



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/C.1/PV.2104
3 December 1975

ENGLISH

Thirtieth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED AND FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 3 December 1975, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. MIKANAGU (Burundi)
Rapporteur: Mr. ARTEAGA-ACOSTA (Venezuela)

- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3254 (XXIX): report of the Secretary-General /34/ (continued)
- Napalm and other incendiary weapons and all aspects of their possible use: reports of the Secretary-General /35/ (continued)
- Urgent need for cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /37/ (continued)
- World Disarmament Conference: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference /40/ (continued)
- General and complete disarmament /41/ (continued)
 - (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament
 - (b) Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency /...

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be distributed as soon as possible.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent in quadruplicate within three working days to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, Room LX-2332, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 4 DECEMBER 1975, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 9 DECEMBER 1975.

The co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

- Mid-term review of the Disarmament Decade: report of the Secretary-General /42/ (continued)
- Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa /43/ (continued)
- Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /44/ (continued)
- Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General /46/ (continued)
- Prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other hostile purposes, which are incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /47/ (continued)
- Declaration and establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia: report of the Secretary-General /48/ (continued)
- Conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests /122/ (continued)
- Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons /126/ (continued)
- Organization of work

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 34, 35, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 122 and 126 (continued)

Mr. KOOLIJMANS (Netherlands): My delegation would like to address itself again to the question of peaceful nuclear explosions. Last Monday, the Netherlands delegation presented the view of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.721 on the amendments proposed by Mexico, Nigeria and Peru in document A/C.1/L.729. In that statement the strong hope was expressed that consultations could be held with the co-sponsors of the proposed amendments with a view to reaching agreement.

I am happy to inform the Committee that useful discussions took place between some of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution and those of the proposed amendments. Some points could be fairly easily solved as a result of our discussions. On others we got a clearer understanding of the different points of view.

Subsequently, the co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.721 carefully considered the different issues and agreed to a revised version of the draft resolution, which is now before us in document A/C.1/L.721/Rev.1. Great flexibility was shown by the delegations concerned, and it is our sincere hope that the revised draft finds wide support now in the Committee.

Allow me to go over the different changes in the draft resolution. First of all, I may remind the Committee that the co-sponsors had already accepted proposed amendments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, which are now incorporated in the revised draft.

(Mr. Kooijmans, Netherlands)

In the first preambular paragraph we have introduced a reference to resolution 3386 (XXX) of 12 November 1975, a resolution on the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency which was unanimously adopted by the General Assembly. In the fourth preambular paragraph, which was the third preambular paragraph in the original draft resolution, we have made the second part of the paragraph more consistent with the first part in an effort to meet the reasons for the second proposed amendment.

The sixth preambular paragraph is somewhat redrafted to take into account the reason for the third proposed amendment and the view expressed by the representative of Mexico last Friday -- that is, to express the desire for the fullest possible exchange of nuclear technology and nuclear materials for the economic and social benefit of mankind.

The ninth preambular paragraph is the sixth Mexican amendment, which we have now accepted also.

Operative paragraph 2 of the old text was replaced by operative paragraphs 3 and 4 in the revised version. By this reformulation we have, as accurately as possible, reflected the actual situation with respect to the results of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

As you may remember, the co-sponsors had considerable difficulties with the twelfth and thirteenth proposed amendments because we thought they did not reflect the actual state of affairs. We thought, and still think, that the United States and the Soviet Union provided considerable information to the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons on the steps that were taken to implement article V of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. However, we must admit that the information that they provided showed that, until the NPT Review Conference, no consultations had yet taken place for the conclusion of the special basic international agreement on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes as envisaged in article V of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

(Mr. Kooijmans, Netherlands)

In operative paragraph 5 we have noted this fact. Several reasons can be given why no progress was made in this field earlier, including a lack of interest by both nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States.

In operative paragraph 6 we asked the United States and the Soviet Union to provide information on present and future consultations in this field to the next session of the General Assembly. We thereby recognize a somewhat special responsibility on the part of those two countries, since they are the only ones which have conducted peaceful nuclear explosion experiments.

In operative paragraph 7 the International Atomic Energy Agency is asked to continue its work on the different aspects of the peaceful application of nuclear explosions, including that in the Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Peaceful Nuclear explosions, whose mandate is provided in the IAEA Board of Governors resolution of 11 June 1975. Operative paragraphs 8 and 9 are the old operative paragraphs 4 and 5.

As is clear from the revised draft resolution, all proposed amendments in document A/C.1/L.729 have, in some way or another, been taken into account. A majority of the amendments have been taken over by the co-sponsors. On others we have tried to find compromise language that would adequately reflect the different views of the delegations concerned. The co-sponsors hope that the revised draft resolution will find the widest possible support in the Committee so as to give clear guidelines in the important field of the peaceful application of nuclear explosions.

Mr. KEVIN (Australia): My statement today will be very brief. I would like to make two short announcements on behalf of the group of co-sponsors concerning draft resolution A/C.1/L.738, that is to say, the resolution concerning the urgent need for the cessation of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests.

The representative of Yugoslavia in the debate yesterday indicated that he would have preferred to see in the operative paragraphs of resolution A/C.1/L.738 on the subject of the comprehensive test ban some reference to the effect that this work should have the highest priority. He pointed out yesterday that this would be in accordance with previous years' resolution on this subject adopted by the Assembly, most recently resolution 3257 (XXIX), of last year.

The co-sponsors are in agreement with this very useful suggestion by the representative of Yugoslavia, and as a result I should like to announce a small oral amendment to operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.738. We should like to replace the words "intensify its efforts to achieve" with the words "give the highest priority to the conclusion of". The whole paragraph would therefore read:

"Urges the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to give the highest priority to the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban agreement and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session on the progress achieved;"

The co-sponsors consider that this minor presentational change does not materially affect the substance of the draft resolution. Consequently we see no need for an amendment document to be issued, unless some other delegation should insist upon it, in which case we would of course agree.

My second announcement is that a number of delegations have requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 1 of document A/C.1/L.738, that is to say, the paragraph which "Condemns all nuclear-weapon tests, in whatever environment they may be conducted". The co-sponsors of the draft resolution make no apology for their present language, which is entirely consistent with that of previous resolutions on this subject which have been adopted by large majorities in the Assembly. At the same time, the co-sponsors are also aware

(Mr. Kevin, Australia)

that a number of delegations which are otherwise rather favourably disposed to the draft resolution as a whole have some difficulty with the choice of words in this paragraph. The co-sponsors are therefore willing to accept a separate vote on this paragraph in addition to the separate votes on the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 5 to which I referred in my statement on 1 December.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Liberia, who will introduce amendments to draft resolutions A/C.1/L.711 and A/C.1/L.731.

I wish to point out that there was an error that crept into the amendments to document A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1. The number of the document containing them is A/C.1/L.747.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): The delegation of Liberia has the honour of presenting several amendments to the two draft resolutions, namely that on the mid-term review, document A/C.1/L.731, and that on new weapons, document A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1. I wish to make it clear that they are being presented with a view to strengthening these documents, and not in an attempt to change them, at a time when, at this stage of the United Nations, we are all concerned with trying to firm up the whole United Nations approach towards the entire disarmament problem.

On the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.731, in the fourth preambular paragraph, we propose the addition, at the end, of the words "and that all peoples of the world have a vital stake in disarmament results,". The aim here is obvious: to underline that the armaments game is, and should no longer be, the exclusive concern of States and Governments, but of their "peoples" who pay for these extravagances and die in the wars in which the arms are used. Incidentally, they are the primary entities in the first three words of the Charter, "We, the peoples", and they surely have a right to be included in a resolution of this kind.

The amendment affecting the seventh preambular paragraph in document A/C.1/L.731 would eliminate the words "among the primary objectives" and substitute for them "a primary objective".

Related to this is an amendment to operative paragraph 1, which would replace the word "central" with the word "primary", so as to bring operative paragraph 1 into harmony with the new seventh preambular paragraph.

In operative paragraph 2, after the word "development", add "are linked in". The word "foster" then becomes "fostering". The aim here is to strengthen the "link" concept, which in any case brings it into harmony with the same thought in paragraph 4, and which is perhaps a clearer version of the intent of that paragraph.

In operative paragraph 6, we delete the words "as necessary" because, in the opinion of the Liberian delegation, they are quite unnecessary and weaken the intent of the draft.

I now turn to the draft resolution on new weapons of mass destruction, document A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1, to which we offer one amendment to operative paragraph 3, requesting the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to work out an agreement and report to the Assembly at the thirty-first session. We add to that the following words:

"Pending this report, governments shall call on their relevant

scientists to suspend their work on these new weapons of mass destruction."

That comes after the present operative paragraph 3.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

This addition goes to the very heart of our dilemma in our having failed singularly to achieve substantial results in disarmament through our many years of effort. Year after year we have generously given the negotiating Powers ample time to negotiate a final accord, only to have them return and ask for more time which we abundantly give them. In that time the scientists work furiously to produce a new generation of weapons. At the moment, we have systems which, like the Frankenstein monsters, are taking over the mastery of our fate. The new nuclear missile systems are, of course, a glaring example.

Perhaps now we are dealing with even more hellish weapons than the missiles, and again we are about to adopt a resolution -- again with supreme generosity -- permitting the military technologists to work in their Mephisto laboratories, pushing their drawing-boards to a new crop of weapons which, when they are produced, will destroy the hopes of all men from ever achieving any safety for the human race.

The Liberian delegation's amendment simply says "do not do it", "do not give the time", because we are now, in the United Nations, in a race far more crucial than the armaments race -- a race against time itself. Our amendment harms no one. These new weapons are not needed for national security, though all weapons are simply ensuring the national security of those super-Powers which we all know are already over secured. We do not ask that they give up playing with these matches if that is the game they want to play. We only ask that they suspend their destructive work, pending a hopeful accord that they may never be approved at all. In so doing, they will have the additional advantage of saving time and money and give an incentive for the negotiations to proceed at a faster pace. We hope, therefore, that our amendments -- which are clear and which we think add something to these resolutions -- will be acceptable.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

Before closing, I wish to make one more brief observation. I refer to the revised text introduced by the representative of the Soviet Union with regard to the prohibition of nuclear tests. Here again we have an example of sending our efforts back to the shop, but we are interested to note that the CCD is being asked, in the revised version, to resume work with the assistance of qualified governmental experts. In our statement on 13 November in the general debate, we introduced this concept of a review of the disarmament issue with the aid of experts. We are not sure that, given the chance, we would have limited any effort to experts of government choice. However, we are grateful that the concept of bringing experts to the field of disarmament is taking root. And while we do not wish to take full credit, we are certainly happy that our introduction of this general concept, in our statement of 13 November, has been referred to -- not directly, but indirectly -- by the representative of Sweden and by other representatives who have spoken during this debate.

With regard to the amendment which we introduced, unfortunately there were two errors to which I would like to call attention. I am referring to the amendments to document A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1 which should read: "pending this task", instead of "they", it should be "it should call on". Instead of "their", it should be "its relevant scientists to suspend their work". Will you, then, substitute "it" for "them" and "its" for "their". I would like those errors to be corrected on the copies you have before you.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I call on the representative of Mexico to introduce the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.744.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): In the four resolutions adopted since 1971 on the item entitled "World Disarmament Conference", the General Assembly has emphatically reiterated its conviction that "all peoples of the world have a vital interest in the success of disarmament negotiations and that all States should be in a position to contribute to the adoption of measures for the achievement of this goal".

The motives underlying this conviction are axiomatic if we think that the nuclear weapons which have already been stockpiled are more than enough to destroy most of the planet and ultimately to render it uninhabitable.

Suffice it to recall in that connexion that the arsenals of the two nuclear super-Powers alone are estimated to be equivalent today to one million bombs of the type which in 1945 caused the death of more than 100 thousand people in Hiroshima. This means -- and surely this is what should be understood by overkill or lethal super-saturation -- that those arsenals would be sufficient to annihilate 100 billion human beings, approximately 25 times the present number of inhabitants of the earth.

The chilling situation which those arsenals have created for the world is probably what prompted the Secretary of State of the United States and the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union last year to make statements in the general debate such as those which are contained in operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of resolution 3261 C (XXIX) of 9 December 1974 in which the General Assembly took note, first, that the Secretary of State of the United States of America, in his statement before the General Assembly on 23 September 1974 expressed, inter alia, the following:

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

"The world has dealt with nuclear weapons as if restraint were automatic. Their very awesomeness has chained those weapons for almost three decades; their sophistication and expense have helped to keep constant for a decade the number of States which possess them. Now, as was quite foreseeable, political inhibitions are in danger of crumbling. Nuclear catastrophe looms more plausible, whether through design or miscalculation; accident, theft or blackmail."

(A/PV.2238, p. 26)

The Foreign Minister of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in his statement to the General Assembly on 24 September, said, inter alia,:

"Stable and lasting peace is incompatible with the arms race. They are antipodes. One cannot seriously think of eliminating the threat of war, while at the same time increasing military budgets and endlessly building up armaments..."

"The supreme interests not only of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States, but also of the peoples of the whole world, require that the Soviet Union and the United States, possessing the colossal might of nuclear weapons, should make every effort to achieve appropriate understandings and agreements." (A/PV.2240, p. 63-65 and p. 71)

In the light of those statements it seems doubly deplorable and difficult to explain that the bilateral negotiations towards the limitation of strategic systems of nuclear weapons known as the SALT negotiations are still progressing -- if it is still possible to use the term progress -- with the slowness of a glacier, as someone said, whereas the arms race, both qualitative and quantitative, continues at high speed.

It is because of this alarming situation that the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Nigeria, Peru, Sweden, Yugoslavia and Mexico have requested the reproduction and circulation of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.744, which I am now formally introducing and about the content of which I shall now add some brief comments.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

In the preamble, the resolution which the General Assembly adopted on the initiation of the SALT negotiations six years ago is recalled and the four most recent resolutions on this question are reaffirmed; there is a brief reference to the forecasts made by the two nuclear super-Powers in 1973 and 1974, forecasts which regrettably have not been borne out by events; and it concludes with a paragraph in which the Assembly states that it shares fully the opinion expressed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations that "disarmament negotiations move very slowly in comparison to the obvious perils posed by the enormous arsenals of nuclear weapons".

The first three operative paragraphs, which are obviously the basic ones, have as their purpose, respectively:

To deplore "the absence of positive results during the last two years" of the bilateral SALT negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on the limitation of their strategic nuclear weapons systems;

To express the Assembly's concern "for the very high ceilings of nuclear arms set for themselves by both States, for the total absence of qualitative limitations of such arms, for the protracted time-table contemplated for the negotiation of further limitations and possible reductions of the nuclear arsenals, and for the situation thus created"; and

To urge anew the United States and the Soviet Union, reiterating the exhortation addressed to them last year in resolution 3261 C (XXIX) of 9 December 1974, "to broaden the scope and accelerate the pace of their strategic nuclear arms limitation talks" and stress once again "the necessity and urgency of reaching agreement on important qualitative limitations and substantial reductions of their strategic nuclear-weapon systems as a positive step towards nuclear disarmament".

The "very high ceilings" referred to in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution are those agreed upon in the joint declaration at Vladivostok and which, as can be noted in document A/C.1/1070, circulated at the request of the Mexican delegation, amount for each of the two super-Powers to a total of 2,400 offensive nuclear vehicles, in which category are included intercontinental ballistic missiles, ballistic missiles on submarines and heavy bombers; moreover it must be borne in mind that of that total of 2,400 units, 1,320 can carry multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

These circumstances have prompted the experts in this field to conclude that, on the one hand, the quantitative limitations set for offensive nuclear missiles are considerably greater than those actually in existence, and that it is not envisaged that the Treaty proposed in Vladivostok will include any qualitative limitations whatever on the development of new nuclear weapons and delivery systems; and, on the other hand, if the provisions of the Treaty in preparation were to be strictly in line with the principles agreed on in November 1974 in Vladivostok, their application would in fact mean very substantial increases in the military budgets of the two super-Powers, and the increase, to a terrifying degree, of the destructive capacity of their arsenals, a capacity which even at its present level has rightly been described as far exceeding the bounds of imagination.

With regard to the fourth and last paragraph of the draft resolution, its purpose is to reiterate the invitation previously addressed to the aforementioned two Governments to keep the General Assembly informed in good time of the progress and results of their negotiations. The fact that the only result obtained to date from the invitation to that effect which extended to them last December was the transmittal, a year after it was made public, of the text of the Joint Declaration of Vladivostok, contained in document A/C.1/1069 of 25 November 1975, and we consider that fact more than sufficient proof that the final paragraph of our draft is justified.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to express the hope, on behalf of the sponsors, that if the draft resolution we have put forward cannot be unanimously adopted, it should at least be adopted by consensus, since we are convinced that the considerations and exhortations it contains faithfully reflect the feelings of all peoples of the earth, of those peoples which, as I said at the beginning, have been repeatedly declared by the General Assembly as having a vital interest in the outcome of the disarmament negotiations.

Mr. JOB (Yugoslavia): The basic position of my delegation on the world disarmament conference was briefly outlined in our statement in the general debate in plenary as well as in our main statement on disarmament issues in this Committee. That we choose to address ourselves now more specifically to the world disarmament conference issues and related questions is an earnest of our constant active interest in the matter, and in anything that might serve to accomplish a breakthrough in the international community's collective dealing with disarmament in the framework of the United Nations.

Many speakers during this session of the General Assembly, among them some most distinguished statesmen, Heads of State or Government, have convincingly described that most disturbing and most directly dangerous unremitting worsening of the world's armaments situation, the spreading and speeding up of the vertical and horizontal arms race -- especially the nuclear arms race, which now more than ever, with redoubled urgency, calls for full mobilization of the international community, of the collective membership of the United Nations, in resolute measures to take the initiative for concrete action, with a world disarmament conference playing a central role.

It is most disturbing, and I hope it is a sobering thought, too, that the first call for a world disarmament conference was issued by the Belgrade summit conference of non-aligned States as early as 1961, and that that call was motivated even then by the gravest concern over the then state or drift of affairs. How much worse off are we today. We approach the annual figure of \$300 billion spent on armaments. The analysis has been made that the crushing burden of armaments made necessary for all by the super-armaments race of a few, combined with interference and the use or threat of use of force represents, either objectively or by design, a special form of pressure on and against the non-aligned and developing world. It was also authoritatively stated that the huge armaments-producing establishments in themselves represent a reactionary, conservative political force, with a vested interest in maintaining tensions, depicting the other competing sides in the worst possible light, in order to justify absurd expenditures and the continuation of policies and the defence of interests that are not only irrational in a world of interdependence, but constantly keep the world at the brink of possible catastrophe.

(Mr. Job, Yugoslavia)

The NPT Review Conference has amply reflected all these and other disturbing aspects of the situation.

Yet in all these years we have not been able to bring the world disarmament conference much closer to reality, and the work of the Ad Hoc Committee, while in itself to a modest extent constituting a useful effort and exercise, has not been making much progress.

This year we have had such an unreasonable situation that despite, for example, the clear call of the non-aligned summit at Algiers in September 1973 for a world disarmament conference "as soon as possible", and the Lima Non-Aligned Conference's support for the holding of a world disarmament conference "with as little delay as possible", it was not possible to have the Ad Hoc Committee's report state simply, among other observations and conclusions, that a large majority of States -- and just in those non-aligned conferences there were about 80 -- felt that the need for a world disarmament conference was urgent.

It will also be recalled that my delegation was against putting the Ad Hoc Committee on a permanent basis, precisely in order not to create the impression that the Committee's work, and the necessity of having a world disarmament conference, could be relegated to a never-never land.

The Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Lima in August this year, had this to say on the matter:

"The Ministers for Foreign Affairs agree to co-ordinate the action of the Non-Aligned Countries within the framework of the United Nations in order to promote the holding of a World Conference on Disarmament, with as little delay as possible, with the participation of all States on an equal basis and during which universal disarmament guidelines, in particular with respect to nuclear disarmament, would be approved, together with the utilization of resources thus freed for international economic co-operation". (A/10217, para. 113, p. 29)

(Mr. Job, Yugoslavia)

We would like to underline once more, as we have repeatedly done in the Ad Hoc Committee, that a world disarmament conference to which all countries must be invited could not possibly lend itself to being an instrument or a platform of only some, but would serve the true collective interests of the international community of the United Nations as a whole, enabling anyone to bring attention to his particular contribution, his views, his analysis of what must be done, under what conditions, what obstacles must be removed, what measures undertaken, and so forth.

Now, in the specific situation before us on the matter, my delegation will as heretofore, in the context of consensus that remains a modus operandi, support a decision that ensures the continuity of the item and the effort, the renewal, the extension of the Ad Hoc Committee's mandate, with appropriate tasks, both realistic and advancing us towards our avowed goal to which we, together with other non-aligned countries, remain committed.

Both the Belgrade Conference in 1961 and the Lima Conference this year mentioned also the possibility of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament issues. My delegation has already stated its views on that and may have further views to express.

Mr. BAYANDOR (Iran): I have a very short announcement to make on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.741.

In the course of the consultations that have taken place following the circulation of this document, a number of delegations have approached the co-sponsors and have requested that one word in operative paragraph 3 (b), namely, the word "transit", be deleted from the text in order to enable them to support the resolution.

The co-sponsors have given careful consideration to the suggested amendment and, in order to maximize support for the draft resolution, have consented to the deletion of this word, namely, the word "transit", in operative paragraph 3 (b). After consultation with the Secretariat, a revised version of this text, or a corrigendum, will be issued shortly.

Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden): I should like to address myself to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.726. The co-sponsors of that draft resolution have agreed to make a slight revision to the text, adding to operative paragraph 2, at the end of the first line, the three words "in absolute terms".

We would ask the Secretariat to circulate a revised text of the draft resolution.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): Along with the other co-sponsors, my delegation listened with great interest and attention to the amendments in document A/C.1/L.746 to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.731 relating to a mid-term review of the Disarmament Decade proposed by a friend and elder brother, the representative of Liberia, Ambassador Harmon.

We sincerely share the noble sentiments which motivated him in putting forward those amendments. We also think that so far as style and elegance are concerned some of the Liberian amendments would have improved our text had we had more time than is available to us to sit down with him and consider them at length.

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

However, in the spirit of brotherhood and friendship, and having regard to the high sentiments which moved him, as well as the provisions of the General Assembly resolutions referred to in our draft resolution, I wish to appeal to him not to insist on his proposed amendments.

I am glad to be able to say that I have conferred with the representative of Liberia and that I am under the impression that he is agreeable to reconsidering his submission. Furthermore, I am happy to be able to say that we share the basic aim of his proposed amendments, which seek to give greater emphasis to the relevance and significance of disarmament in the work of the United Nations.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): As another indication of African unity and brotherhood, in reply to the appeal that has just been made by my brother and colleague from Nigeria, and not wishing to delay this debate, I should like here to restate that the purpose of our proposed amendments, as he has correctly stated, was to improve the text. Nevertheless, as an indication of co-operation on our part, after conferring with him -- or he with me -- I have decided not to press for a vote on the proposed amendments to the resolution in document A/C.1/L.731.

The CHAIRMAN: (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Liberia for his spirit of co-operation.

(The Chairman)

The representative of Egypt has asked for the floor in exercise of his right of reply. I now call on him.

Mr. ALFARARGI (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): Once more, the representative of Israel this morning wished to reconfirm his allegations and raise a curtain of smoke to show us the policy of Israel based on expansionism and the threat of its nuclear power to the countries of the Middle East.

It would be easier for us to refer to the official document which the representative of Egypt has referred to in his statement here in this Committee on 20 November, and which clarifies the stand of Egypt, revealing the allegations of Israel and its continuing misrepresentations.

Document A/10221, dated 12 September 1975, and addendum A, reconfirm the stand of Egypt based on the seriousness of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Allow me to compare the true and sincere stand adopted by Egypt and the misrepresentations and falsifications which reveal the stand of Israel.

Egypt has continually and repeatedly said it is willing, on a mutual basis, to stop the present manufacture of nuclear weapons, or even to possess them or stockpile them, provided that Israel would accept that; and it also seeks to avoid having arsenals of weapons of mass destruction.

Egypt again is willing to ratify the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons once Israel has done that. Here again, we reveal the stand of Israel. Egypt ratified this agreement in 1968; whereas we find that Israel, which congratulates itself and those who voted on the resolution on non-proliferation in the First Committee and in the General Assembly in 1968, answers the Secretary-General, after a lapse of seven years, that it is still studying the legal implications of such an agreement and convention. How many years does it require, and on what basis did it vote prior to that? This is an important and urgent question.

(Mr. Alfarargi, Egypt)

Israel lays down its laws to explain its stand for not ratifying this Treaty as a member of the area of the Middle East. It knows it is fostering this condition to allow for digression and to falsify and provide a justification for the occupation of Arab lands and territories. If Israel is sincere in its intentions, there are numerous ways to prove this, such as the way in which the majority of the countries of the area have acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. And this would be followed by a declaration of non-interference, of non-use or a ban on nuclear weapons by Members of the United Nations. In this way, an atmosphere of confidence would prevail in the area.

Perhaps the representative of Israel may remember what was said in this respect, and very clearly, by Ambassador Hoveyda of Iran when he submitted this draft resolution.

(Mr. Alfarargi, Egypt)

The representative of Israel said this morning that his Minister of Foreign Affairs had stated in the General Assembly on 30 September that Israel would not be the first State in the area to use nuclear weapons. Is not that in accordance with what is to be found in the preambular part of the draft resolution and also in its operative paragraph 3, yet, in spite of that, the representative of Israel does not approve of the draft resolution. If what the Foreign Minister of Israel said in the General Assembly reflects the true policy of Israel, why is he contradicted here, in the First Committee, by his representative? Which is the true policy of Israel? Or is it intended as provocation?

I shall proceed to the examples given by the representative of Israel of nuclear weapon-free zones, whether established or proposed to be established. Can the representative of Israel point to areas and regions where, through the repeated use of force, there is occupation of the territories of other States in the area, such as exists in the Middle East and such as Israel is carrying out in its continued occupation of Arab territories and the deprivation and usurpation of the rights of the Palestinians and the continued occupation of territories in defiance of United Nations resolutions, with the threat of the use of nuclear force? What is the position today?

In a series of untruths and basing himself on a comparison with other regions, the representative of Israel has tried to mislead us. Has he read the comprehensive study on nuclear free-zones, which is an important document before this Committee, in which the experts have concluded that it is impossible to apply one criterion to all areas of the world and that each region has its own conditions, as we have heard stated by many members of this Committee?

I wanted to reply to the allegations and contradictions raised continually by the representative of Israel here in this Committee, which undoubtedly are known by the majority of members of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: (interpretation from French): I call upon the representative of Israel in exercise of his right of reply.

Mr. ERELL (Israel): I feel that there is no need for me to reiterate the position taken by me this morning in explaining the attitude of my country concerning the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.741. However, I see some usefulness in making one or two comments on the remarks just made by the representative of Egypt.

I hope the Government of Egypt will understand that it is not really possible to find any takers for the strange doctrine which he tries to sell, namely, that one must not negotiate in order to reach agreement -- in other words, if one wants agreement the way to achieve it is to refuse to negotiate. That is a very strange doctrine indeed, and one which I believe no one will accept.

He referred to the very important question of goodwill and good intentions. I think he would have been a little more convincing, perhaps, if he had given up the constant use of hostile language in referring to Israel. However, if the Government of Egypt sees the need to foster goodwill in relations between the two countries it can make a very necessary and easy start by affirming that, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, it will respect the equality of sovereignty of the State of Israel. I think that would be a very useful first step.

The representative of Egypt complains about territories held by Israel. I do not know that his Government has recognized the sovereignty of Israel and I do not see why he should expect Israel to respect his Government's sovereignty without reciprocity. That is an important point, which ought to be well understood.

I believe there is no disagreement among any experts in relation to nuclear-weapon-free zones anywhere in the world. On the question of the requirement that such zones be based on a treaty, if we want a treaty it will have to be negotiated. The theory that one can have a treaty by refusing to negotiate will not hold water.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): As members are aware, we shall hold two meetings tomorrow. At the morning meeting we shall listen to all those representatives who wish to speak on the various draft resolutions. Therefore, I would request those representatives to be good enough to inscribe their names on the list of speakers for tomorrow.

Tomorrow morning's meeting will be the only one we shall have at which to comment on the various draft resolutions. Once we finish with our comments on them we shall then proceed immediately to vote on those drafts, tomorrow afternoon and at the two meetings on Friday.

Mr. FOWE (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the work programme you have proposed for tomorrow, and my delegation agrees totally with that proposal. I have a question to pose to you and, through you, to the Committee.

I think, because of the time constraints we all feel, it might be helpful, before this meeting comes to an end today, if we all had a clear idea as to which draft resolutions we might agree now could be voted upon in the course of the meetings tomorrow. In view of the number of draft resolutions we have before us between now and the end of our meetings on Friday, and as I am sure we would like to end on Friday, an indication from you, Sir, and remarks from the Committee on this question, would, I think, be very helpful -- most certainly to my delegation -- and I should therefore appreciate your views, Mr. Chairman, and, through you, the views of the members of the Committee in this regard.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): After having consulted with the Secretary of the Committee, it would appear difficult for me to give an immediate reply. However, tomorrow morning the Secretary could reply to you after consulting with the Chairman, because there will be financial implications to some of the draft resolutions. We thus hope to be able to satisfy the representative of Canada tomorrow morning.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): I fully endorse what my colleague from Canada has said, but I do not think we clearly understood what you just said, Mr. Chairman. Do I understand you, then, that there would be no voting on draft resolutions tomorrow morning, but that the voting would begin in the afternoon?

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): To clarify this, let me say that tomorrow morning we shall hear comments and observations on the various draft resolutions, and shall then proceed to the vote in the afternoon.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.