



CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Agenda items 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34 (continued):   |      |
| World Disarmament Conference: report of the Secretary-General   |      |
| Implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency  |      |
| General and complete disarmament:   |      |
| (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament;   |      |
| (b) Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency;   |      |
| (c) Report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2852 (XXVI), paragraph 5  |      |
| Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament   |      |
| Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests:  |      |
| (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament;   |      |
| (b) Report of the Secretary-General   |      |
| Implementation of General Assembly resolution 2830 (XXVI) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General |      |
| Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace: report of the Secretary-General   | 1    |

Chairman: Mr. Radha Krishna RAMPHUL  
(Mauritius).

AGENDA ITEMS 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33 AND 34  
(continued)

World Disarmament Conference: report of the Secretary-General (A/8654, A/8668, A/8681, A/8693 and Corr.1, A/8757, A/8817)

Implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear Weapon States: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (A/8774)

General and complete disarmament:

- (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (A/8818);
- (b) Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (A/8774);
- (c) Report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2852 (XXVI), paragraph 5 (A/8803 and Corr.1)

Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the conference of the committee on disarmament (A/8818)

Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests (A/8740, A/8741, A/C.1/L.611 and 615):

- (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (A/8818);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General (A/8807)

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 2830 (XXVI) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General (A/8653, A/8808)

Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace:  
report of the Secretary-General (A/8809)

1. Mr. HIERRO GAMBARELLA (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Uruguayan delegation considers that basically disarmament must be a legal and political act from which no nation can be barred and in which all nations, enjoying equal sovereignty, must participate in those decisions that lead to it. But what is strange is that we must also say that non-members of the Organization should also participate—such as Germany, for instance—since it is difficult to understand that there are nations that do not belong to the Organization or are kept outside it for no reason.

2. The disarmament agreed to by the powerful is an act of power, and that itself vitiates and limits its basic meaning, because disarmament is not a negative act, to refrain from arming or limiting armaments, but a positive and creative act: that is to say, to cease resorting to the use of weapons and to find new and more fruitful paths to understanding and the coexistence of peoples and countries. Without underestimating what has been done so far, we must consider disarmament as it is, but so far there has been more contention than creation.

3. We believe that there are no countries which are heavily armed, or countries which have the exclusive power of nuclear weaponry, confronted by others which are neutral because they lack arms. The expansion of the evils of armaments, regardless of the intensity of the potential damage that they carry, knows no borders, protagonists or spectators, since all human beings and all nations form a dramatic unit that plays a part in the extension of a tragedy or the universalization of its threat. There are no countries that are alien, and I would say that there is no human entity that is alien, to active participation in this great subject on the face of the earth, therefore how can we conceive of disarmament of the more powerful, agreed to and organized by them—or in any case by some of them, since not all agree—when the weak and the unarmed basically have just as much to do with the integral

development of this dramatic universal problem as do the strongest?

4. The strength of the Charter lies in that very concept, which was laid down when it was drawn up. Today, after 25 years of existence, the development of ideas and also, basically, the immense scientific and technological revolution that we are witnessing and in which we are involved have greatly extended the scope of the Charter and are stimulating modern thinking and common achievement of the goals which mankind will have to reach in this decade or in future ones.

5. Perhaps the man of today has not really understood that, together with the immense technological conquest of the modern era, something new has developed in the mind of man, an unusual spiritual dimension that was not known at previous stages of human existence—planetary awareness, the feeling that man is living on one indivisible planet.

6. Man may have had a universal awareness as his ideals, philosophical training and juridical conscience led him to understand the similarity of human destiny; but what I have called “planetary awareness” is born at the very moment when man goes beyond his own planet and undertakes the immense adventure of the conquest of outer space. Man must understand that achievements, conquests, efforts and even frustrations and inhibitions that go beyond the crust of the planet involve all mankind and its universal environment. And man also realizes this when he knows that the cataclysm that he has provoked by unleashing a certain power will affect all men.

7. Universalism, to which all humans tend, is born of the most important philosophic and social currents of thought that feed the human spirit. This planetary awareness, to which I am referring, seems today almost a tangible reality which the man of these decades can sense and feel in the same way that he is able to understand and sense the incalculable magnitude of the human adventure launched beyond the natural boundaries of life and unifying man beyond all borders.

8. Obviously this awareness is just now beginning to be sensed; we are only starting on our planetary era. But future decades will show that this emotion will receive rational assessment by man and then a new philosophy, a new body of law will go hand in hand with the conquests of science and technology. But nothing that is human can be considered without taking into account this new and exciting dimension which is at the same time an obligation to man of today. Therefore, we are entitled to ask whether the concept of political, military or economic power that has thus far guided the history of man, can survive as it has thus far beyond the missions, ideas and constructions of the law; whether the presence of a new reality will not tend, as I believe it will, to universalize that concept so that it will be shared and assumed by and for every inhabitant of the planet, leaving behind the feudal vestiges of the sectorialization of life that has thus confined the course of history.

9. If we are the only ones to have realized this, it is incumbent upon us to ensure the growth of this awareness, to point out that every action that we take as an Organization can limit or strengthen that awareness. It may well be that countries like mine, that some call peripheral countries because they do not understand us, that may not

have a high level of economic development—but let us not qualify this—do have that level from a spiritual standpoint, and are better capable, without giving up national bases and roots, of participating in this new human conduct. Perhaps if we carefully study our own roots and if we accept them with pride, we may have found a fraternal similarity with the roots of other members of the human species. Perhaps because of the deeply-rooted love of our own style of life, we have found earlier than others certain universal substances to which I am referring.

10. Furthermore, we do not conceive that the Assembly or the Committees of the Organization can be receiving periodic inventories of the agreements that may be arrived at by the nuclear Powers, or whatever agreements may be arrived at on the understanding that they have greater powers of decision than any other Members of the international community, not only for the reasons that I have already stressed, but because of a desire to defend the legal capacity of the organs of which we form part. We do not understand why the great topics of the world, be they what they are, can be limited and divided up and taken out of the general purview of this Organization and its structure; nor can we understand that the function of the Organization is to be reduced to that of a simple spectator which is yearly told how events are taking place, events which by their nature are part of the specific obligations of the Organization. It is not because we feel that one or another country may travel along an unusual road but because we cannot conceive of this Organization deciding in any way to amputate its own faculties and powers; it is as though we were asking the Organization to cut out some of its functional organs.

11. We believe that one of the major moral crises through which the world is going at the moment is that of scepticism, the despair of not believing that men and nations will derive the benefits as well as the responsibilities of the organizations they have set up. Man is sceptical when he does anything, at the very moment he does it, but he is the more so when what he does proves his own weaknesses and his fears. But these institutions that were created in a despairing, although hopeful, expression of faith, must feed those hopes and that faith, so that mankind will not give in to pessimism or suffer the agony of indifference. Acts of faith, based on reason, are the greatest things that man or humanity have ever done, and nothing could be more affirmative of the confidence and trust that we must possess, as a species and in the species, regarding what we can do for the future life of the species.

12. Without having to repeat figures that the Committee knows full well, because they have been stated in so many reports, the truth of the matter is that if the nuclear super-Powers and other countries possessing enormous war budgets were to devote only one part of the resources earmarked for armaments to the economic solidarity with the so-called developing countries, then the gap between one and the other world would be narrowed down and probably wiped out within a decade.

13. Without doubting the sincerity with which we are discussing the problems arising from the economic dichotomy of the world, it is sometimes frustrating to feel that increasing separation is also the cause of the convulsions that afflict many countries with economies similar to that

which I represent; these problems could also be solved by those who shortsightedly benefit from the poverty of countries that produce one commodity and from irregular or erratic economic development. If the picture were to be studied with the serenity and the thoroughness that the subject deserves, within a decade we would be able to do away with, for all time, the fundamental cause of violence that today is sweeping over many of the peoples of the so-called third world, and within a decade the conditions for a lasting and true peace would have been laid down.

14. We have never adduced that argument, although we have heard it stated, when reference is made to the expenditures which end in investigations of planetary conquests, because we consider that in these terms that argument leads to a scepticism regarding the great human conquests that should not be doubted. But there can be no doubt that one of the greatest blots on mankind's civilization today is the existence of that barrier between the wealthy and the poor that could be done away with in one generation, in so few years that they are mere minutes in the history of man, were we to spend on life what we spend on death.

15. Thus, in the chapter of blame and responsibility, it is very easy to attribute these to the powerful nations and to point to the weak as simple victims of these harsh social set-ups. It is easy, but it is not entirely true, since if among all of us who are exercising democracy in the world, starting from the principle of the sovereign equality of States, we all were to do so at all times and with faith, with the faith that we must possess in order not to lose the highest dignity of life, we would be taking a better road than those we are on today, by laying down the norms for a law that all would be bound to obey.

16. It is clear that seldom before have man, peoples, countries, all been enslaved by fear which is the most uncertain and undefinable of feelings that can be harboured by man.

17. We fear insurrections, we fear wars, and that fear creates armaments, ever multiplied and perfected by technology—a fear which, when applied to death, is also a fear of the transcendental capacities of man. And there is a fear—a universal fear, a planetary fear—of the power of nuclear weapons, and perhaps those who fear them most and the final capacity of destruction that lies in them may well be the very inventors of those weapons, those who hold them, the feudal lords of this power that we all know cannot be unleashed because I cannot term fear what the possible victim of any testing may feel, since countries and peoples have suffered and can always suffer the final consequences of a tremendous criminal act.

18. But no society, no nation, no family, no individual has moved ahead when imbued with fear. Therefore the question of disarmament must be summed up in an exhortation to set fear aside and start on greater conquests more lucid, less sombre, less melancholy and less bitter than the one which looms over man's destiny today.

19. It is obvious that this path must be taken by all and not by only a few, and the only way in which we can do so is to stop for all time all testing or manufacture of nuclear

weapons whatever the ideological symbols that may be painted on them.

20. It is also obvious that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which we consider to be a stage in a process, despite all the efforts made and the achievements obtained and mentioned in this debate, which, as we have said, we believe are more negative than affirmative, cannot ignore two nuclear Powers in the adoption of decisions by an organ that contains the other nuclear Powers. There is no clear explanation for their exclusion, which nullifies the importance of its agreements.

21. If we want to find a practical method to universalize these decisions, it must be through a policy of integration and not one of secession that we shall achieve this goal.

22. If we examine positive achievements on the road to denuclearization, I cannot omit a warm reference—not only because it confirms the Uruguayan view that in this field perhaps we the unarmed can do more than those who are wielding nuclear weapons but also because of its own importance—to the Treaty of Tlatelolco on the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America and its auspicious achievements and also an expressive and warm mention to the Ambassador of Mexico, Mr. García Robles, the architect of that important legal instrument.

23. But we believe that the holding of a world disarmament conference should, over the long term and looking beyond the present, result in replacement of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament by whatever organ such a conference may decide upon. It is clear that we are not under the impression that such structures and such a substitution can be carried out in one day nor would it be the fruit of a decision inspired in optimism that goes beyond the realism that must guide us in such a delicate sphere and in such a controversial question.

24. My delegation would want the world disarmament conference to be very carefully prepared through decisions and adequately representative bodies that would reflect the political picture of the world, without inexplicable exclusions, without irritating oversights and without giving pride of place to any. Careful preparation can ensure results. We do not believe these will be immediate or spectacular since that would be alien to the very nature of the problems that will have to be studied and solved. But what we do hope for is that because of the legal content and real and historic force of the problems, the decisions will give the Organization the sure methods of eradicating the use and the manufacture of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction and avoid any act that will lead to armament beyond the supreme right of the defence of the State and the nation, a right that must go beyond the generic denomination since disarmament calls for the destruction of all weapons that serve for annihilation and for aggression.

25. We have stated and we reiterate that we trust that this conference will yield a constructive instrumentation and not a negative one, an instrumentation that will not only avoid and clearly distinguish these acts but also lead to basic peace on the planet where the creative forces of man that are so powerful will be allowed free reign without the nightmares that today limit and minimize them.

26. It is obvious that our concept of peace is not merely to ask for disarmament but to insist that all that is devoted to destruction today be turned to the achievement of justice among men and peoples, since that and none other is the true path to human peace.

27. Mr. ENE (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): The resumption of the debate on disarmament again places our Committee before a very urgent and important political problem whose solution is closely linked to the legitimate aspirations and hopes of all peoples to live in peace and security and to devote all their resources and energies to progress and the development of civilization.

28. It is from this premise that we consider it imperative to proceed at this session to a thorough analysis of the critical situation prevailing in the field of disarmament negotiations in order to define the practical ways of stemming the arms race and implementing effective disarmament measures. Since the last session of the General Assembly, as was the case during the whole post-war era, the arms race has continued its rising curve without hindrance. The accumulation of considerable military arsenals, in particular enormous stocks of nuclear weapons, the sophistication of existing weapons and the improvement and the production of new methods of mass destruction constitute an increasingly serious threat to the peace and security of peoples and to their very existence. Arms are still being used as instruments of the imperialist policy of power, aggression and *diktat*, as means of pressuring and threatening the liberty and sovereignty of States and the sacred right of peoples to an independent existence and development and against the national liberation movements. At the same time, military expenditures constitute an increasingly heavy burden which with every passing year reduce more and more the material and spiritual level of life of all nations and which is becoming increasingly difficult to bear.

29. The debate on disarmament in this Committee as well as in other organs and the analysis of the efforts made and the results obtained in this field have stressed with all the necessary energy the pressing need to put an end to the arms race and, above all, to prohibit and destroy nuclear weapons.

30. In the light of the critical disarmament problems, in the first place the prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons, the discussions and the negotiations on disarmament which have been taking place for so many years have not achieved the results that one had a right to expect. Far too little has been done regarding true disarmament measures.

31. It is true that the United Nations has been and continues to be, according to the Charter, the place where the overwhelming majority of States have each year spoken out—and their voices are raised even louder at present—against the arms race and for achieving disarmament. In the course of the years the General Assembly has adopted a number of resolutions and other documents whose strict and universal implementation might have led to true progress on the road to the cessation of the arms race and to disarmament. However, the majority of those resolutions and documents have unfortunately not been implemented.

Furthermore, it is sufficient merely to glance at the activities carried out thus far by the General Assembly to realize that problems of such great importance to all peoples, such as the cessation of the production, the reduction and destruction of nuclear weapons, have never been included on its agenda. Certain measures, such as those calling for the liquidation of military bases on foreign soil, for some years have no longer appeared on the agenda whereas other questions—general and complete disarmament is a typical example—have achieved practically no progress, although our Organization has discussed them for a long time.

32. An important United Nations organ, the Disarmament Commission, established especially to meet the need to ensure the functioning of a specialized body in which all States can participate and contribute actively to the discussion and the solution of problems of disarmament, has not met for more than seven years. The balance sheet of the activities in the last decade of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva also is far from what had been expected. The Committee has done far too little to fulfil the mandate entrusted to it and has not gone on to the negotiation of the priority measures called for by nuclear disarmament, one of the items on its agenda.

33. The Socialist Republic of Romania, therefore, considers that it is vitally important to redouble our efforts to achieve general disarmament, and first and foremost nuclear disarmament, by effectively implementing practical measures that will lead to that end.

34. As the President of the Council of State of Romania, Mr. Ceausescu, pointed out at the recent national conference of the Romanian Communist Party:

“The achievement of general and complete disarmament, and first of all of nuclear disarmament, today constitutes the first requirement of all the peoples of the world. Therefore it is imperative that we intensify the political activities of all the progressive and anti-imperialist forces. The peoples must make themselves heard with all the necessary force. It is on the way each people participates in the struggle to achieve this primary requirement that the success of this struggle will depend. General disarmament, and particularly nuclear disarmament, must be the fruit of the active participation of all States and all peoples of the world.”

35. It is precisely within this context that the Romanian delegation considers the questions relating to the world disarmament conference. We believe that that conference will be able to make an important contribution to increasing and combining the efforts of all States aimed at disarmament, concentrating the struggle on the most important problems, informing world public opinion on the subject and winning the support of the peoples for disarmament.

36. The documents of the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries held in Georgetown in August 1972, the replies of States to the Secretary-General of the United Nations [*see A/8817*], and the general debate at the present session of the General Assembly have all shown how the States of the world see the question of the convening of a world disarmament conference.

37. The idea of such a conference reflects the need for a solution of the problems of disarmament and the cessation of the manufacture of weapons. States will have to take part in conditions of true equality, regardless of their size, strength or potential, since all peoples without exception are vitally interested in disarmament.

38. The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the world disarmament conference would be the highest democratic forum for debates and negotiations, with the participation of all States, which will scrupulously examine and contribute in an effective way to the adoption of concrete measures for the stemming of the arms race and the achievement of disarmament and above all for the prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons. My country's attitude towards the world disarmament conference flows from this concept of its purpose. Imbued with this conviction, Romania has constantly pronounced itself in favour of the holding of a world disarmament conference and participated in the debate at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly on the conference and in the efforts towards agreement on and unanimous adoption of resolution 2833 (XXVI) on the question. On the basis of the same line of reasoning the Romanian Government informed the Secretary-General of its opinions on the world disarmament conference, its preparation and its convening, and these are contained in document A/8817 of 25 September 1972.

39. The present session of the General Assembly gives us an opportunity to consider thoroughly the considerations advanced by all States on the world disarmament conference and allows us to assess what has been done, to contribute to a better understanding of the positions of other States and to arrive at a rapprochement of views and a widening of the sphere of consensus on the modalities of the preparation and convening of that conference.

40. It is obvious that to ensure the success of the conference it must be carefully prepared. More than anywhere else, in this procedure it is imperative that the political will be expressed to arrive at an agreement, that proof be given of openness regarding ideas, suggestions and proposals from all sides and that solutions be arrived at that will be supported by a general consensus.

41. The Romanian delegation considers that it is imperative that these objectives be well defined so that the world conference may serve its purpose and to ensure that it will be successful. The role of the world conference must not be reduced to that of organizing academic discussions on the problems of disarmament or of tackling them in a general way. On the contrary, the conference must elaborate specific programmes for disarmament, starting from the absolute priority of nuclear disarmament and the need to negotiate a series of measures on the stemming of the arms race and on disarmament itself.

42. The Romanian Government considers that the centre of the efforts for disarmament must be occupied by the cardinal problems, that is, those concerning the cessation of the arms race and disarmament, and first and foremost the question of the prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons. Extremely important to that end is the cessation of the arms race, the freezing of military budgets and the

establishment of a specific programme for a gradual reduction of such budgets and particularly of the military budgets of the highly armed great Powers. Apart from the political effects of such a step, the reduction of military expenditures, the cessation of armament and gradual progress towards general disarmament would allow considerable human and material resources to be liberated and thus used exclusively for peaceful activities.

43. In view of the unchallengeable fact that nuclear weapons constitute the most destructive arms at present in the arsenals of States and that they represent the most terrifying danger threatening mankind, Romania supports with all possible force the granting of priority to nuclear disarmament in the debates and in the negotiations on disarmament.

44. Although the paramountcy of nuclear disarmament has been proclaimed and reaffirmed in a number of documents of the General Assembly and has also been affirmed in an international treaty, the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons does not today occupy its rightful place in the negotiations. This is a situation which, in the eyes of the Romanian delegation, is completely abnormal.

45. No postponement or delay in the negotiations in this connexion, nor the constant avoiding of a thorough examination of the problems of disarmament, can be justified by any considerations, be they political, military or of any other nature; nor can world public opinion accept them. World public opinion calls quite justifiably for the reduction and elimination of the nuclear danger. For those reasons we believe that a concrete programme must be prepared to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons, to create zones of peace and denuclearized areas, to cease the production of armaments, particularly of nuclear weapons, as well as chemical weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction, and then to go on to the gradual liquidation of those weapons under international control.

46. The Romanian delegation wishes to stress once again the importance and the urgency that we attach to the prohibition of nuclear weapons. An important step towards the implementation of such a measure, which flows from the fundamental principle of non-resort to the use or threat of use of force in relations between States, a principle which is to be found in the Charter and is confirmed in important international documents, would be the achievement of a universal agreement, in the form of a joint pledge by States, or of separate declarations, in accordance with which, *inter alia*, the nuclear-weapon States would undertake the obligation not to resort to the use or threat of use of such weapons against any State or in any circumstances. It is surely in the vital interests of the non-nuclear-weapon States to receive firm guarantees of security from the nuclear-weapon States, to be assured that they will never, and in no circumstances, be the victims of the use or threat of use of those weapons.

47. Another category of measures the achievement of which calls for the utmost energy is that of the dismantling of all military bases located on foreign territory and the withdrawal of all troops within their national frontiers.

48. The implementation of such true disarmament measures, and first and foremost the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons, would contribute to strengthening the security of all peoples, reduce tension, increase trust and confidence among States and improve the international climate. That, in turn, would facilitate the adoption of measures which would gradually reduce the numbers of national armed forces and liquidate military blocs. However, all those measures must be complemented by practical steps to put an end to war propaganda and discord among States.

49. The final objective of the efforts leading to disarmament has always been, and still is, general disarmament. The Romanian delegation considers it necessary that we widen and combine the contribution of all States so as to take concrete steps towards general disarmament, a field in which new prospects could be opened up if, first and foremost, measures were adopted prohibiting nuclear weapons and destroying those that already exist. The implementation of concrete measures aimed at putting an end to the arms race and achieving disarmament calls for political will and also a spirit of responsibility towards countries, peoples and mankind as a whole. Furthermore, it requires the assurance of favourable premises so that all members of the international community can contribute on an equal footing to the achievement of disarmament. Experience has shown that today no international problem, particularly a problem of the nature of disarmament, can possibly be solved in a just, lasting and stable way without the participation of all nations concerned and without taking into consideration the interests of all.

50. By its very nature, the world disarmament conference will have to ensure the appropriate premise: namely, that all countries, great, medium-sized and small, whether or not they possess nuclear weapons, whether or not they are Members of the United Nations, will be permitted to participate effectively and on an equal footing in all phases of the preparation of the conference and in its activities.

51. It is obvious that a fundamental condition would be that all action should be undertaken with the consensus of all States, so that they keep the legitimate rights and interests of all peoples in mind and contribute to the strengthening of peace and security.

52. In the light of the immense range of problems regarding disarmament, the urgency of the problems and their importance, the Romanian delegation considers that all efforts towards disarmament must be increased and made more effective.

53. As an organization possessing responsibilities and general competence in the field of disarmament, the United Nations can and must make a much greater contribution to disarmament than it has made thus far. Therefore the General Assembly must concentrate more attention on the most urgent and important problems of disarmament. The United Nations must examine them specifically, reach practical conclusions and make precise recommendations for action in disarmament negotiations. We believe that the General Assembly should make a practice of continuing its examination of the way in which its resolutions and other instruments are implemented.

54. We share the opinion expressed by a number of delegations that it is appropriate that the world disarmament conference be held under the aegis of the United Nations.

55. Effective progress in the field of disarmament depends, in the last analysis, upon the political will of States to co-operate, their readiness to assume obligations and their compliance with them, as well as their acting in accordance with the interests of the peoples. An increasingly important role in disarmament is played by world public opinion, by the peoples themselves, who, because of the enormous force they possess in deciding the course of events, can impose prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, their destruction and, finally, general disarmament.

56. In conclusion the Romanian delegation wishes to stress once again the firm decision of socialist Romania to make its contributions to the achievement of this vital goal, which is crucial for the whole of mankind, since it will safeguard peoples from the dangers of nuclear weapons and ensure disarmament. The Romanian delegation is ready to co-operate actively with other delegations to that end.

57. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translation from Russian*): In discussing any problem in the United Nations, Member States as a rule, and quite rightly, draw conclusions in respect of the progress made in solving it, compare positions and views and, on that basis, take decisions on measures to achieve the results they wish to achieve in fulfilment of their obligations under the Charter and for the implementation of unanimous decisions taken earlier. Such an approach should be made also to consideration of the item on a world disarmament conference.

58. This is not a new question, where everything has to be started from the beginning. In Article 11, paragraph 2, of the Charter we read:

“The General Assembly may discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any Member of the United Nations, or by the Security Council, or by a state . . . and . . . make recommendations with regard to any such questions to the state or states concerned or to the Security Council or to both.”

59. As we all know, much has already been done in this direction. The General Assembly, in accordance with a proposal of the Soviet Union, has taken a stand in favour of achieving general and complete disarmament. The Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the treaties prohibiting the emplacement of nuclear weapons in outer space and on the sea-bed and ocean floor have been concluded and are already in force. A convention was adopted which provides for the complete elimination from the military arsenals of all States of bacteriological, biological and toxin weapons. At the same time, efforts are being made to broaden the number of participants in those agreements. The Soviet Union and the United States have concluded a treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems and also an

interim agreement on certain measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms [see A/C.1/1026]. Negotiations are being conducted to limit armaments both on a bilateral and on a multilateral basis, including discussions within the United Nations.

60. The General Assembly has adopted a Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXV)], which is based on the inadmissibility of the use or threat of force in international relations. In that Declaration, which was approved by all Member States of the United Nations, with the exception of South Africa and Portugal, an appeal is addressed to all States, especially the nuclear States, to make a concerted effort to bring the arms race to an end, to reverse the arms race, to eliminate nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and to conclude an agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The same provisions and appeals are also contained in other documents which were unanimously adopted at the twenty-fifth anniversary session of the General Assembly, in particular, the Declaration on Principles of International Law Governing Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [resolution 2625 (XXV)] and the Declaration on the Occasion of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations [resolution 2627 (XXV)]. In the coming days, the proposal of the Soviet Union on the non-use of force in international relations and for completely prohibiting forever the use of any nuclear weapons<sup>1</sup> will be considered at plenary meetings of the General Assembly.

61. We have all witnessed the struggle being waged by all the peoples of the world in efforts to further reduce international tension and to establish a more healthy international atmosphere.

62. It is only natural that at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly Member States unanimously adopted resolution 2833 (XXVI) on a world disarmament conference. That resolution—and we want to stress this—was supported by all Members, including the two which had earlier either expressed skepticism or proposed that no decision at all should be taken. What was achieved by that unanimously adopted resolution? Very much was achieved. All the States Members of the United Nations recognized that it was the responsibility of the United Nations, under its Charter, to achieve disarmament and strengthen peace. They expressed their conviction that all the peoples of the world were vitally interested in the success of the disarmament negotiations. They felt it was absolutely necessary that all countries—I stress all countries—should continue their efforts to take effective measures to achieve disarmament, and in particular nuclear disarmament.

63. Furthermore, proceeding from the premise that the world disarmament conference could make a contribution to the achievement of those objectives, the General Assembly unanimously expressed the view that it was extremely desirable to take immediate steps in order to allow for careful consideration of the question of convening, after adequate preparation, a world disarmament conference open to all countries.

64. The same resolution provided for obtaining the views of all States in the world on questions related to the convening of the conference and, in particular, in connexion with its main objectives, the items on its agenda, the date when it should be held, its duration, the procedures to be adopted for carrying out its preparatory work, the place where it should be held and also its relationship with the United Nations.

65. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR notes with satisfaction that, after the adoption of that resolution, many States devoted considerable attention to the question of convening a world disarmament conference. The need for convening such a conference is reflected in dozens of statements that have been made after bilateral meetings of leaders and delegations of various countries as well as in the statements of many countries, in documents that were adopted at multilateral meetings at governmental and other levels, in statements made in the general debate at this session of the General Assembly and in the official replies of States which are contained in the report of the Secretary-General in document A/8817.

66. One could quote many statements which favour the convening of a world disarmament conference, but that would take much time. That is why we shall confine ourselves to drawing certain general conclusions and indicating certain individual examples. There has not been a single communique of a bilateral meeting of leaders of States in which the idea of holding such a conference has been rejected. Such a statement cannot be found, not even in the joint communique of the two countries which at this time are not in favour of the idea of convening a world disarmament conference. In the 34 replies which were received by the Secretary-General to his questionnaire under the provisions of resolution 2833 (XXVI), all except one expressed support for the idea of convening the conference. Of 125 speakers who participated in the general debate at this session, only one stated that “it is better not to hold that conference”, while almost 50 representatives spoke out in favour of preparing for and convening the conference. In the First Committee, all representatives who spoke before me, with the exception of two, have supported the conference and have also proposed concrete measures with respect to questions related to its preparation and convening. At the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Georgetown, Guyana, in August 1972, a statement was adopted which states, *inter alia*, that:

“... the participants felt that the convening of a world disarmament conference, after due preparations, which would include all States including all nuclear weapons States, would be a useful step. The basic aim of the world conference would be to exert a positive effort in achieving progress towards general and complete disarmament and primarily towards banning and the elimination of nuclear armaments and other weapons of mass destruction. The non-aligned countries should co-ordinate their action in this regard and take an active part in the consideration of this matter during the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly.”

67. The support of the idea of convening a world disarmament conference was also reflected in many com-

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Annexes, agenda item 25, document A/8793.

munications related to the regional meetings of the representatives of several countries on the eve of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly. The participants at the international meeting of the Committee of Non-Governmental Organizations on disarmament which took place in Geneva in September expressed their support of the idea of convening a world disarmament conference and approved measures to limit the arms race, which should be carried out both within the framework of the United Nations and also by multilateral and bilateral negotiations, as well as—and above all—through the Soviet-American agreement on strategic weaponry. The participants at that Conference addressed to the General Assembly of the United Nations and to the whole of the world community a solemn appeal to make every effort to have the world disarmament conference, which was approved at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, indeed take place as speedily as possible.

68. It is well known to all representatives that the Secretary-General stated *inter alia* in his introduction to the report on the work of the Organization that “A wider discussion of disarmament among all States is also of central concern, and in this respect the General Assembly at its forthcoming session will have the opportunity to consider the convening of a World Disarmament Conference”.<sup>2</sup>

69. As a general conclusion it may be stated that a world disarmament conference is favoured by States with very different social structures, socialist and capitalist Powers, countries with a small military potential and those with a large one, countries which are or are not Members of the United Nations, countries which belong or do not belong to military groupings, countries which are situated in various regions of the world. This is very natural inasmuch as the questions relating to the cessation of the arms race and to disarmament are precisely those in which all the interests of all the peoples are interwoven, and the achievement of an agreement on disarmament and the implementation of general and complete disarmament would be in the interests of all.

70. The positions of the large majority of countries on this question also indicate that disarmament is a problem which is not only ripe for solution but whose solution has become possible; that the time is ripe and the conditions exist for taking a decision on convening a world conference on disarmament and on the immediate beginning of the preparatory work on holding such a conference in the near future; and that in this effort all States should participate on an equal footing.

71. The broad support for the idea of convening a world disarmament conference is a victory for the anti-imperialist forces. We are very proud to see that the efforts of the peoples which voluntarily united 50 years ago in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and their struggle against the imperialist policy of aggressive wars and the arms race have now been joined by such a huge number of other States. We are convinced that no attack against the anti-imperialist Powers can either weaken or undermine them and cannot even become an impediment to the struggle of the peoples against imperialist aggressive and reactionary policies.

72. In this context one should not overlook the position and the arguments of the individual delegations which are not in favour of the idea of convening a world disarmament conference. We share the views of the representatives who stated that they have no weighty or strong arguments. In practice what emerges is the statement that all questions of disarmament can be discussed within the United Nations, or the obviously slanderous attacks and the contrived statement that the conference should not be convened because apparently it has no clear objectives.

73. Setting aside the unworthy efforts of one delegation to divert the attention of the Committee from a business-like discussion of this important question, we shall draw the attention of all delegations to the fact that the convening of a world conference on disarmament does not in any way presuppose substitution for or minimization of the discussions which are conducted through other channels, in the Committee on Disarmament or on a bilateral basis. The convening of such a conference can in no way impede or obstruct the convening of a conference of the five nuclear Powers to discuss matters of nuclear disarmament and the full and complete elimination of this weapon of mass destruction. The convening of the conference would in no way exclude that, but in fact would make more active the co-operation of States to create non-nuclear zones in various parts of the world, liquidate military bases, eliminate from the military arsenals of countries various types of weaponry or adopt measures of disarmament on a regional basis—or in fact solve any other problem related to disarmament.

74. In our view, the taking of a decision of principle to convene a disarmament conference would aid the efforts of States to find solutions to the problems of disarmament which have not yet been resolved and would also facilitate the conclusion of further agreements.

75. We should like to recall that all the earlier conferences on disarmament which were convened by the United Nations dealt with problems of a kind which, after the completion of such conference, were then considered further by other organs of the United Nations. In all the earlier cases, whenever a conference was to be convened it was never said that one thing would prevent or impede the other. Furthermore, it is well known to all of us that as soon as a decision is taken to convene any conference all States begin to prepare themselves very carefully for the consideration of the problem which will be discussed by that conference. They weigh the realistic possibilities of achieving agreement on all the problems as a whole or on partial measures and this usually yields positive results. We are firmly convinced that the States will act in the same manner when they prepare for the convening of a world disarmament conference, and all this will facilitate the determination of very clear and definite objectives for that conference, for the formulation of which it is proposed to set up a preparatory committee in which all the nuclear Powers would participate, all the participants in the Committee on Disarmament, which have accumulated considerable experience in negotiations on disarmament, and a small number of other States, in accordance with the principle of a balanced political and equitable geographical distribution.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Twenty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 1A.



76. From what was said it is clear that this position is shared by the overwhelming majority of countries and it is obvious that the opposition to the conference is artificial and has no basis. If these objections conceal other purposes, purposes which their authors do not wish to disclose, then the General Assembly is entitled to warn very seriously the opponents of the convening of such a conference and to tell them that they are assuming a heavy responsibility in undermining the efforts of all countries, including the peoples of their own countries, in a matter related to strengthening international peace and security.

77. The Byelorussian SSR has sent its reply to the questionnaire on the convening of a conference and this reply is published in full in document A/8817. We shall therefore not explain it in detail now but shall only stress that this conference, with the participation of all countries, could deal with the problems of disarmament as a whole, both as regards weapons of mass destruction and all conventional weapons and armed forces, and would consider as its main objective general and complete disarmament although it would also work on partial measures of disarmament. We also hope that in the preparatory committee our comments will be duly taken into account regarding the duration of the conference, its timing, its venue, the periodicity of convening other conferences in the future.

78. In concluding my statement I wish to stress again that in taking a decision on the question of convening a world disarmament conference it is necessary to take as a basis the decisions already adopted by the General Assembly in this regard, the replies of Member States to the questionnaire, the positions which have been expressed in the United Nations. As was pointed out by the representative of Mexico [*1872nd meeting*], 93 countries favour the convening of a conference.

79. If we consider the results of the discussion in the First Committee we see that this number is increasing every day. If this information is properly assessed the General Assembly can reach only one conclusion, namely, that it is necessary to take a decision on the convening of a world disarmament conference with the participation of all States and the setting up of a preparatory committee, so as to ensure fruitful work by that Committee and make possible the earliest possible convening of the conference in the interests of the peace and security of all countries.

80. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR, on the basis of the position it has always taken in the matter of strengthening peace and achieving disarmament, is in favour of a decision on the question of convening this conference which would be consistent with the view of the overwhelming majority of States, and we appeal to all states to make every effort to arrive at that decision.

81. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand): I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.611, which is sponsored by Australia, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Peru, Philippines, Thailand and New Zealand. In taking this step I am conscious that the 13 sponsors of this draft have agreed to table it as an expression of their opposition to all nuclear weapons testing and the conduct of such tests in the Pacific area in particular.

82. During their preparation of this draft resolution the sponsors were influenced by two undeniable facts. First, that nine years after the General Assembly endorsed the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water, two States still conduct nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere. Secondly, that although the same treaty bound its parties to conclude an agreement on the banning of all nuclear tests, no such agreement has been reached, while at the same time the rate at which nuclear weapons are tested underground has significantly increased.

83. Draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 deals with both of these problems in separate sections. However, I should emphasize at this point that the problems of atmospheric testing and underground testing cannot be dealt with in isolation because they are inextricably linked with each other and with the more general problems of nuclear arms control and general and complete disarmament. In the draft resolution which we have tabled we have attempted to strike a balance between the problem of atmospheric testing and the problem of underground testing which sets out the objectives for a unified approach towards further agreements in these fields.

84. In part I of our draft resolution we have referred to the numerous statements of concern by Governments in and around the Pacific area expressing strong opposition to the atmospheric nuclear tests being held in that area. I shall refer briefly to some of the more recent of those statements.

85. On 20 June 1972, the Prime Ministers of Australia and New Zealand wrote to the Co-Chairmen of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament expressing their joint protest that a further series of atmospheric tests was imminent in the South Pacific. The text of that letter is given in document A/8741, which is before this Committee.

86. On 21 June 1972 the Foreign Ministers of Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru noted that nuclear tests were going to be carried out by the French Government at Mururoa atoll. They condemned such tests, and they noted that decisions of the General Assembly and the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment placed upon them the responsibility for demanding the immediate suspension of those tests. The full text of that declaration is before the Committee in document A/8740.

87. On 14 July 1972 a ministerial meeting of the Association of South-East Asian Nations issued a communiqué containing the following passage:

“The meeting deplored nuclear tests anywhere in the world. Such tests pose unknown hazards to human life, disturb ecology and pollute the environment, and are in defiance of the Declaration adopted by the Stockholm Conference on Human Environment.

Moreover, they are contrary to the letter and spirit of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water, which has received almost universal support”.

88. On 14 September 1972, representatives of the Governments of Australia, Fiji, Nauru, New Zealand, Tonga,

Western Samoa, and the Cook Islands issued a communiqué at the conclusion of the third meeting of the South Pacific Forum. The communiqué stated, *inter alia*, that:

“Members were unanimous in expressing their deep concern that the French Government should have failed so signally to accord recognition to the wishes of the peoples of the South Pacific Area despite the views so clearly indicated by both Governments and peoples. The fact that radio-active fall-out from this year’s series was low because of the nature of the test explosions carried out did not lessen their opposition, which would remain unaltered until such time as a firm assurance was given that the South Pacific would not be used as a site for further experimentation of this kind with its resulting implications for man and his environment, and in particular for the marine environment”.

89. I might also add that the members of the South Pacific Forum include the States nearest to and most directly affected by the nuclear explosions carried out in the South Pacific. Not all of them are Members of the United Nations, but I can confidently state that the draft resolution I am introducing today has the support of their Governments and peoples.

90. I have restricted myself to those statements issued by Pacific region Governments acting together. To these must be added the numerous unilateral statements, declarations and protests made about nuclear tests by Governments in the Pacific region and elsewhere. Furthermore, we must include the initiatives taken by United Nations bodies, including the large number of resolutions on disarmament recommended by this Committee, the resolution on nuclear testing passed by the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment and the consideration of the environmental effects of nuclear testing undertaken by Sub-Committee III of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction.

91. I would also like to draw this Committee’s attention to chapters XVI and XVII of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples<sup>3</sup> concerning Niue and the Tokelau Islands, and the Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Pitcairn and the Solomon Islands. In both those chapters specific reference is made to the conduct of nuclear tests in the Pacific region. Chapter XVI expresses the fears of the people of Niue which stem directly from the conduct of these tests, while chapter XVII contains a recommendation that the Government concerned should desist forthwith from carrying out more nuclear tests.

92. It is sufficient to note that, in direct opposition to the statements and opinions I have listed, two States carried out nuclear tests in the atmosphere during the past year. Furthermore we are given every reason to believe that these recent tests are not the last ones which will be carried out. Neither Government involved has stated that it will abide by past General Assembly resolutions on nuclear testing.

93. Similarly, nuclear weapons tests conducted underground, in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater

still continue in spite of General Assembly resolutions calling upon States to cease such tests and conclude a treaty banning all nuclear tests. All nuclear weapons tests have one objective: they are carried out in order to make more efficient, more destructive, more deadly nuclear weapons, that is, weapons which represent more of a threat to mankind. All States in all regions are subject to this threat.

94. There can be no doubt that the peoples of the States in and around the Pacific want all nuclear weapon tests to be stopped. The nuclear tests carried out in their vicinity led to consultations among a number of Pacific States, most of which are now sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611. Nevertheless, the draft they have devised is universal in its application. It calls for an end to all atmospheric tests and all underground tests. It calls for universal adherence to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water, and it calls for the rapid conclusion of a treaty banning all nuclear tests which it declares would be an important element in the consolidation of the progress towards disarmament and arms control made thus far and would greatly facilitate future progress in these fields. Few States will disagree with these objectives and we hope that every member of this Committee will support the draft resolution.

95. My delegation is also pleased to note the 15-Power draft resolution on nuclear testing contained in document A/C.1/L.615. Unlike the draft I am introducing, it contains a detailed, step-by-step programme which its sponsors feel will facilitate the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. My delegation feels that this programme should be carefully considered by this Committee and for this reason we commend and will support this draft.

96. The 13 delegations which have tabled the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.611 were motivated initially by the need to have discussed in this Committee a specific aspect of the nuclear testing problem which particularly affects them. But any nuclear weapon testing has implications for the future and security of mankind, implications which apply no matter where the tests are carried out. We are dealing with a universal problem. On behalf of the sponsors of this draft resolution, I express the hope that this Committee will give its overwhelming support to our initiative.

97. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): I propose to speak today only on item 32 of the agenda, dealing with nuclear testing, and reserve my right to comment on other aspects of arms control and disarmament at a later date.

98. My immediate purpose is to remind the Committee that Australia is a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611, which the representative of New Zealand has just introduced. It is significant, I believe, that we are in the company of 12 other sponsors from both sides of the Pacific Ocean.

99. The draft resolution invites the General Assembly of the United Nations to declare itself in favour of two main objectives: first, a halt to all atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons in the Pacific region or anywhere else in the world, and universal support for the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Supplement No. 23.

Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water, and secondly, the suspension of all nuclear weapons tests in all environments, and the negotiation of a treaty banning all such tests.

100. As a party to the partial test-ban Treaty and as a country which for many years has argued in favour of the universal application of that Treaty, Australia has long been opposed to the conduct of atmospheric nuclear weapons tests in the Pacific region. Each year, along with other States of the region, we have protested against the conduct of such tests and have supported and sponsored resolutions in the General Assembly seeking their termination.

101. Each year, as well, we have followed with the closest attention and sympathy the efforts of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to negotiate a treaty that would prohibit all nuclear weapons tests. As our voting record in the General Assembly indicates, we have given our full support to those efforts.

102. My delegation regards it as a matter for regret that all of these protests, all of these expressions of opinion on the part of the General Assembly and all of the work of the Disarmament Committee have so far not been successful. Testing in the atmosphere has continued and, as is evident from the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [A/8818] which is now before us, there is apparently little immediate prospect of agreement on a comprehensive test ban that would have the support of all the nuclear weapon Powers.

103. This year, once again, a series of atmospheric nuclear weapon tests has been conducted in the south Pacific region, an area of the world far removed from the metropolitan territory of the Power concerned—with which Power, I may say, Australia enjoys close and co-operative relations in many fields. Those tests have been conducted in disregard of the opinions of the peoples of that region, in disregard of what can be regarded as a consensus or at least a near-consensus of world opinion—and certainly in disregard of world opinion as expressed in the partial test-ban Treaty. That Treaty is particularly relevant to our discussions on nuclear testing and it is regrettable indeed that some States are not parties to it. The Australian Government now, as in the past, earnestly calls upon all countries to accede to it, because it undoubtedly reflects the wishes of the great majority of mankind.

104. The conduct of nuclear weapon testing in the atmosphere in the Pacific area is an affront to the peoples who inhabit that part of the world. If anyone doubts that these tests are being held in disregard of the genuine concern of those peoples and their Governments, let me refer him to the various expressions of concern, emanating from the Pacific region, that have accompanied the tests in 1972.

105. The representative of New Zealand has already spoken about a number of these protests. He has referred to the joint letter of 20 June from the Prime Ministers of Australia and New Zealand to the Co-Chairmen of the Conference of the Committee of Disarmament, which was subsequently sent to the Secretary-General of the United Nations; the declaration of 21 June by the Foreign

Ministers of Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru, which was also sent to the Secretary-General; the declaration of 14 July by the members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations; and the joint statement of 14 September by the nations of the South Pacific Forum.

106. In addition, I would refer the Committee to three other statements that are relevant to the aims of this draft resolution: on 14 June the Prime Ministers of Western Samoa, Tonga and Fiji, the Premier of the Cook Islands and representatives of the Niue and Gilbert and Ellice Islands Governments described the tests as a real threat not only to the peoples of the South Pacific but also to their environment; on 29 June the Foreign Ministers of Australia and New Zealand issued a statement deploring and condemning the resumption of testing; also on 29 June the ANZUS Treaty Council called for universal adherence to the partial test-ban Treaty.

107. These regional expressions of concern and alarm are of course additional to action taken on a broader front this year both at the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment and at the Geneva session of the sea-bed Committee.

108. As I have said, if anyone doubts that the peoples of the Pacific are unanimously opposed to these tests let him study those expressions of concern; let him also study the draft resolution that is now before the Committee in document A/C.1/L.611, which reflects the views of the peoples of the region.

109. As far as my own country, Australia, is concerned, I must report that popular feeling against these tests has reached a high and sustained level this year. Australians from many walks of life have joined in protesting against this threat to the environment of the region in which they live. Their concern is not simply because of the possible effects upon themselves and their own country; it arises also from fears about the possible effects on the environment of the whole region, of which Australia is a part. These protests have been widespread and in many cases have come from sections of the community quite unaccustomed to participation in political demonstrations.

110. The States that conduct atmospheric nuclear weapons tests no doubt believe that they derive benefits from those tests. Surely it is reasonable to ask in this Committee whether the tests confer any benefits on the peoples of the region or regions in which they are conducted. We can conclude from the expressions of concern I have reported that, in the view of the peoples and the Governments in the Pacific region, the atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons confers on them no discernible benefits, environmental or otherwise. Indeed it would appear to be their unanimous view that the contrary is the case and they ask, therefore, that the tests be stopped.

111. In case my delegation's preoccupation with atmospheric testing and with the Pacific region might be misunderstood, I hasten to draw attention to part II of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611, which calls for a suspension of all nuclear weapon tests in all environments and seeks to point the way towards the negotiation of a treaty banning all nuclear weapon tests. Agreement on such a treaty has

long been our objective and remains our objective. We would not want this to be obscured by our disquiet, important though this is to us, about what is happening in one particular part of the world.

112. As recently as 27 September, speaking here in the general debate, the Foreign Minister of Australia said:

“Australia would particularly like to see the negotiation of a comprehensive treaty, with effective provisions for verification and control, to prohibit the conduct of nuclear weapons testing in all environments by all States. The first step towards that objective should be, in our view, the universal acceptance and application of the existing treaty banning nuclear weapons testing in the atmosphere. But we still do not have universal acceptance of this treaty, and there is still no halt to nuclear weapons testing in the atmosphere.” [2042nd plenary meeting, para. 132.]

113. In this respect we note with interest and approval the initiative taken by the 15 sponsors of the separate and independent, but at the same time complementary, draft resolution A/C.1/L.615, which seeks, although by a slightly different path from the draft resolution of which we are a sponsor, the same objective which we seek—that is, a comprehensive nuclear weapons test ban which would have universal adherence—and we commend this initiative.

114. I have pleasure in commending draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 to the attention of the Committee, and in so doing I reiterate the appeal it contains to all nuclear weapon States to suspend nuclear weapon testing in all environments, and to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to get down to work seriously and let us have the text of a treaty banning all nuclear weapon tests. If this draft resolution can contribute to that objective it will have served, we believe, a most useful purpose.

*The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.*