequate verification arrangements are established so that all prohibitions will be fully effective and durable. Only through the conclusion of individual agreements dealing with specific weapons systems, rather than a global convention affecting many diverse branches of science and technology, can we adequately meet the need to distinguish between peaceful research and weapons development and ensure that normal, necessary civil research is not impeded. We do not, however, insist that a resolution such as the one now proposed should emphasize only this particular approach to the problem. Indeed, we would have hoped, in the interests of establishing a basis of consensus, that a formulation which sought to keep all possibilities open and avoided giving priority to one approach over another could have been agreed upon. That did not, in the event, prove possible.

It is because the Nine fully support the need for effective and lasting prohibitions on new weapons of mass destruction that they cannot endorse the approach of the present draft resolution. We shall therefore abstain in the vote.

Mr. NONOYAMA (Japan): My delegation understands the significance of the effort to prohibit the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. My delegation, however, does not consider it appropriate for the Committee on Disarmament to negotiate the preparation of a draft comprehensive agreement on these weapons, because the scope of such an agreement and the type of weapons that would be encompassed are far from clear, and verification difficulties, for example, would arise.

We consider that it is more appropriate at this stage to keep the question under review in the Committee on Disarmament so that negotiations can be started whenever any specific new weapons of mass destruction that may be identified come into the picture. In view of these considerations, my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.6.

The CHAIRMAN: The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.6, entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons", has eight sponsors. They are, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Viet Nam. The representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic has asked for a recorded vote. I should like once again to ask the members of the Committee to be patient and to agree to postpone our action on this draft resolution until this afternoon, when the voting could be done by machine, because to take a recorded vote at this time would probably delay our work.

As I hear no objection I take it that that is agreed, and we shall proceed to deal with draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.22, entitled "World Disarmament Conference", which has six sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka at the 35th meeting of the First Committee on 15 November. The sponsors are Burundi, Peru, Poland, Spain, Sri Lanka and Viet Nam, who have asked that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. As I hear no objection, it is so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.22 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Bangladesh, who wishes to state his delegation's position on the draft resolution that has just been adopted.

Mr. RAHMAN (Bangladesh): My delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.22, which has just been adopted by this Committee by consensus. Bangladesh has consistently supported the idea of holding a world disarmament conference, in keeping with the decision taken by the non-aligned countries at their Belgrade meeting. As a token of our support for a world disarmament conference we fully endorsed the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. A second special session on disarmament is scheduled to be held in 1982. We believe that the holding of that special session will create an atmosphere conducive to the effective participation of all parties concerned, which will lend meaning to the eventual holding of a world disarmament conference.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has completed its work on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.22.

It is now my intention to deal with draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.27/Rev.1, which comes under item 42 of the agenda, "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session", and is entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission". This draft resolution has 17 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 39th meeting of the First Committee on 21 November. The sponsors are: Argentina, Bangladesh, Cyprus, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uruguay, Yugoslavia and Zaire. The sponsors have asked that this draft resolution be adopted without a vote. As I hear no objection, it is so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.27/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the representative of Spain, who wishes to explain his delegation's position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. de LAIGLESIA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): The Spanish delegation attaches great importance to the work of the Disarmament Commission. Therefore we joined in the consensus on draft resolution L.27/Rev.1 which refers directly to that work. In our opinion one of the aspects of disarmament to which that body should devote special attention is the aspect of conventional weapons. The contents of operative paragraph 3 reflect the balance which should exist between nuclear and conventional disarmament. This draft resolution makes it possible to prepare an agenda for the substantive meeting which will take place in the spring of 1980. In accordance with the priorities set forth in paragraph 45 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, consideration will be given to the conventional arms race, and obviously that is a matter which deserves special attention within the general framework of a comprehensive disarmament programme.

We find that the working procedures have been very positive. It has so far always worked in accordance with the consensus rule. The delegation of

AW/9/km

A/C.1/34/PV.40
43-45

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

Spain feels that it should continue along those lines, and therefore we do not wish to offer any comments on this text, the language of which is not entirely in keeping with our thinking. More importantly, we should maintain intact the principle of a consensus. We think this draft resolution should be supported, but greater stress should be laid on the important question of the conventional arms race.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has completed its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.27.

It is now my intention to deal with the draft resolution in document A/C.1/34/L.31 under item 42 (e) "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: Disarmament Week". The draft resolution has 19 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mongolia at the 39th meeting of the First Committee on 21 November. The sponsors are: Afghanistan, Burundi, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, India, Japan, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela and Zambia.

The sponsors of the draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.31 have asked that this draft be adopted without a vote.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation has gone through this draft resolution and we find it an excellent one which we shall certainly support. But just for the sake of conformity of language, I wonder whether the formulation used in operative paragraph 3 could also be included in the last preambular paragraph. Operative paragraph 3 makes reference to the fact that the relevant specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency should in the dissemination of information act within their areas of competence. We consider it important that these United Nations agencies be given an opportunity to concentrate solely on their major tasks and deal only with other items if and when they fall within their realm of competence. For reasons of clarity, I would suggest including the same words, "within their areas of competence" also in the last preambular paragraph after the words "International Atomic Energy Agency". That paragraph would then read:

"Recognizing the need for active involvement of relevant specialized agencies of the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency within their areas of competence in promoting the cause of disarmament and, in particular, in holding Disarmament Week:".

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to ask the sponsors of this draft resolution whether they would agree to accept the amendment read out by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Mr. ERDENCHULUUN (Mongolia): The Mongolian delegation could go along with the suggestion that has just been made by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany. But there are quite a few sponsors - in fact, we now have 24 - of this draft resolution and I can only speak on behalf of the Mongolian delegation. Japan indicates that it could go along with this wording, and Mozambique also, but I do not know what the attitude of other delegations would be.

The CHAIRMAN: Mongolia introduced this draft resolution and, while I am not sure that it can speak for the other delegations, if I hear no objection from the other sponsors, I shall assume that they also agree to the amendment made by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: If I hear no objection, draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.31, as amended, is adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.31, as amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.31.

It is now my intention to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.20/Rev.1. This draft resolution has 26 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany at the 34th meeting of the First Committee on 14 November 1979.

This draft resolution has financial implications, and I now call on the Committee Secretary to read the financial implications to the Committee.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the First Committee): Under the terms of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.20/Rev.1, the General Assembly would:

Decide "to undertake a comprehensive study on confidence-building measures, taking into account the answers received by the Secretary-General as contained in document A/34/416;"

Request "the Secretary-General to carry out the study with the assistance of a group of qualified governmental experts appointed by him on a balanced geographical basis and to submit it to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session;"

Request "the Secretary-General to submit a progress report on the work of the group of governmental experts to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session;"

Should the draft resolution be adopted, additional expenditure would have to be incurred in an amount of \$308,200 plus \$200, based on the following assumptions: the 10 governmental experts would have to hold one meeting in Geneva in April 1980 and three meetings in New York in August 1980 and in February and July 1981; further, one consultant at a level equivalent to a P-5 post would be required for a total of three months over the period up to the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly to co-ordinate the work of the experts; then, a staff member would have to travel from Headquarters to Geneva to serve as secretary to the group; further, interpretation would be provided in four languages, namely, English, French, Russian and Spanish; translation would be required in three languages, namely, French, Russian and Spanish; the volume

(Mr. Banerjee)

of in-session, pre-session and post-session documentation would amount to approximately 20 pages for the first meeting, approximately 120 pages for the second meeting and approximately 200 pages each for the third and fourth meetings. A detailed distribution of expenditure will be contained in the annex when the document on the financial implications of this draft resolution is circulated to members of the Committee.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like to make a brief statement on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.20/Rev.1, which was distributed this morning. It relates to a very minor change of the text in L.20 and involves the deletion of the words "on a regional basis" in operative paragraph 1, because we found it appropriate to accede to a request that we received from some countries.

May I also take this opportunity to propose to the Committee a minor addition to operative paragraph 2. Some delegations have asked us to add the following words at the end of that paragraph: "and the relevant statements made during the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly".

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): My delegation would like to make a brief statement - in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.20/Rev.1, if the Committee decides to vote on it, or of our acceptance of a consensus if the Committee decides to adopt it in that way.

My delegation appreciates the spirit in which the initiative on confidence-building measures was introduced by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany. We believe that confidence-building measures can indeed increase trust amongst States and should therefore be encouraged. We think that is particularly essential in regions where intense tension exists among States.

However, we believe also that a minimum of such trust is an indispensable ingredient in the very development of confidence-building measures. Such a minimum of trust should, we think, be predicated on an undertaking by the States of the region that they intend to abide by the principles of the United Nations Charter and other rules of international law governing relations among States; an undertaking that is borne out not merely by their becoming Members of the United Nations but also in their practice by the States concerned. It is essential therefore, in our view, that in the consideration of arrangements for confidence-building measures - arrangements that would take strict account of regional peculiarities - all aspects of the question should be borne in mind, not just a catalogue of specific measures that may be taken in situations where the minimum of trust, to which we have referred, already exists.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

We think that States are unlikely to be persuaded of the efficacy of confidence-building measures if their sovereignty and territorial integrity are threatened by non-respect of the Charter by other States in the region. If, as draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.20/Rev.1 indicates, the United Nations, in accordance with its Charter, can play an important role in creating conditions conducive to the consideration of confidence-building measures, then my delegation believes that any study commissioned by this Organization on this subject should include consideration of "how" the United Nations can fulfil that vital role. That was the reasoning behind the suggestion made to the sponsors by my delegation for an additional operative paragraph that would have read as follows:

"Determines that such study should include an examination of basic conditions the existence of which would facilitate the consideration of confidence-building measures on a regional basis and of the role which the United Nations could play in creating such conditions."

I should like to express my delegation's gratitude to the sponsors of this draft resolution for the spirit of accommodation that they have shown by incorporating in their text my delegation's suggestions for additional preambular paragraphs, which have been fully reflected in the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs. We appreciate also the difficulty they encountered in incorporating in their text the additional operative paragraph to which I just referred. Notwithstanding the fact that they did not incorporate that operative paragraph, we believe that the explanation given to us, namely that the intention of that operative paragraph is in fact implicit in the draft resolution itself, is an assurance and hope that the group of experts which will undertake the study will bear that in mind.

I am particularly grateful to Ambassador Pfeiffer of the Federal Republic of Germany for the very great understanding that he has shown of my delegation's preoccupations in this matter.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Therefore, if the draft resolution is put to the vote my delegation will cast an affirmative vote; if it is adopted by consensus it will gladly go along with that, particularly in view of the minor addition made this morning by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany that further assures us that the views expressed on this subject at this session will also be made available to the group of experts.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): My delegation would like to make the following statement in connexion with the discussion of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.20/Rev.1.

As is well known, the Soviet Union has consistently favoured the strengthening of international peace and security. As radical measures for the attainment of that goal it has been considering practical steps to call a halt to the arms race and bring about disarmament. In addition, the Soviet Union is a supporter of measures that, although not themselves measures of genuine disarmament, would nevertheless promote progress in this area. This relates in particular to measures to promote the strengthening of confidence among States and the deepening of military détente.

Serious progress in creating an atmosphere of trust would be achieved by such measures as are applicable to the European continent and were agreed upon at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, in the convening and successful conclusion of which, as is well known, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries played an active role. In full compliance with the provisions of the Final Act signed at Helsinki, the Soviet Union informs this Committee of its acceptance of military observers for training and invites observers from other States for training.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

Experience in the implementation of the measures adopted at Helsinki shows that they certainly promote, to a degree, the strengthening of trust in military détente. In accordance with the Final Act of the European Conference, which proclaims the possibility of expanding confidence-building measures on the basis of accumulated experience, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have put forward in recent years a whole series of proposals aimed at the development of the process of military détente in Europe.

I should like in this connexion to remind the Committee that, in the Moscow Declaration of November 1978, adopted at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, and further, in the Budapest communiqué of the meeting of Foreign Ministers in May 1979, the Soviet Union and other States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty proposed, inter alia, an agreement on the non-first use of conventional and nuclear weapons upon the conclusion of a similar agreement on that subject among the participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. They also proposed that agreement be reached on the containment of military and political groupings in Europe.

The socialist countries also stated their readiness to come to agreement on the limitation of military training exercises to 66,000 men as well as on measures with regard to large troop movements and major air force movements within the sphere of operation of the Final Act of the European Conference, and on major training operations in each other's territorial waters and the expansion of confidence-building measures in the Mediterranean region. The task of implementing additional confidence-building measures and of reducing military confrontation, which has assumed high priority and urgency in the present circumstances, and the subsequent reduction of the concentration of armed forces and armaments indicate the range of tasks for the discussion and solution of which the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty are proposing to convene a conference at the political level with the participation of all European States, the United States and Canada. They have expressed their willingness to proceed immediately - and I stress immediately - to consultations among the concerned parties on preparations for convening such a conference.

The proposals of the socialist countries were further developed in the statement of Mr. Brezhnev in Berlin. Mr. Brezhnev proposed an expansion of the measures known as confidence-building measures. On a basis of mutuality, the Soviet Union now proposes to report on major military training manoeuvres not merely for the period of time specified in the Helsinki Final Act, but over a longer period; to reduce the minimum number of troops which would define such manoeuvres from 25,000 to 20,000 men; not to carry out such manoeuvres with more than 45,000 men; to report land force movements of more than 20,000 troops within the zone prescribed by the Final Act of Helsinki. This is a specific, concrete and tangible programme of action in the field of confidence-building measures. At the same time, the Soviet Union is ready to consider other ideas designed to build confidence among States.

Last year, on the basis of our general approach to the question of confidence-building measures, we supported General Assembly resolution 33/91 B on the subject which contains an invitation to Member States to inform the Secretary-General of their views and experiences regarding confidence-building measures. The Soviet Union's detailed and well-developed answer to this invitation is to be found in document A/34/416.

The present draft resolution, A/C.1/34/L.20/Rev.1, to the extent to which it continues the general orientation of last year's resolution, also meets with our sympathy and understanding. We agree in particular with the recommendation contained in paragraph 1 that all States should continue to consider arrangements for specific confidence-building measures, taking into account the specific conditions and requirements of each region.

However, this draft contains provisions connected with research into the question of confidence-building measures. The Soviet delegation has already had the opportunity of expressing its general views on the question of carrying out various kinds of research and studies through the United Nations. We have a definite feeling of concern at the growing number of various kinds of studies and research which entail certain financial implications and which, most importantly, do not yield tangible results for genuine disarmament. It is from this standpoint precisely that

our delegation views proposals for the carrying out of a study on confidence-building measures. That question seems to us to be sufficiently clear; we need no expert views from specialists here. What we need are concrete, practical actions, translating existing proposals into the language of policy.

Therefore, the Soviet delegation cannot give its consent to a consensus, and requests that a separate vote be taken on paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the draft resolution.

Mr. PRZYGODZKI (Poland): Poland's deep involvement in endeavours aimed at fostering confidence among States is well known. We believe that broadly conceived confidence-building measures provide favourable political conditions for promoting efforts in the field of halting the arms race and achieving genuine disarmament. We attach particular importance to the full implementation of the provisions agreed upon in this regard in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

Together with other States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, Poland has put forward a series of new, important initiatives designed to increase mutual trust among States and, in particular, to lower the level of military confrontation in Europe. Moreover, we have expressed our willingness to give very careful consideration to other proposals aimed at strengthening confidence among States and at military détente. In its reply to the Secretary-General, the Polish Government expressed its readiness to take joint action with other States, both on a regional and a global scale, with a view to promoting confidence-building measures which would serve the consolidation of peace and security and the furthering of understanding among nations.

Yet my delegation is unable to support those provisions of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.20/Rev.1 which envisage undertaking a new study on confidence-building measures. I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to the report of the Secretary-General of 19 October 1979 (A/34/519) concerning a study on all aspects of regional disarmament. As we can see from paragraph IV B of the provisional outline for the study, the question of confidence-building measures has already been taken up by the Group of Governmental Experts on Regional Disarmament. This is understandable, since the regional framework seems to be particularly well suited for measures of that kind.

(Mr. Przygodzki, Poland)

The advisability of a regional approach to the problem has been recognized by the authors of the draft resolution in question, A/C.1/34/L.20/Rev.1, which, in its operative paragraph 1,

"Recommends that all States should continue to consider arrangements for specific confidence-building measures, taking into account the specific conditions and requirements of each region".

The study on regional disarmament will be submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session.

My delegation feels that elaborating in parallel two separate studies covering the same subject by two different groups of governmental experts would indeed mean undue overlapping and duplicating of the effort that should rather be directed towards working out concrete agreements aimed at fostering mutual trust and bringing about more tangible progress in disarmament, and not at proliferating still new studies. That is why, bearing in mind also the considerable financial implications of the study in question, my delegation will abstain in the vote on operative paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the draft resolution before us, which we shall support as a whole.

Mr. KRUTZSCH (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic would like to say the following in connexion with draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.20/Rev.1.

The task of strengthening détente and furthering disarmament by implementing confidence-building measures is of considerable importance. The German Democratic Republic therefore proposed, together with other socialist States, a programme of confidence-building measures designed for Europe.

However, it has also to be stressed that decisions on the introduction and stationing of new types of highly sophisticated nuclear weapons in the region would create a situation not conducive to endeavours at strengthening confidence among States. Furthermore, it is to be regretted that the draft resolution focuses attention on a study. Instead of losing precious time with studies, it would be more appropriate to appeal to States Members to sit down and negotiate, and so start the realization of concrete confidence-building measures. Therefore, the delegation of the German Democratic cannot support the provisions contained in operative paragraphs 2 to 5 of the draft resolution before us and will abstain in the vote.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): My attention has been drawn to the fact that Denmark and Finland were not mentioned as original co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.34 on the study on the relationship between disarmament and development. I would therefore ask that they be recorded as such.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to announce the following additional sponsors of draft resolutions: A/C.1/34/L.15/Rev.1, Angola, Ethiopia, Mongolia, Mozambique, the Soviet Union, Viet Nam; A/C.1/34/L.22, Mongolia; A/C.1/34/L.30, Tunisia; A/C.1/34/L.31, Angola, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Viet Nam; A/C.1/34/L.32, Viet Nam. Uruguay has become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.25, L.26, L.27, L.30, L.34 and L.38.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.