



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 9th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire)

CONTENTS

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Rana (Nepal)  
Mr. Murin (Czechoslovakia)  
Mr. Deen (Malaysia)  
Mr. Haider (Pakistan)  
Mr. Kapllani (Albania)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Mr. RANA (Nepal): Permit me, Sir, at the outset, to congratulate you on your unanimous election to the high office of Chairman of the First Committee and to offer felicitations to other members of the Bureau on their respective elections. On this occasion, I assure you of my delegation's fullest co-operation, and I wish you every success.

We are meeting at a particularly interesting - perhaps even auspicious - time as far as disarmament and international security issues are concerned. Only last month, for example, we adopted by consensus the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. This landmark document not only reaffirmed the crucial linkage between disarmament and development - the two most important challenges facing mankind today - but also underlined a broad and timely concept of security, not only in its military aspects, but also its political, economic, social and ecological dimensions.

While this offers a wide agenda for future activities in the area of disarmament and international security, the current session is also significant in that it takes place on the eve of the third United Nations special session devoted to disarmament, to which we look forward with much interest and optimism.

I have already stated that we are at an important phase of our work in this Committee. Apart from the reasons just mentioned, there is now the added - and hopeful - sign represented by the agreement in principle between the super-Powers for the elimination of shorter- and intermediate-range nuclear missiles, not only from Europe, as was once proposed, but also from Asia and the rest of the world. It is the sincere hope of my delegation that the forthcoming summit meeting between

(    Rana, Nepal)

the United States of America and the Soviet Union will come to mark a new and more relaxed era in super-Power relations. If such a process is indeed initiated it would, apart from all else, help to enhance the significance of the third special session. In any case, we believe that it should not merely build upon or reaffirm the achievements of the first special session, but also take into consideration new elements and concepts that can contribute to enhancing international security, the ultimate purpose of disarmament. My delegation wishes to record its conviction that disarmament should be approached in terms not only of a reduction but also of the prevention of an arms race. It is with that in view that my delegation has been stressing the importance of initiatives such as the creation of zones of peace in various strategic regions of the world, whether embracing the territory of many countries or just one.

To come back to super-Power relations, I wish to reaffirm the urgency of agreement on other nuclear disarmament measures between the super-Powers, primarily on effecting deep cuts in their awesome strategic nuclear arsenals, as also in other categories of nuclear weapons, no matter how deployed. Nepal favours a restrictive interpretation of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, of 1972. It is also our firmly held view that, in order to prevent a nuclear arms race in outer space, the provisions of that Treaty must be reinforced to prohibit anti-satellite weapons in outer space, in the light of the recent technological and research advances in that particular area. On this occasion, Nepal wishes to reiterate its belief in the urgency of realizing a comprehensive test ban treaty that would end all nuclear explosions by all countries in all environments for all time.

Nepal well understands the importance of verification in the disarmament

(Mr. Rana, Nepal)

process. We therefore welcome the recent exchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union in this area and would be glad to support any move that would result in the establishment by the Conference on Disarmament of an ad hoc committee to examine all basic issues regarding scope, compliance and verification, with a view to the realization of a comprehensive - and verifiable - test-ban treaty.

While we welcome the recent advances in the sphere of verification, as reflected in the consensus report of the verification Working Group at this year's session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, we cannot but reiterate the need for nuclear-weapon States to abide by the provisions of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, including their obligations to halt all nuclear-weapons testing. Compliance with such Treaty provisions would, we sincerely believe, help in the realization of the goal of nuclear non-proliferation.

Nepal welcomes the outcome of last year's Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures in Europe. However, we believe that there is room for further expansion, specially in the light of the new climate in international relations consequent upon the improvement in super-Power relations.

I have just indicated my country's support for the regional approach to disarmament, security and confidence-building in Europe and we believe this needs to be further strengthened. One practical way of doing so, in our view, is by increasing public awareness of the complex web of relationships involved in disarmament and in security- and confidence-building measures in various regions of the world. For this reason, Nepal has supported the establishment of the United Nations Disarmament Centre in Lome and has also endorsed the General Assembly move to establish another in Lima.

(Mr. Rana, Nepal)

So far, however, Asia - currently the most war-prone and populous of all continents - remains without one. Against that backdrop and keeping in mind Nepal's location at the very heart of Asia and its deep commitment to peace and disarmament, we should be honoured to act as host to a United Nations disarmament centre in Asia, at Kathmandu, when funds are available for it. With that in view my delegation proposes to consult with other Asian delegations and, if necessary, introduce a draft resolution in this Committee to that effect.

Nepal continues to stress the need for conventional disarmament, for the obvious and often-stated reason that the bulk of global military expenditure is on conventional weaponry. Another very compelling reason is that, over the past four decades, more than 150 wars including the ongoing conflict between Iran and Iraq, now in its eighth year, have been fought with conventional weapons. That apart, modern technology has increased not only the reach and accuracy of conventional arms, but also their destructive power, which in some categories comes close to that of nuclear weapons. Therefore, my country would welcome any move resulting in a reduction of military expenditure and, to that end, supports endeavours aimed at greater openness, transparency and verifiability in military budgets.

Another area of weaponry whose total elimination should be high on the global agenda is that of chemical weapons, which to our utter dismay continue to be used in today's conflicts. Nepal therefore welcomes the progress made at the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva on negotiations on a convention on the complete prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction. We are hopeful that in the more open and relaxed international environment of today it will be possible for the existing problems in the drafting of such a convention to be soon resolved. In this context too the need for agreement on verification procedures can hardly be minimized.

(Mr. Rana, Nepal)

As members know, Nepal is a country without a coastline or a navy. However, in an era of submarine-launched intercontinental nuclear missiles, our landlocked configuration is hardly a source of solace or security. It is for that reason that Nepal firmly supports the concept of naval disarmament, and confidence-building and conflict-limiting concepts such as the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. Nepal joins others in urging that the practice of neither confirming nor denying the presence of nuclear weapons on board ships - especially those passing through international waters and the territorial waters of littoral States - be abandoned, and we would support any move in the direction of naval disarmament, particularly in the nuclear field.

Let me briefly comment in conclusion on the importance to international security and disarmament of the establishment of zones of peace. Nepal believes that the creation of zones of peace and of nuclear-free zones is inextricably linked with issues of international peace, security and disarmament. It is for that reason, among others, that Nepal has consistently supported all such initiatives, whether they relate to the South Atlantic, the South Pacific, South-East Asia, the Mediterranean, Africa or the Indian Ocean.

It was for the very same reason, among others, that Nepal proposed, as long ago as 1975, that it be declared a zone of peace. We believe that the concept of one-nation zones of peace, proposed by His Majesty the King of Nepal, could be a useful addition to our growing list of confidence-building and conflict-limiting measures. As in the past, my delegation reiterates its call upon all nuclear-weapon States to undertake a commitment to respect the status of such zones of peace and nuclear-free zones, as well as a non-first-use commitment vis-à-vis one another. They should also commit themselves not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States.

Mr. MURIN (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): I should like first of all, on behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation, to extend to you, Mr. President, our congratulations on your election to your high and responsible post. We assure you and the other Committee officers of our full support and co-operation.

Our work this year is taking place at a time characterized by increased dynamism in the international community's efforts to avert the nuclear threat and make a genuine breakthrough in the field of disarmament.

Indisputably, the most meaningful result of those efforts has been the agreement in principle between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the elimination of two classes of nuclear weapons. The expected conclusion and implementation of a treaty on the global elimination of Soviet and United States intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles would be, above all, a first historic step towards nuclear disarmament and thus tangible proof of its feasibility. It should also be a promising prologue to an all-embracing process of disarmament, the next step in which could be a 50-per-cent reduction in strategic offensive weapons, parallel with consistent compliance with the Soviet-United States anti-ballistic missile Treaty.

We highly appreciate the fact that the agreement guarantees fulfilment of the requirement of equal security both for the States parties and for their allies. As we stated during the general debate at the current session of the General Assembly, Czechoslovakia has done its best to facilitate positive steps towards real disarmament, and is ready to continue its efforts in the expectation that other countries concerned will proceed in the same spirit.

(MR. MURIN, Czechoslovakia)

We are convinced that this agreement addresses the most vital interests of the entire international community and responds to the constructive ideas, approaches and concepts in all areas of disarmament that are beginning to come increasingly to the fore.



(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

This is the first tangible result of the new, creative, highly humane and realistic policy and not a dividend of the policy of confrontation. It would be highly advisable for all nuclear Powers to make their own national contribution to the establishment of a nuclear-free world, all the more so since there is growing international recognition of the need for disarmament as the most important material guarantee of the survival and all-round development of civilization. Moreover, the concept of a world free of nuclear weapons and violence is gaining support and becoming universal. Realization of this concept is the aim of the comprehensive system of international peace and security proposed by the socialist countries. Thus, new and positive options are emerging to replace the hazardous policy of nuclear deterrence and reliance on force in international relations. The realistic nature of this trend is also confirmed, we believe, by numerous constructive statements made during the general debate in our Committee, beginning with your introductory statement, Mr. Chairman.

Disarmament remains the most urgent task facing mankind. The Governments of all the countries of the world, and the United Nations. In today's interdependent and integrated world, progress in disarmament is particularly closely linked to the need for new political thinking, reflecting the objective realities of a nuclear and space age, and, first and foremost, the fact that the security of any State can be reliably assured only within the framework of global international security, and never at the expense of the security of other countries.

Czechoslovakia, together with the other States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, is making a persistent effort to eliminate the possibility of the outbreak of a nuclear war or any other war and to put into practice a broad international programme of disarmament which, by the end of this century, would lead to a

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

step-by-step elimination of nuclear and other kinds of weapons of mass destruction and to a substantial reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments.

In our view, if stability is to be ensured at all stages of the disarmament process, it is necessary to proceed consistently from the principle of reasonable sufficiency at the lowest possible level of nuclear and conventional armaments. In this context, we propose to the States Members of the North Atlantic Treaty (NATO) that they should hold consultations on military doctrines with a view to reaching agreement on an exclusively defensive strategy.

In the context of the multilateral efforts to solve the problem of disarmament, we attach great importance to the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, as was confirmed in the address this year by the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Gustav Husák. We are making positive efforts to enable the Conference to fulfil its role as a unique negotiating forum for the preparation of concrete international agreements on disarmament. In this statement I should like to address in greater detail the activities of the Conference.

First of all, I would like to emphasize that we fully share the concerns expressed by a number of delegations in the First Committee over the fact that in the course of the past 10 years, aside from some partial moves, this negotiating forum has not achieved a tangible solution to any of the issues discussed. We cannot go on forever tolerating the practice of procedural delays in the Conference really amounting to obstruction. Nor is it possible, as was so clearly stated here, to allow a situation in which we should pay a heavy toll for the dogmatism of a few - very few - members of the Conference. We too agree that steps must be taken at the current session of the General Assembly to put an end to this inauspicious development.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

From the practical point of view, we consider the results of the Conference unsatisfactory, particularly as regards the priority issues of halting the nuclear arms race and of nuclear disarmament in general. It is perfectly understandable that the informal plenary sessions of the Conference on these issues cannot make up for practical in-depth negotiations on the substance of the problem. We cannot put up with a situation in which the questions of the cessation of the nuclear arms race are not in fact being considered at the Conference on Disarmament, although they were placed on the agenda of the Conference by the General Assembly as matters of great urgency.

This is precisely where the work of the Conference and the attention of all delegations must be concentrated. Indeed, in our time no single country can stand aloof since the nuclear threat is global in its consequences and makes no distinctions as regards either national boundaries or differences in ideology.

What is essential, therefore, is the greatest possible internationalization of efforts and a concrete, businesslike discussion of these questions on a multilateral level. This could also ensure a more favourable atmosphere for consideration of the subject of nuclear disarmament at bilateral Soviet-American negotiations. We are convinced that it is possible, through a combination of bilateral and multilateral efforts, to proceed to the elaboration of a phased programme of nuclear disarmament in which all nuclear States would participate.

We view the Soviet programme for the elimination of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction by the end of this century as a comprehensive, realistic platform for the solution of questions of nuclear disarmament inasmuch as it has substantially broadened the notion of the procedure, timing and methods of solution of the proposed concrete measures. It would guarantee equal security for all States at all stages of its implementation.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

We think that after the Reykjavik meeting, which definitely proved the possibility of implementing such a programme, the importance and role of the Conference on Disarmament has been considerably enhanced.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

Accordingly, we consider it necessary to set up a separate committee to work out all the basic questions of nuclear disarmament, including the relationship between measures for nuclear disarmament and the reduction of conventional potentials, conditions for the elimination of all nuclear weapons, the discontinuance of the production of fissionable substances for military purposes, and verification procedures. In this framework, there could be consideration and elaboration of agreed-upon measures for cases of non-compliance with, or attempts at circumvention of, the future comprehensive agreement on the non-use and elimination of nuclear weapons as well as steps designed to prevent nuclear terrorism.

We also favour an intensification of the negotiations on measures for the prevention of nuclear war and related questions. This subject covers a whole range of political, legal, moral and psychological guarantees of the non-use of force in international relations and the building of security and confidence.

As there is an understanding of principle in the Conference on Disarmament regarding the need for a comprehensive approach to the question of the prevention of nuclear war, it is necessary to set up an ad hoc committee and begin specific negotiations. That it is possible to resolve these questions effectively, given the political will on the part of the participating States, is manifested by the Stockholm agreement and by the signing of the Soviet-United States agreement on the establishment of centres for the reduction of the nuclear danger.

The strengthening of international peace and security would be considerably facilitated also by the assurance of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of the use of the nuclear weapons. We therefore continue to regard as highly relevant the elaboration and adoption of a legally binding international document on this question. We also believe that all nuclear-weapon States should

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

follow the example of the USSR and China in providing such guarantees on a unilateral basis as well.

Among the central problems of the present time, when a dividing line can be seen between new ways and traditional patterns of thinking and acting, priority must be given to the cessation of nuclear tests. The approach to this extremely serious and sensitive question clearly testifies to the real positions of States on the subject of nuclear disarmament. The example of the Soviet moratorium and the level of technical means of verification achieved clearly show that the conclusion of a treaty on a general and complete ban on all nuclear tests is a realistic possibility.

In the interest of a speedy commencement of practical negotiations on this question, the socialist States have this year submitted a proposal on "Basic provisions of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests". In so doing, we took account of the directive of the General Assembly that the elaboration of such a treaty be considered as a priority task and that it must not be made dependent on the results of negotiations on other questions.

We propose a broad set of verification measures ranging from notification of the location of nuclear test sites to mandatory challenge inspections.

The establishment of a special group of scientists authorized to submit to the Conference well-thought-out and agreed recommendations on the structure and functions of the verification system could become a practical step towards encouraging the undertaking of concrete drafting work on the treaty. We also regard as very valuable the idea of establishing an international system of global verification of radiation security with the use of space communication means.

Like the overwhelming majority of delegations, we consider it inexcusable that the Conference on Disarmament still has no working body to carry on practical

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

negotiations on the text of the treaty. In that context, we have listened with profound interest to the constructive proposals put forward by the delegation Mexico in our Committee and we are ready to work actively for the achievement of an understanding at the outset of the Conference session next year on a generally acceptable mandate of the committee on the nuclear test ban with a view to opening in-depth negotiations on this subject.

We welcome as a constructive and important step the decision by the USSR and the United States of America to undertake, by December 1987, comprehensive, staged negotiations on the limitation and subsequent complete cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests. In our view, those Soviet-United States negotiations should be conducted in parallel with the preparation of a comprehensive treaty within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

The Reykjavik meeting and its follow-up clearly show that the solution to the problem of nuclear disarmament and of the elimination of the threat of nuclear war is being complicated primarily by the ever-present danger of the extension of the arms race to outer space. We are firmly convinced that outer space must be preserved for peaceful co-operation and not for star wars.

Resolute efforts must be made along all lines to resolve this vital question - from the implementation of the proposed realistic options for strengthening the Soviet-United States Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and for preventing the deployment of weapons in outer space to the joint elaboration and implementation of a programme of practical action in the peaceful uses of outer space.

The Conference on Disarmament should also significantly step up its work in this area. The present activities of the Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space indicate that the real tasks of the Conference in this sphere

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

do not lie in a repeated study of documents relating to the status of outer space or in a non-binding consideration of general approaches. In order to make substantive progress, this Committee must be given a clear-cut mandate in the next year to agree on specific measures for the prevention of an arms race and the stationing of weapons in outer space. In this context, we fully support the idea of establishing a system of international verification of the maintenance of peace in outer space, which would be based on the inspection of all objects to be launched. Similarly, we support proposals for the elaboration of an international agreement to ban anti-satellite weapons and guarantee the immunity of artificial earth satellites.



(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

Today, there is a realistic prospect of achieving concrete results with regard to the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons. In a desire to accelerate the progress of negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament, the socialist countries have done their utmost in this sphere as well to resolve a whole gamut of problems that have for a very long time been considered as the main obstacles to the completion of a chemical-weapons convention. Among them are the elimination of stockpiles and production facilities of chemical weapons, verification of that process, verification of the non-production of chemical weapons in the civilian chemical industry and, lastly, the question of challenge inspections. The readiness of the USSR to accept the stipulation of such a modality of certification without right of rejection in the chemical-weapons convention, as well as the demonstration of the elimination of chemical weapons in the territory of the Soviet Union are convincing proof of its readiness to resolve even the most complicated questions in the spirit of openness and mutual trust.

We agree with the requirement that work on the convention should be accelerated so that it may be completed early next year. We do not, however, conceal the fact that we are seriously concerned over steps that run counter to this goal, foremost among which are the plans of the United States to build and deploy binary chemical weapons in Western Europe, as well as the proposal of France to allow all States to acquire a certain reserve of chemical weapons until the completion of the process of their elimination. Thus, a destabilizing rearmament factor is being injected into efforts with a view to chemical disarmament, thereby confirming that today the problem no longer resides in refinement of the technical or legal aspects of the text of the convention, but rather in the presence or absence of political will on the part of some States.

Of even greater urgency is the question of the prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction. It is our view that the work of the Conference would

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

be promoted by the achievement of a joint position with regard to the definition of such weapons and by the elaboration of appropriate recommendations. We also advocate a ban on the production of non-nuclear-weapons based on new principles of physics, the devastating effects of which approximate those of nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction.

In recent times the topicality of a ban on radiological weapons and the inadmissibility of armed attacks against nuclear-power facilities has become even more evident. This should encourage the acceleration of relevant negotiations within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament and lead to a rapprochement of views on a generally acceptable solution.

We are disappointed with and concerned over the results of this year's work of the Ad Hoc Committee on a comprehensive programme of disarmament. We regard as strongly negative the tendency to one-sided questioning of a whole number of provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, primarily those concerning nuclear disarmament. Should some States proceed from a calculation that the elaboration and adoption of a comprehensive programme of disarmament can be blocked by a revision of that Final Document, the prospects for substantive and all-embracing disarmament negotiations will continue to be vague and limited. We, for our part, are determined to continue to extend active and constructive support to the idea of a comprehensive programme of disarmament and believe that other delegations will proceed in the same manner.

Effective consideration of the main items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament requires, in our view, the establishment of an optimum balance between bilateral and multilateral negotiations, as well as the application of the principle of mutual reinforcement and enrichment.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

The work of the Conference would undoubtedly be facilitated if delegations were to have better access to information on the state of the bilateral Soviet-United States negotiations. We therefore welcome the readiness of the Soviet Union to increase the level of information, which has been expressed during the Committee's present deliberations, and to reach agreement with the United States delegation on an appropriate procedure in that regard.

We favour comprehensive intensification of the work of the Conference on Disarmament, which is all the more urgent since the wheels of the negotiating mechanism are turning at a much slower pace than those of the arms race. Thus, a dangerous contradiction is emerging between present-day requirements and military technology.

A contribution to the increased effectiveness of the Conference on Disarmament could be made by certain changes in the organization of its work. In our opinion the lengthy gaps between sessions are not in keeping with the urgency and importance of the problems included in the Conference's agenda. We therefore believe that the Conference should, in principle, work throughout the year, with only a few short recesses. In response to the ideas expressed in our current discussions, we should like to support the view that it would be useful to establish permanent working bodies of the Conference on all fundamental questions on its agenda. We believe it would be useful to give thought to a great number of other questions as well that are linked to the need to enhance the effectiveness and productivity of this unique international forum.

In this connection, we welcome the practice of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons of holding sessions during the recess periods between official meetings of the Conference. That practice could also be expanded to holding additional special sessions of the Conference, including plenary sessions, as needed to achievement decisive progress on individual agenda items.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

The Conference on Disarmament will doubtless continue to grow in significance. The problems of the cessation of the arms race and of disarmament are truly global in nature and directly affect all States. For that reason, we share the view that the Conference on Disarmament should, in the future, become a permanent universal body for disarmament negotiations. Of course, as long as nuclear weapons exist, problems of nuclear disarmament must be the focal point of the Conference's attention.

In conclusion, allow me to express the hope that all States participating in the Conference on Disarmament will demonstrate sufficient political will, which, at this very decisive stage, can help to achieve concrete agreements. We believe that new political thinking will prevail and that genuine progress will in fact be made in the cause of disarmament. The Geneva Conference must play an irreplaceable role in this. For our part, we shall do our utmost to achieve the enhanced effectiveness and prestige of the Conference as the main disarmament forum in which the most responsible decisions will be taken in the interests of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world.

In the subsequent discussions in the Committee the Czechoslovak delegation will explain in greater detail its views regarding the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and regarding the other relevant questions on our agenda.

Mr. DEEN (Malaysia): Sir, my delegation is pleased to congratulate you on your election as Chairman of this Committee. We are confident that you will be an effective guide to the Committee's demanding and difficult tasks. My delegation also extends its felicitations to the other officers of the Committee on their election.

Disarmament is an issue of paramount importance to the international community; not only is the issue of critical importance in itself but it carries far-reaching implications for almost every other issue that concerns humanity. The very existence of mankind remains at stake unless the tide of the global arms race can be turned, and turned back decisively.

While Malaysia firmly believes in multilateralism in international affairs as the most comprehensive and equitable way of dealing with problems, we recognize that a breakthrough in disarmament can come only through super-Power accord. The role of other Powers should be to encourage and support super-Power dialogue and assist in the process of confidence-building and the lessening of tensions that is a sine qua non of the disarmament process. The international community must also play its role in providing the necessary framework to complement and sustain super-Power disarmament with a view to the achievement of true security on a global basis.

Malaysia therefore welcomes whole-heartedly the recent announcement by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that they are on the verge of signing an agreement on intermediate range nuclear forces that provides for the global elimination of medium- and shorter-range nuclear missiles. The talks between Mr. Shevardnadze, the Soviet Foreign Minister, and Mr. Shultz, the United States Secretary of State, in Washington in mid-September also held out promise for Soviet-American negotiations on reductions in strategic nuclear weapons, a nuclear-test ban and a broad range of security issues.

(Mr. Deen, Malaysia)

We congratulate the leaders of both countries on taking this significant step forward on the long and arduous road towards elimination of nuclear weapons. We call on the allies of the Soviet Union and the United States of America and on all Members of the United Nations to play their part in ensuring that the Soviet-American talks will lead to major reductions in the massive arms stockpiles currently maintained by the great Powers. We look forward to a successful summit meeting later this year between President Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev, which we hope will lead to a qualitative improvement in East-West relations.

While the spotlight is focused on the super-Powers, we hope that other major Powers will not neglect their own role in nuclear disarmament or the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. We hope that other nuclear-weapon States will join with the super-Powers in working for an early comprehensive test ban agreement. The Conference on Disarmament should have a significant role to play in this context.

Malaysia would also like to see substantive progress at the Conference on Disarmament on the prevention of an arms race in space; it has, after all, been five years since the General Assembly adopted a resolution on the subject. Outer space is of vital concern to mankind and we should ensure that it is reserved for peaceful purposes.

There is a pressing need for greater effort to achieve reductions in conventional weapons through bilateral and multilateral negotiations. The growing sophistication of the weapons and their accumulation poses as great a threat to global and regional security as do nuclear weapons. We strongly support the efforts of the United Nations Disarmament Commission in this respect.

Verification, we believe, is a crucial element in the disarmament process and we are supportive of the work done by the Disarmament Commission in this area. In

(Mr. Deen, Malaysia)

this respect, the United Nations can play an important role in support of arms agreements. We hope that the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will give practical effect to this endeavour.

The first step, and a significant one, has been taken in articulating the relation between disarmament and development in the Final Document of the recent Conference on the subject. My delegation would like to see an effective structure built on this foundation so that the important concepts established at the Conference can be carried to their logical conclusion.

My delegation fully supports the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean in its report (A/42/29) for the General Assembly to press for the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean at Colombo to implement the 1971 Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and for the Committee's mandate to be renewed so that the preparations for the conference can be concluded as soon as possible.

Malaysia has been an active participant in the Committee's work because it is a firm proponent of the creation of zones of peace in the different regions of the world. My delegation believes that the establishment of such zones enhances regional co-operation, reduces major Power rivalry and tension, and provides an underpinning for the disarmament process. Malaysia and its partners in the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) were guided by these criteria when they advocated the South-East Asian zone of peace, freedom and neutrality, in the Kuala Lumpur Declaration in 1971.

Developments in the arms negotiations between the super-Powers, progress in the negotiations on European security and good prospects for improved East-West relations augur well for the future. The multilateral efforts in disarmament must keep pace with these processes. The major Powers, on their part, should not

(Mr. Deen, Malaysia)

neglect their own role in the multilateral effort, especially in being responsive to international opinion and by making necessary information available to the forums concerned. We should also look to the streamlining of international machinery dealing with disarmament. We agree with the views expressed by a number of delegations that reforms are needed to allow this Committee to continue to play its pivotal role in the multilateral contribution to disarmament. Above all, we must apply ourselves sincerely to this vital issue and set aside narrow interests to work for the collective good. We owe at least this to the generations that will succeed us.

Mr. HAIDER (Pakistan): May I first of all extend to you, Sir, my warm felicitations on your election to the chairmanship of this Committee and assure you of the full co-operation of my delegation in the fulfilment of your important tasks. Knowing your abilities and wide experience as a diplomat, we are confident that under your guidance the work of the Committee will be conducted in a most efficient and skilful manner. I should also like to take this opportunity to compliment your distinguished predecessor, Ambassador Zachmann of the German Democratic Republic, for the competent manner in which he presided over this Committee during the last session of the General Assembly.



(Mr. Haider, Pakistan)

The past year has been one of intensified debate on the global disarmament agenda. While the promise held out by the Reykjavik summit has not been realized, it showed that radical reductions in nuclear weapons and the adoption of measures to prevent the extension of the arms race into outer space were realistic objectives. The dialogue between the two nations possessing the largest military arsenals in the world has since continued. There is today an increased awareness of the contribution that openness and transparency can make to promoting disarmament and confidence among nations.

A month ago the international community restated its belief that disarmament and development were among the most urgent challenges facing it and that they constituted the two pillars on which international peace and security could be built. Preparatory work for the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament has begun in real earnest. There is now a legitimate expectation that concrete measures in respect of disarmament will be achieved.

Pakistan has been following with close attention the bilateral talks between the two super-Powers since the Reykjavik meeting. We are pleased at the agreement in principle reached between them on the global elimination of their intermediate- and shorter-range nuclear missiles, which are among the most destabilizing nuclear weapons possessed by the two sides. We regard such a treaty as significant inasmuch as it would be the first international agreement on the elimination of nuclear weapons already deployed. At the same time one cannot ignore the fact that the elimination of medium-range missiles would reduce only by a very small proportion the nuclear weapons possessed by the United States and the Soviet Union, and would not measurably reduce the nuclear threat. We therefore hope that the conclusion of a treaty on the elimination of these missiles will be followed by radical reductions in strategic arms and by the elimination of other nuclear weapons, thereby bringing about a significant reduction in the nuclear danger.

(Mr. Haider, Pakistan)

My delegation has noted the agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union to begin full-scale stage-by-stage negotiations on nuclear testing in which, after agreement on effective verification measures for their bilateral threshold test-ban Treaty of 1974 and the Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes, of 1976, the two sides will proceed to negotiate further intermediate limitations on nuclear testing. We welcome the fact that the ultimate objectives of those talks would be the complete cessation of nuclear testing. We would be in a position to support intermediate limitations on nuclear testing as well, if they were designed to curb qualitative improvements in nuclear weapons and the development of new types and systems of such weapons and if they were adopted in the context of a complete prohibition of nuclear tests at a predetermined early date. Otherwise, we would be deceiving ourselves and world public opinion by creating the illusion of progress while deferring indefinitely the goal of a comprehensive test ban.

With the forthcoming United States-Soviet bilateral talks on nuclear testing it has become all the more urgent that the Conference on Disarmament, the only multilateral negotiating forum in the field of disarmament, undertake substantive work on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. My delegation deeply regrets that, because of the unwillingness of a handful of delegations to agree to an appropriate mandate for an ad hoc committee on a nuclear-test ban, the Conference was prevented for the fourth successive year from fulfilling its responsibilities on this crucial issue. The flexibility shown on the question of a mandate by the Group of 21 in the Conference on Disarmament has not been reciprocated by the Western group, and we would urge those countries, in particular those that regard a test ban as a long-term objective, to consider carefully the effects that any further delay in the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty would have on efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to additional States.

(Mr. Haider, Pakistan)

The objective of non-proliferation, to which Pakistan is deeply and sincerely committed, would be promoted also if the non-nuclear-weapon States were given effective assurances against the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons. Regrettably, on this question as well, the deliberations of the Conference on Disarmament this year proved to be sterile. Repeated appeals to nuclear-weapon States which have not so far extended the unqualified and unconditional assurances sought by the non-nuclear-weapon States have gone unheeded. We call once again upon the nuclear-weapon States concerned to review their unilateral declarations on this matter, taking into account the concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon States. By doing so they would be contributing to the objective of non-proliferation. On the other hand, failure to extend those assurances would be bound to weaken the non-proliferation régime.

As the Secretary-General notes in his report on the work of the Organization (A/42/1), the regional dimension of disarmament merits much attention. That is true in both the nuclear and the conventional fields. While participating fully in global disarmament efforts, Pakistan has also explored every possibility for regional initiatives in South Asia.

Conscious of the motivation for proliferation arising out of a fear of the nuclear capabilities and intentions of other States in a given region, we have taken several initiatives to prevent a nuclear-arms race in South Asia. Countries of the region have made undertakings, at the highest level, not to acquire or manufacture nuclear weapons and to devote their nuclear programmes exclusively to the economic and social advancement of their peoples. Those undertakings could be translated into binding commitments through a formal treaty establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region.

(Mr. Haider, Pakistan)

Among the other proposals made by Pakistan for keeping our region free of nuclear weapons are the following: simultaneous acceptance by India and Pakistan of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons or of comprehensive safeguards formulated by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA); inspection of each other's nuclear facilities, and a joint declaration renouncing nuclear weapons.

We are open to any other equitable and non-discriminatory modality for keeping our region free of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, as the Prime Minister of Pakistan announced at the 11th meeting of the General Assembly on 24 September, we are prepared to subscribe to a comprehensive test ban in a global, regional or bilateral context. The proposal for a bilateral nuclear test ban was made by the Prime Minister of Pakistan to the Prime Minister of India in June this year and we are looking forward to a positive response from the other side. The conclusion of such a bilateral test-ban agreement would serve to assure each other and the world that neither country has the intention of pursuing the nuclear weapons option.

In his address to the General Assembly, the Prime Minister of Pakistan proposed that in order to explore the possibility of an agreement to keep the South Asian region free from nuclear weapons, a conference on nuclear non-proliferation in South Asia be convened, under the auspices of the United Nations, as soon as possible with the participation of the regional and other interested States. We hope this proposal will be accepted by other States in the region and will receive the support of other countries.

The regional approach is equally applicable to conventional disarmament. The increasing attention that this subject is receiving these days is to be welcomed. The discussions in the Disarmament Commission this year revealed widespread agreement on the need to pursue actively the subject of conventional disarmament in the United Nations. We hope that next year the Commission will be able to finalize

(Mr. Haider, Pakistan)

its conclusions and thus lay the groundwork for further deliberations on this question at the third special session devoted to disarmament.

Pakistan has always attached particular importance to the need for adequate provisions for monitoring the implementation of disarmament agreements and for an effective complaints procedure for resolving disputes about compliance. By strengthening confidence among States that the obligations undertaken by them are being observed and that doubts about compliance can be resolved, such provisions can make a significant contribution to the disarmament process. We are therefore pleased that the importance of verification in disarmament negotiations is now being more and more widely recognized. We are also encouraged by the progress made by the Disarmament Commission, which considered the subject of verification for the first time this year, in the elaboration of concrete recommendations and proposals on this question, which could serve as useful guidelines in future disarmament negotiations.

The world is today facing the imminent threat of the extension of the arms race into outer space. This can be averted only by strict adherence to existing treaties and the conclusion of additional agreements to remedy the deficiencies and loopholes in the current legal régime. Among the agreements now in force, the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems occupies a central place. Without this Treaty, the viability of existing arms control agreements and the possibility of cuts in strategic nuclear forces would be gravely jeopardized. We therefore call on the parties to this Treaty to abide by its terms in letter and spirit.

Agreements currently in force leave considerable room for military activities in outer space, including the deployment of a wide range of weapons. Further developments in space technology could erode the existing space law and make it completely irrelevant. While the two super-Powers, which are the two principal

(Mr. Haider, Pakistan)

space Powers, bear a special responsibility in this connection, questions relating to outer space are equally of concern to the other members of the international community. The United States-Soviet bilateral talks on space arms do not therefore diminish the need for multilateral negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament and we hope that next year the Conference will be able to focus its attention on elaborating further concrete measures for preventing an arms race in outer space to supplement the existing legal régime.

It is indefensible that while hunger, poverty and disease continue to plague hundreds of millions of people in the developing world, precious human, material and technological resources are being wasted on an ever-escalating arms race. The close interrelationship between disarmament and development was once again reaffirmed by the international community at the Conference held here in New York last month. We regard as historic the reaffirmation by the participating States of their commitment to allocate a portion of the resources released through disarmament for socio-economic development. We view the Conference as the beginning of a process which must be actively pursued in the coming years. The Conference should provide an impetus to further international efforts on the two interrelated fields of disarmament and development. We are confident that this subject will now remain a priority item on the international agenda and will be reviewed periodically by the General Assembly.

Nearly a decade has passed since the General Assembly met in its first special session devoted to disarmament. The objectives, principles and priorities laid down in the Final Document adopted at that session have guided all multilateral efforts in the field of disarmament since then. Recent developments on the international scene make it necessary that the General Assembly should have another special session to review the implementation of the Final Document and elaborate further measures and principles.

(Mr. Haider, Pakistan)

In so doing, the General Assembly at its third special session devoted to disarmament would have to build on the consensus reflected in the Final Document. In our view, the goals of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should include the following: first, urging an agreement between the super-Powers for a process of nuclear disarmament on the lines envisaged at the Reykjavik summit; secondly, opening multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament, which should include all five of the nuclear Powers; thirdly, agreement on some priority measures in nuclear disarmament - namely, a nuclear-test ban, security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States and the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones; fourthly, a consensus in favour of promoting a regional approach to disarmament; fifthly, an agreement on the relationship between disarmament and international security, especially the security of the smaller developing and non-aligned States; and sixthly, strengthening and improving the United Nations disarmament machinery.

In conclusion, may I express the hope that our deliberations will contribute effectively to the objectives that we all share and seek.

Mr. KAPLANI (Albania): Allow me at the outset, Sir, to congratulate you warmly on your election to the chairmanship of the Committee and to wish you success in carrying out your responsibilities.

Not to go too far back into historical considerations of the problem, suffice it to mention that from the time of the League of Nations down to the founding of the United Nations, disarmament has consistently remained one of the central issues of discussion in relation to international peace and security. Now too, talks, meetings and conferences devoted to this major issue are being sponsored and organized. As is known, two special sessions of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament have been held. Organisms, forums and institutions such as the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the United Nations negotiating

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

forum on disarmament known as the Conference on Disarmament and the United Nations Institute for Disarmament and Research have also been set up. However, the world has not yet seen any disarmament. On the contrary, the arms race has been going on at top speed, assuming qualitatively new and ever more dangerous proportions and dimensions.

Less than a decade ago, in 1980, the world's armaments expenditures reached the figure of \$500 billion. In 1986, this figure doubled, hitting the astronomical level of \$1000 billion. Those figures demonstrate that the dynamics of armaments expenditures is expressed only by an upward curve. It is conditioned by imperialist policy and by political, economic and other factors that make prediction difficult even for the most meticulous experts in the domain, who had predicted that the \$1000 billion figure would be reached by the year 2000.

Consequently, what we are witnessing is a frenzied arms race unprecedented in history. In that arms race, which absorbs a colossal proportion of the world's natural and human resources, it is the United States and the Soviet Union that at present take the lead, spending more than \$600 billion annually on the manufacture of arms.

As the arms race goes on unabated between them, the number of proposals and counter-proposals put forward by each side increases with the same intensity. It is crystal clear that the mania of the super-Powers to put as many disarmament proposals as possible on the negotiating table is part and parcel of the propaganda war - an attempt to gain credit in world public opinion so that each may boast of being the champion of disarmament. They attach special significance to this propaganda race which, though varying in scope, degree and outward forms according to circumstances and situations, has a permanent common denominator - demagoguery. As the super-Powers seek to sow fear by their force of arms, which they never fail to



(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

demonstrate, so they never cease their efforts to create illusions about their self-professed concern over reductions in the actual level of their military might.

Nowadays, we hear much talk to the effect that, allegedly, the super-Powers themselves admit that a nuclear war cannot eventually be won and therefore must never be fought. Well, if this is what they really believe, why is it then that they each continue to accumulate a huge nuclear arsenal of about 25,000 nuclear warheads? If they really believe that a nuclear war must not be fought, why then after so many lengthy and "laborious" negotiations were they barely able to reach the accord to reduce this huge, unprecedented arsenal of nuclear weapons by a meager fraction of a symbolic 4 per cent?

This is no doubt in keeping with the super-Powers' imperialist concept that in our days, strength is the price of peace. In other words, they will continue as of now to talk to the world from a position of strength and in the language of force. Despite their high-flown words and bombastic declarations, they base the concept of security on arms and armaments. In essence, they stick to the idea that nuclear weapons, "the balance of power or terror" and the doctrine of "deterrence" or even what is at present termed "minimum deterrence" have, according to them, strengthened international peace and security.

We are all witnessing the fact that, notwithstanding the high level of nuclear armaments, the super-Powers continue all the same to conduct nuclear tests. This fact alone, however, gives the lie to their "good will" concerning abatement of the arms race - particularly the nuclear arms race. What we are today facing is a dangerous trend - a qualitatively new arms race intended further to perfect existing weapons and manufacture more sophisticated ones, such as space weapons or the so-called "intelligent" weapons. Thus, there is only talk on disarmament, while their arms race goes on unremittingly.

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

Europe is the continent where a gigantic arsenal of all kinds of armaments has been deployed and which is currently dominated by the political and military blocs of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Treaty, led respectively by the United States of America and the Soviet Union. It is evident that the disarmament issue, be it in Europe or in other regions of the world, cannot be dealt with in isolation from imperialist policy, particularly from that of the super-Powers and the blocs they have created and sustained.

International tension has not heightened by itself, or because of the mere existence of nuclear weapons. For weapons, however deadly, are in the final analysis themselves dead instruments if not used and operated by a human hand. Their manufacture and perfection is a by-product of the policies of the imperialist Powers, which need them as tools for attaining their aggressive and expansionist ambitions and goals.

It is a well known fact that the countries members of these blocs hold in their territories troops and nuclear and conventional weapons belonging to the United States and the Soviet Union. It is now widely acknowledged that the Governments of these European countries have no right whatsoever to exercise control over the bases and the armaments they shelter. As for the European countries, whether in the East or the West, they do not and cannot possibly have the least desire to support upon their backs the nuclear weapons, troops and bases of the super-Powers, as they cannot possibly wish to bind themselves with the super-Powers' chains nor to become hostages to their nuclear threat.

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

Lately, Europe, and along with it the whole world, is witnessing an agreement in principle between the United States of America and the Soviet Union connected with the double zero option formula, according to which the United States and the Soviet Union's medium- and short-range missiles will be removed from Europe. As far as the People's Socialist Republic of Albania is concerned, it has from the very outset been opposed to the deployment of those missiles on the European continent. It has joined its voice of protest to that of the European peoples who by millions took to the streets to oppose the installation of the medium-range missiles on their continent. None the less, the super-Powers, with complete disregard for the will of the peoples and in full opposition to it, did install their missiles on our continent. There can be no question that we who from the very start opposed their installation are unequivocally in favour of their immediate dismantling and destruction, just as we are also against all nuclear, chemical and other weapons of destruction wherever they are. However, when the super-Powers deployed those missiles, and even now that they are talking of removing them, it is sure that they have made their own calculations, which in no way means that they care for the security of others nor that in so doing they are prompted by their concern for genuine disarmament.

The reasons compelling the super-Powers to talk and sometimes even agree on an insignificant, partial and sectorial slow-down or reduction of the arms race are numerous. They may be military, political, economic, internal, external and so forth. It goes without saying that both sides will strive to make the most of this agreement for their own propagandæ purposes on a domestic and international level. Yet, despite this step, the truth remains that as far as the avoidance of war and the safeguarding of international peace and security are concerned, nothing has really changed for the better. The nuclear arsenals of the super-Powers remain

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

vast and their quality is constantly being perfected. The banning of a certain type or a fraction of missiles does not in any significant manner reduce the danger of a conscious or accidental nuclear war. Moreover, the huge arsenals of conventional weapons, which also have destructive effects are still there.

It is common knowledge that a nuclear war would ruin life on our planet. However, is it not suspicious and misleading repeatedly to overemphasize the priority of nuclear disarmament alone and almost forget the threat of conventional weapons and the need for disarmament in this field as well? Let us recall that 20 million people met their deaths in more than 150 local wars and conflicts fought with conventional weapons after the Second World War and that expenditures for conventional armaments account for 80 per cent of the total military expenditures of the world. Therefore, it cannot but sound cynical to tell those who have witnessed the death of millions killed by conventional weapons to console themselves over the fact that they were able to escape nuclear disaster.

Ever more often we are hearing the super-Powers speak about the importance of the summit meetings between them, as countries bearing special responsibilities from the military point of view. They also continue to tell us that it is of paramount importance that the international political climate should be favourable for the success of their meetings. From another perspective this seems to convey the message that when the super-Powers are busy bargaining to reach an agreement between them the rest of us must keep quiet and pray for the success of their talks, or else their peaceful mood may be spoiled and they may get angry. And as we know from ancient mythology, when Zeus was angered on Olympus, he hurled arrows of fire on those below. If such logic were to be accepted, it would mean that the peoples consent to leaving their destinies in the hands of the two super-Powers.

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

We think that such a situation should not be tolerated. The United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, has rightly posed the question: By what right do the leading nuclear Powers decide the fate of all mankind?

We are of the opinion that in matters pertaining to international peace and security, each and every country, big or small, is greatly interested and concerned, and each should therefore have its own say. Otherwise, we would have to admit that the role played by the international community has been reduced to simply providing a setting for the scenarios written by the super-Powers, or to an audience that simply takes note of or applauds the decisions adopted by them.

In recent years the notion of nuclear-free-zones has become a topic for discussion and proposals within and without the United Nations. There is no doubt that it is up to the peoples and Governments of those countries to decide upon the creation of such zones. But what is noteworthy is that the super-Powers have made this a favourite topic and repeatedly mention to others, never failing to point out explicitly the advantages to be derived from it. Naturally, the question arises: Why is it that the very ones who are armed to the teeth with nuclear weapons are so eager and interested in trying to talk others into the creation of nuclear-free-zones by constantly pointing out the benefits that would ensue therefrom. Furthermore, to sound convincing they go to such lengths as to promise not to use their nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear States and nuclear-weapons-free zones. To say the least, this kind of interest and concern sounds insincere and arouses suspicion.

A paradoxical situation has been created in the disarmament field. First, we are confronted with the manufacture of one or several types of weapons; then come proposals for limiting or banning them. This very much resembles a symbiosis of real armament with false disarmament.

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

At the beginning of September this year, within the framework of the United Nations, an International Conference was held on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. The People's Socialist Republic of Albania could not but join with those condemning the frenzied arms race of the imperialist Powers, the super-Powers first among them, which absorbs colossal monetary amounts and vast human and natural resources at a time when the world, in whole regions and continents, is confronted with economic backwardness, under-development, illiteracy, famine, disease, epidemics and so on and so forth. Life bears witness to the fact that the super-Powers have no real desire to disarm themselves. Much less can it be expected that they will disarm so as to release funds and reallocate them to development. Imperialism has never been distinguished for altruism of any kind. It is distinguished by extreme selfishness and greed in plundering others, for domination and expansion which it endeavours to accomplish by all manner and means, preferably weapons, war and aggression.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): We have just heard the last speaker on our list for the meeting this afternoon. I shall now call on the representative of the United Kingdom to introduce a draft resolution.

Miss JOLESBY (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): Mr. Chairman, as this is the first time I have spoken in this Committee, may I offer you my congratulations on your election to the Chair. I personally have happy memories of my own earlier association with Zaire and I am delighted that the Permanent Representative of Zaire is now our Chairman.

I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations" (A/C.1/42/L.2) on behalf of the delegations of Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

I do not need to underline to this Committee the immense significance, for all the nations represented in this room, of the bilateral negotiations going on between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Those two countries possess, between them, the overwhelming number of nuclear weapons in the world, as well as the greatest capability for the military use of space.

It is perhaps not surprising, in view of the complexity of the issues under negotiation, as well as the vital security issues at stake, that the negotiations have been difficult and protracted. They have had their ups and their downs. Now, however, as a result of recent developments, the negotiations seem firmly set on a positive path.

When they met in Washington last month, Secretary of State Shultz and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze issued a joint statement that they had reached agreement in principle to conclude a treaty on the question of intermediate and shorter-range missiles. The two sides agreed to work intensively in Geneva to resolve remaining

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

technical issues and promptly to complete the text of a draft treaty. As we have heard from the statements of the Soviet and American representatives, this work has been going on, although it is not yet completed.

In addition - and this is most important - the two sides also agreed that a similarly intensive effort should be made to achieve a treaty on 50 per cent reductions in strategic offensive arms within the framework of the Geneva nuclear and space talks. We have also heard accounts from the American and Soviet representatives of how these negotiations are going.

A further important meeting is due to take place between Secretary of State Shultz and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze in Moscow at the end of next week. We must all hope that this will further the process that is in train. There is also the prospect of a summit meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev being agreed.

We have always believed that the General Assembly should offer constructive support to the two sides in their vitally important negotiations, which are clearly now entering a crucial stage. We are convinced that this support needs to be expressed in a considered, substantive and comprehensive manner. We have, accordingly, in consultation with a number of other countries, prepared the draft resolution that is before you. We believe that it could form the basis of a common expression of view to be sent by the General Assembly to the two countries concerned before their forthcoming meeting.

We have constructed the text carefully to try to take account of the latest situation, as well as of the views of a wide spectrum of countries. We are well aware that there may be additional views on other elements to be considered, and the Committee already has before it a text in document A/C.1/42/L.1 submitted by Romania, which is directed to the subject-matter of our own draft.



(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

Let me make it crystal clear that we believe that this year the Assembly should aim to send a united message to the two sides in the bilateral negotiations. We are accordingly most open to suggestions on our text, and also ready to enter into consultations with all interested parties in order to seek consensus.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I should like to remind members that, during the 6th meeting of this Committee on 15 October, it was proposed that in so far as possible the Committee should take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.1. On the basis of consultations which are still continuing, and on the basis of other developments, it would seem that the Committee finds it desirable to hold additional consultations on this matter in order then to consider appropriate action to be taken. If I hear no objection, I shall consider that the Committee accepts this way of proceeding.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.