United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION
Official Records *

FIRST COMMITTEE
4th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 16 October 1979
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 4th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

79-74021

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/34/PV.4
23 October 1979

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 30 TO 45, 120 AND 121

GENERAL DEBATE

The CHAIRMAN: The First Committee is today starting its substantive work. In accordance with its programme of work and time-table, we will begin with the consideration of the disarmament items. Although many of the items on our agenda are a carry-over from previous years, the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, adopted a number of decisions and recommendations which added to the momentum of United Nations efforts in the field of disarmament. Consequently, I urge the members of the Committee that, in making statements in the general debate, they lay a special emphasis on those recommendations and subsequent follow-up. The Committee's programme of work listed item 42, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session", separately from other disarmament items in order that an additional and special measure of emphasis may be given to the consideration of that item.

(The Chairman)

Needless to say, disarmament remains one of the most important problems facing the international community and therefore requires continuous and vigorous efforts. It demands a stronger commitment on the part of all of us to work diligently towards halting the arms race and channelling the vast resources thus released to the much needed economic and social development in the developing countries, and above all to strengthen international peace and security and save mankind from possible holocaust.

As we call for more diligent and vigorous efforts to make a breakthrough in disarmament, we should nevertheless take note of some positive developments in the area of bilateral and multilateral agreements. I refer in particular to the signing of the SALT II Treaty by two super-Powers, and hope that this development will leave its impact not only on the reduction of nuclear and strategic arms but also on other area of armaments. The implementation of SALT II is the beginning of SALT III negotiations. There has been some reported progress in the area of chemical weapons and the ban on nuclear tests, but the anxiety of the international community over the arms race will not diminish unless substantive progress has been achieved very soon.

As members of the Committee address all or some of the disarmament items on the agenda of this session, they will have the opportunity to express their views and state their positions on what has been and what should have been achieved. Time should not be wasted and efforts should not be spared to make meaningful progress in this area. Notwithstanding the realities of the world situation and the difficulties that we are all aware of, there are many potential areas of agreement that should be explored if we are to reach a satisfactory conclusion of our work.

I should like to draw attention to the First Committee's document A/C.1/34/1/Add.1, which contains a letter from the President of the General Assembly addressed to me, informing me that the General Assembly had allotted to the First Committee for consideration an additional item 126, entitled "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations".

In view of this decision of the General Assembly, and in pursuance of the consultations we held with the parties concerned, the Bureau of the First Committee ventured to devote the meetings this afternoon and tomorrow

(The Chairman)

afternoon to the introduction and consideration of that item, and also to allot 30 November for further discussion and action upon it.

I should like to make one further clarification with respect to the decision reached by the Bureau, and this concerns the list of speakers for today, tomorrow and Thursday, 16 to 18 October.
On the days allotted for our discussion there were few representatives who had inscribed their names, and the decision was taken mainly in the interest of saving time and to get our work started. For this reason only, the representative of the Soviet Union will be making introductory remarks with regard to item 126.

I call now on the first speaker for this morning.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, I hope you will not consider it a violation of rule 110 of the rules of procedure if, before getting into the substance of my statement, I say that, having had the privilege of following your discreet but effective work in First Committee matters over many years, my delegation is most gratified to see you presiding over our deliberations. I am convinced that this is the best promise of success in our work.

Among the results of that memorable session we have come to refer to - although it is a misnomer - as the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, pride of place must obviously be given its Final Document, adopted by consensus, whose four sections contain the definitions of a series of principles objectives, priorities, measures, procedures and machinery for channelling and encouraging the efforts of all countries in order to do away with the threat of a nuclear war, stem the arms race and create a comprehensive disarmament programme covering all measures deemed advisable for the achievement of general and complete disarmament under effective international control in a world in which international peace and security can reign, and in which the New International Economic Order can be created, consolidated and strengthened.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Three separate paragraphs of that Document (A/S-10/4), in fact, stressed the need for implementation of its provisions in keeping with the desires of the Assembly, lest it follow in the footsteps of so many others that have been consigned to oblivion. Thus, in paragraph 42 there is specific provision that "...Member States ... declare that they will respect the objectives and principles" set forth in the Declaration which comprises the second part of the Document. Another paragraph, paragraph 126, contains the solemn affirmation by Members of their decision to implement "practical measures aimed at halting and reversing the arms race". A third paragraph, paragraph 17, stressed that "the pressing need now is to translate into practical terms the provisions of this Final Document and to proceed along the road of binding and effective international agreements in the field of disarmament."

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

It therefore becomes evident that such agreements must primarily result from the work of what the special session termed the only multilateral disarmament forum for negotiation, which has been entitled the Committee on Disarmament.

Since that organ has just held its first session, I believe it would not be untoward to consider its discussions and the results thereof in order to gather some idea of how States have lived up to their commitments or, to use the terms used in item 13 of the agenda of this Committee, to consider "implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session" that are directly related to the work of the Committee on Disarmament.

As can be seen from the report of the Committee itself, almost the entire first part of its session this year, the "spring session", was devoted to questions of organization and procedure. In the course of that session, the Committee - under the successive chairmanships of Argentina, Australia and Belgium, in application of the system of monthly rotation of chairmanship set forth in paragraph 120 of the Final Document that has replaced the unheard of institution of permanent co-chairmanship by the nuclear super-Powers - elaborated and adopted its rules of procedure, its agenda and its first programme of work. Since the debate and the results thereof are reproduced in the Committee's report, as is the programme of work approved for the "summer session", I shall limit myself to making a few comments that may help to facilitate the reading and assessment of the report.

The rules of procedure are composed of a brief introduction, 47 rules and an annex that contains an alphabetical listing of members. With the exception of rule 18, which simply repeats, word for word, the provisions of the Final Document of the special session and reiterates that the Committee "shall conduct its work and adopt its decisions by consensus", all the rules contain additions that enrich the very concise stipulations of the Document.

Regarding the functions and composition of the Committee, aside from repeating that it is a disarmament-negotiating forum open to nuclear-weapon States and 35 other States, and that its membership will be reviewed at regular intervals, the rules of procedure go on to state in rule 3 that:

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

"All member States of the Committee shall take part in its work in conditions of full equality as independent States, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations."

The provisions of rules 21 and 23, if correctly understood, could, we believe, prevent the Committee on Disarmament from falling into stagnation and paralysis whenever the nuclear-weapon States are unable to submit to it a draft treaty or convention on which they have managed to come to an agreement. In point of fact, rule 21 states that:

"If the Committee is unable to take a decision on the substance of an item under negotiation, it will consider the subsequent examination of that item."

Turning to rule 23, we see that the Committee will be able not only to set up open-ended subsidiary bodies but also to exempt itself from that general rule and create ad hoc sub-committees, working groups and other bodies with a more restricted membership. That would allow the nuclear Powers, when they considered it necessary, to carry out bilateral agreements they considered to be important, as has been the case during the last two years in the discussion of tripartite talks on the prohibition of nuclear testing, in the form of preliminary negotiations. The form of negotiations would not be changed, but there would be a difference that we consider to be basic. It is that they would be acting as an organ of the Committee on Disarmament, and the Committee on Disarmament would be the master of appropriate procedures to ensure that it is constantly and adequately informed of progress in the negotiations.

May I take the liberty of recalling something that we have repeatedly stated both here and in many other forums. We are convinced that there is no reason to make it an indispensable requisite for the nuclear Powers to transmit to the multilateral negotiating organ a draft treaty or draft convention that they may have been negotiating among themselves in order for that document to be considered complete. Appropriate implementation of the provisions of rules 21 and 23, to which I have just referred could be a solution to that problem that would be acceptable to all concerned.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Turning to section VIII of the rules of procedure, "Agenda and programme of work", we feel that we must primarily stress the very praiseworthy flexibility that in no way diminishes the precision of the item, introducing the new elements contained in rules 30 and 31. According to rule 31, while the work of the Committee is in progress member States may request the inclusion of an urgent item in the agenda, and, according to rule 30, the subject of statements made in plenary meetings will normally correspond to the topic then under discussion, and it is the right of any member State of the Committee to raise any subject relevant to the work of the Committee at a plenary meeting even though it is not specifically included in the agenda or the programme of work.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

By virtue of the terms of rules 32 to 36, we see that a procedural system has been set up which guarantees the exercise of the rights of the States not members of the Committee as recognized by the special session, touching upon their possible participation in the negotiating body. We feel - I should like to say parenthetically - that this is one of the most important new elements when comparing this series of rules of procedure with those of the CCD.

With respect to language, I think it is useful to point out that, in accordance with the rules of procedure, the languages of the Committee shall be those "used within the United Nations system by Member States of the Committee who are participating in its work". Pursuant to that provision, the Chinese language will automatically be added to those five already mentioned in the foot-note to the rules of procedure as soon as China occupies the seat reserved for it in the Committee, which we hope will occur at the beginning of the 1980 session, that is, next February.

At the beginning of each of the annual sessions, the Committee is to adopt its agenda for that year, in accordance with the terms of rule 27 of the rules of procedure, and the Committee will take into account the following three items: recommendations made to it by the General Assembly, proposals presented by member States of the Committee and the decisions of the Committee itself.

On the other hand, the programme of work is not an annual matter. The Committee will prepare the programme at the beginning of each of the two parts of its annual session. That programme will include a schedule of activities which is to be adopted. In so doing, the Committee shall take into account "the recommendations made to it by the General Assembly, the proposals presented by member States of the Committee and the decisions of the Committee".

The terms of rule 20 define the public nature of the Committee's meetings; the official documents of the Committee will be made available to the public, as noted in rule 40, as will also the communications that may be made by the non-governmental organizations, pursuant to the terms of rule 42. All these provisions can only lead to an improved situation from which mutual advantage will be derived both by world public opinion and by the multilateral negotiating bodies on disarmament.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The penultimate section of the rules, which deals with "Reports to the United Nations General Assembly", covers rules 43 to 46 and includes a series of data and suggestions, among which I believe the following must be mentioned: the drafts of reports, whether annual or special, shall be made available to all member States of the Committee for consideration "at least two weeks before the scheduled date for their adoption"; the annual report shall be distributed to all Members of the United Nations before the opening of the regular session of the General Assembly for that year; the reports of the Committee shall be factual and reflect the negotiations and work of the Committee and, inter alia, will contain the agenda, a summary of specific requests addressed to the Committee by the United Nations General Assembly at its preceding regular session, conclusions and decisions of the Committee, working papers and proposals submitted during the year, verbatim records of the meetings held during the year, distributed as a separate annex, an index of the items and an index of the verbatim records by country and by item.

Finally, rule 47 entitled "Amendments", which closes the main body of the rules of procedure, is a very useful reminder that we must keep in mind that if laws and even constitutions are not immutable, far less can we expect the rules of procedure to be immutable. Whenever circumstances make it necessary, rules of procedure must be adjusted to the requirements of reality, which is in a constant state of flux and evolution.

After adopting and approving the rules of procedure, the Committee turned to the preparation of the agenda for 1979 and the organization of its work for the first part of that session. For that purpose it followed the same procedure that had been used in the case of the adoption of the rules of procedure, namely, an ad hoc working group was constituted. Its membership was declared open to all States members of the Committee. Basing himself on the results of almost one month of work by the ad hoc Working Group, the Chairman of the Committee submitted a document which, upon adoption, became the agenda of the Committee. The text can be found reproduced in paragraph 20 of the report to the General Assembly. That agenda is in three parts. The first two parts contain an introduction and a general definition of the competence and jurisdiction of the Committee, which will be permanent in meaning and application, whereas the third part is to be adapted yearly to the requirements of the prevailing international situation.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The introduction begins with the general statement that the Committee on Disarmament, as the multilateral negotiating forum, "shall promote the attainment of general and complete disarmament under effective international control", which leads us to hope that the Committee will try to revive activities to achieve that noble aim. Since the beginning of the 1960s, however, that noble objective has only served rhetorical purposes. The introduction further states that when dealing with the cessation of the arms race and disarmament, the Committee will take into account "the relevant provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assemby devoted to disarmament".

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

With regard to the second portion of the agenda, its content met the need to define the competence of the Committee in very general terms which would avoid the discussions which would inevitably have arisen had any effort been made to define it in an exhaustive list of items. It was thus that the definition was made under 10 headings - to which the Committee referred in its debates as the "decalogue" - which because of their scope, cover, virtually all the principles, objectives, measures and procedures contemplated in the Final Document of the special Assembly session. The 10 headings are as follows. I. Nuclear weapons in all aspects; II. Chemical weapons; III. Other weapons of mass destruction; IV. Conventional weapons; V. Reduction of military budgets; VI. Reduction of armed forces; VII. Disarmament and development; VIII. Disarmament and international security; IX. Collateral measures; confidence-building measures; effective verification methods in relation to appropriate disarmament measures, acceptable to all parties concerned; X. Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament leading to general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

Within the framework thus defined, the Committee adopted an agenda for 1979 which, apart from the consideration and approval of the annual report to the General Assembly, contained five substantive items: nuclear test-ban; cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament; so-called "negative guarantees" to the non-nuclear-weapon States; prohibition of chemical weapons; and prohibition of new weapons of mass destruction including radiological weapons. With the exception of the final week, which was devoted to the report to the Assembly, the Committee devoted its entire summer session to the consideration of those five basic items in the manner and with the results that I shall now attempt to outline.

With regard to a nuclear test ban, when the Committee began its consideration of this item, the prevailing situation was the same as that which had faced the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) the previous year and consisted of waiting for a "positive conclusion" to the negotiations which, from mid-1977, had been in progress between the three States members of the CCD which possessed nuclear weapons, the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. Such a result had been urged by the General Assembly, both in the Final Document of the special session and in General Assembly resolutions 32/78 of 12 December 1977 and 33/60 of 14 December 1978. The justification of this urging on the part of the Assembly will be obvious to anyone with even the most superficial idea of the background of this matter.

(Mr. Abdia Pobiti, Togo)

This is, in fact, a subject with which the United Nations General Assembly has been concerned for a quarter of a century. The pages of the documents of the Organization, of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee and of the CCD which contain the statements and proposals on this matter may be counted not in the hundreds or even in the thousands, but in the tens of thousands. The question was debated in the General Assembly for the first time in 1954. The next year the first resolution on the subject was adopted - General Assembly resolution 914 (X) - and in 1957 the Assembly urged Member States, in resolution 1148 (XII), to come to an agreement on the immediate suspension of "testing of nuclear weapons". Since 1959 this item has figured each year on the agenda of the General Assembly, and beginning in the 1960s its title became "Urgent need for the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests" which title in turn gave way in 1974 to "Conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition" of such tests.

In the last 24 years the General Assembly has adopted no less than 38 resolutions on the matter. From 1971 the CCD was asked to assign "maximum priority" to its work towards the conclusion of that treaty. On seven separate occasions the Assembly has "condemned" all nuclear weapons tests, on three of them "vigorously" or "with the greatest energy" or "with the greatest emphasis".

> In 1972 and 1973 the General Assembly reaffirmed its deep apprehension at "the harmful consequences of nuclear weapons tests for the acceleration of the arms race and for the health of present and future generations of mankind". (resolution 2934 C (XXVII)).

It thus referred both to underground tests and tests in the atmosphere and in 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977 and 1978 it reiterated and broadened its original declarations on the matter. Since 1974, it has expressed its conviction that

> "the continuance of nuclear weapons testing will intensify the arms race, thus increasing the danger of nuclear war".

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The Committee on Disarmament at its recent session took into account the second report of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events, and three working papers, as described in paragraph 37 of the Committee's report to the Assembly, were submitted. At the meetings devoted to consideration of this subject the statements stressed again the urgent need to arrive at an agreement on the treaty which has been vainly sought for so long. Thus the Mexican delegation, in a statement made on 21 June last, recalled the conclusions arrived at by the Secretary-General of the United Nations more than seven years earlier. In the statement he made in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on 29 February 1972 he made the following comments, among others:

"There is no matter in the field of disarmament that has been the subject of so much study and discussion as that of the cessation of nuclear weapon tests. I believe that all the technical and scientific aspects of the problem have been so thoroughly studied that all that is needed now to achieve a final agreement is the political will. The increasingly strong conviction is shared by the nations of the world that the prohibition of underground tests in itself is the most important, if not the only feasible, measure which in the near future will curb the nuclear arms race, at least as far as its qualitative aspects are concerned....

"Although I understand and acknowledge that there seems to be a difference in the effectiveness of the methods of seismological detection and identification of underground nuclear tests, the most knowledgeable experts feel that there are possibilities of identifying all these explosions to a level of a few kilotons. Although a few such tests can be carried out clandestinely, it is very improbable that such tests could escape all detection. Furthermore, one is justified in asking whether there is any valid or important strategic reason for continuing those tests or in fact whether such tests of small magnitude have any military value at all ...".

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

In concluding his comments, the Secretary-General went on to say seven years ago - and it is still valid today:

"In the light of all these considerations, I must come to the inescapable conclusion that the potential risks inherent in a continuation of the underground testing of nuclear weapons are much greater than any possible risks there may be in the ending of such tests."

In the statement my delegation made in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, we also dwelt on one aspect of the statement of the Secretary-General, which, in the light of the imminence of the second Review Conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which is to be held next year, is particularly significant. That aspect was defined by Mr. Waldheim as follows:

"A total test-ban treaty would be an important step towards the cessation of what has been termed 'vertical proliferation', that is to say, the further improvement and expansion of nuclear weapons, and that treaty would also strengthen the determination of those States that have the possibility of becoming nuclear States not to acquire nuclear weapons, thus contributing to the prevention of the 'horizontal proliferation' of such weapons.

"Furthermore, if the nuclear Powers continue the testing of nuclear weapons, they might jeopardize the confidence that might be placed in future in the Non-Proliferation Treaty which was achieved after so many efforts and even endanger the viability of that Treaty. I need not dwell on the very acute dangers which would then confront the world in that case."

Unfortunately, in spite of this recapitulation I have made, the Committee was unable to carry out any negotiations on the matter; for there was received from the nuclear Powers participating in the trilateral negotiations, on 31 July - that is, at the very end of the session - only a very vague and general report in which, under the guise of a conclusion, it was stated:

"Though there is agreement on the main elements of verification, negotiations are still proceeding on the detailed arrangements", since verification

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

"is a complex subject, involving many technical issues that require time to negotiate". (CD/PV.46, p. 10)

Thus it is understandable that the Group of 21 - which, as is well known, is composed of members of the Committee that do not belong to either of the two great military alliances - pronounced itself on that document as follows:

"The Group expresses its dissatisfaction with the report on the trilateral negotiations, conveyed at the very end of the Committee on Disarmament's session. The Group believes that it should have been possible for the States concerned to provide a comprehensive and detailed report on the status of those negotiations and of the areas of agreement and disagreement. However, it is apparent from the reported progress made in the trilateral negotiations, as indicated in the official statements of the States concerned, that there is no justification to delay any further the initiation of concrete negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament on a CTBT.

"The Group, therefore, affirms that such negotiations should be initiated at the beginning of the next session of the Committee on Disarmament as the highest priority item." (CD/50, p. 2)

(Mr. Garcia-Robles, Mexico)

Contrary to what occurred with the previous item, with regard to that one, entitled "The cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament," there was a most encouraging turn that seemed to augur an opening of the road towards the adoption of the idea that the Committee on Disarmament is the most appropriate body in which multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament could take place. This conviction was sparked by the submission of a working paper by seven socialist States - among them one of the nuclear super-Powers - in which it was proposed that preparatory consultations take place in the Committee for the ultimate holding of nuclear disarmament negotiations within the framework of the Committee on Disarmament.

It was a matter of particular satisfaction to note the constructive, realistic and balanced approach shown in some of the proposals included in that document. Among them, I would cite the following.

Quite correctly, it was stated:

"Agreement on this important problem can be reached only provided there is strict observance of the principle of the inviolability of the security of States and the interests of peace throughout the world. The elaboration and implementation of measures in the field of nuclear disarmament should be buttressed by the parallel strengthening of political and international legal guarantees of the security of States." (CD/4, p. 1)

And with regard to the ultimate goal and the evolution of the negotiations, that same document stated:

"The subject of negotiations should be the ending of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and the gradual reduction of their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed. At different stages of the negotiations consideration could be given, for example, to cessation of the production of fissionable materials for military purposes, gradual reduction of the accumulated

stockpiles of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles, destruction of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles. Agreement should also be reached on the necessary verification measures." (Ibid.)

With regard to the stages in the negotiations, the working paper went on to suggest:

"The cessation of the production, the reduction and the destruction of nuclear weapons should be carried out by stages on a mutually acceptable and agreed basis. The content of measures at each stage may be decided by agreement among the participants in the negotiations. The degree of participation of individual nuclear States in measures at each stage should be determined taking into account the quantitative and qualitative importance of the existing arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States and of other States concerned. The existing balance in the field of nuclear strength should remain undisturbed at all stages with the levels of nuclear strength being constantly reduced." (ibid., p.2)

The debates on this subject, as the report of the Committee shows, "helped to clarify different ways of approaching nuclear disarmament" and shall "be continued and redoubled at the forthcoming session to arrive at an agreed upon basis for progress in these negotiations". The Group of 21, however, was more explicit and, after expressing the opinion that Committee on disarmament "constitutes the most appropriate forum for the preparation and the holding" of negotiations of this nature, it went on to state that, on the basis of the progress that may be achieved as a result of "unofficial meetings and consultations" in the Committee, consideration might be given to the possibility of setting up a working group to negotiate agreements and concrete measures in the field of nuclear disarmament.

With regard to the so-called negative guarantees which appeared in the agenda under the long-winded title,

"Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons." (A/34/27, p.6)

this was the only subject on which a consensus was arrived at for the establishment of a working group, and that was a step forward even though the existence of that working group was limited to the session of the Committee for the present year.

The Group, which was given the four documents which the Committee had on the matter, held seven meetings and its report appears as Appendix II of the Report of the Committee to the Assembly. The Committee adopted the recommendation of the Group to continue negotiations on this subject, regarding which the Group of 21 has already given its opinion that in 1980.

> "...the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group should be renewed so as to continue the search for a common approach which could be included in an effective international instrument to assure the non-nuclear weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons." (CD/50, pp. 2-3)

The topic of the negotiations on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons, and of their destruction, enjoyed the two-fold privilege of having been among those that were included in the agenda under the most concise title, simply, "Chemical weapons," and it was the one that led to the presentation of the largest number of Working Papers. In fact, 14 were submitted on the subject, as can be seen in the list that appears in paragraph 53 of the report.

Despite the abundance of that documentation, which in fact is only a very faint reflection of the over-abundant documentation that the Committee inherited from the CCD, containing no less than three draft conventions submitted to it, respectively, by a group of socialist States, in 1972, by Japan in 1974 and by the United Kingdom in 1976, some idea of the volume of which we can gather from the fact that the Secretary of the Committee was able to prepare a "Listing of materials on chemical weapons" which includes an inventory of about 700 references dealing with the main aspects of the subject, culled from the Working Papers submitted to

(Mr. Garcia-Robles, Mexico)

the CCD and the Committee on disarmament and from the declarations made in those two organs in the period 1972 1979 - to all of which were added the proposals made at the very beginning of the 1979 session by the delegations of Italy and the Netherlands and by the Group of 21, in their respective working papers - no assent was forthcoming from the two States participating in the bilateral agreements for the setting up of a special Working Group open to participation by all member States of the Committee to prepare a draft convention on the subject under discussion, namely, chemical weapons.

(Mr. Gerald Hobbs, Guyana)

What was achieved, however, was to get the United States and the Soviet Union to submit a "USSR-United States joint report on progress in the bilateral negotiations on the prohibition of nuclear weapons". That report, which goes into far more detail and is more precise than all those that had been submitted earlier by the two Powers to the CCD, was composed of 33 paragraphs, the last of which read as follows:

> "The United States and the Soviet Union note the great importance attached to the elaboration of a convention by the General Assembly of the United Nations and the Committee on Disarmament which manifested itself, in particular, in the identification of the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons as one of the priority items on the agenda adopted for the current session of the Committee on Disarmament. Both sides will exert their best efforts to complete the bilateral negotiations and present a joint initiative to the Committee on Disarmament on this most important and extremely complex problem as soon as possible." (CD/48, p. 5)

The Committee noted "with satisfaction" that report, which it termed a "substantial joint statement" and it added that "taking into account the fact that the prohibition of chemical weapons is one of the most urgent and vital problems in the area of disarmament", it would "proceed with negotiations at its 1980 session". (A/34/27, para. 54)
In turn, the Group of 21 repeated its conviction that "an Ad Hoc Working Group should be established at the beginning of the next session to negotiate on a CW convention". (CD/50, p. 3)

The last of the substantive items on the agenda of the Committee for 1979 was that entitled "New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons".

This was the only subject among the three on which prior negotiations have been carried out by two or more of the great Powers outside the ambit of the multilateral negotiating body on which the negotiators - in this case, the United States and the Soviet Union - were able to come to an agreement on the main elements of a treaty which will deal with "prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons", the text of which (CD/32) was jointly presented to the Committee on 9 July 1979.

(Mr. Garcia-Robles, Mexico)

Although the Committee "welcomed with pleasure" the submission of that joint proposal. it nevertheless reached the conclusion that it could only carry out a "preliminary study" of the document because of the limited amount of time available to it, and that therefore consideration of it would have to be resumed next year together with consideration of the general problem of "new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons".

I think it timely to recall, when glancing at this entire question, that in each and every one of the resolutions of the General Assembly on the subject we are discussing careful specification has been made of the need to give special consideration to this subject in the negotiating body - the CCD first, and the Committee on Disarmament now - "taking into account the priorities" set for the different tasks entrusted to those bodies, which obviously means that the "maximum priority" attributed to the cessation of nuclear weapons tests and the "high priority" given the elimination of chemical weapons must not in any way be affected by the work being done on the subject of the prohibition of the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction. Perhaps it is there that we must seek the explanation for the somewhat reserved attitude and the somewhat faint enthusiasm with which the Committee received the joint proposal from the two super-Powers on the prohibition of radiological weapons.

The synopsis of the work of the first session of the Committee on Disarmament and the results achieved that I have endeavoured to present here allow us to draw a number of conclusions, and to close this statement which is, I think, becoming a trifle too long, I shall limit myself to pointing out those that I deem fundamental. They are as follows.

The Committee on Disarmament can justly pride itself on having achieved in one month what the CCD was impotent to achieve in 17 years, namely, the working out and the approval of an extremely complete series of rules of procedure, and on having, in four weeks, successfully prepared an agenda which contains aside from the subjects for discussion in 1979, others of permanent importance , listing under ten very general headings the decalogue which defines the competence of the Committee. In the future this will greatly facilitate the preparation of the yearly agendas and of the two programmes of work which will have to be included in each of them.

(Mr. Garcia-Robles, Mexico)

Unfortunately the same cannot be said of the work of the Committee devoted to more substantive matters. Naturally when as complex and delicate a subject as negotiations on disarmament is being considered, no date can be set for a successful conclusion of the discussions, particularly on each and every one of the numerous problems that these items include. But it is possible to set a target date, beyond which it is inconceivable that we try to keep a body on which the General Assembly unanimously agreed to confer the honour of being the only multilateral negotiating body on disarmament outside negotiations on disarmament and in absolute ignorance of the basic elements of such negotiations.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

We believe that that target date has passed, particularly in respect of the two main agenda items on concrete disarmament measures. The United Nations Secretary-General himself seems to have arrived at that same conclusion. His message to the first meeting of the Committee on Disarmament on 24 January 1979 - although drafted in the circumspect terms that his high office dictates for such a message - could not be interpreted otherwise. Indeed, in that message Mr. Waldheim stated the following unequivocal views:

"Once again, the General Assembly has attached the highest priority to the conclusion of agreements on a comprehensive test ban and the prohibition of chemical weapons. I urge the parties in the trilateral or bilateral negotiations on these subjects to resolve the remaining issues so that drafts of agreements on both may be submitted for consideration by the Committee and later by the General Assembly. While negotiations with limited participation can be useful for formulating texts which could serve as the basis for further consideration in the Committee, they can cause a sense of frustration when they fail to produce results even after a reasonable period of time. I hope that the work of this Committee will not be hampered by this factor. But if it is, I would invite the membership, including naturally the parties in those parallel negotiations, to consider ways and means to bring them within the purview of the Committee."
(CD/PV.1, p. 14)

My delegation considers that the detailed joint report submitted by the two super-Powers to the Committee on the bilateral negotiations on the elimination of chemical weapons constitutes a first step in the right direction. It should, however, be completed as soon as the 1980 session starts, with the presentation of an equally broad report on the trilateral negotiations on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and with the establishment of respective working groups open to all members of the Committee.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The renewal of the mandate of the Working Group on the so-called negative guarantees must also be ensured. The consideration of the elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme - which was prepared last May by the Disarmament Commission and which, no doubt, the Assembly will submit to the Committee - followed by the creation of another ad hoc group which will immediately set to work to prepare a programme that should be ready before the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament to be held in 1982: the continuation and increase in informal meetings and consultations on nuclear disarmament items submitted to the Committee, so that in due course there can be established a working group for the negotiation of concrete agreements and measures in the field, as proposed by the Group of 21; finally, continuation of the examination of the joint proposal on the prohibition of radiological weapons. All those are so many further steps which we believe the Committee should take during its spring session next year.

We believe that in the appropriate resolutions to be adopted by the General Assembly on the strength of the report of the First Committee, specific provisions should be included to achieve the objectives that I have just outlined. Indeed, we are convinced that, as the President of Mexico Jose Lopez Portillo said during his recent visit to the United Nations:

> "The constant ignoring of resolutions of the annual sessions of the General Assembly produce the impression of an autumnal rite to which the representatives return to discuss the old subjects without heeding and solving the problems that are of concern to the international community.
>
> "Yet we cannot exclude those items from our agenda... Until the great Powers realize that their own security depends on the reduction and ultimate elimination of their nuclear arsenals, we have to repeat our appeal to wisdom and mutual trust...
>
> "The peoples of the world do not want a truce so as to allow the perfection and accumulation of nuclear weapons. They want peace based on collective security and social justice, a peace that will give them a chance to develop independently and jointly to develop the international community."

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the next speaker, I should like to give two reasons why Ambassador Garcia Robles' congratulatory remarks were not interrupted by the Chairman's gavel. First, he dared to be the first speaker and his congratulatory remarks were very brief; and, secondly, I refer to him affectionately as "el bisabuelo de la cuestión de desarme" - the great grandfather of the question of disarmament.

Having said that, I kindly request representatives not to follow his example.

Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia): The purpose of my statement today is to elucidate the substance of the Czechoslovak initiative concerning the adoption of a declaration on international co-operation for disarmament and to introduce a draft of such a declaration contained in document A/34/141/Add.1, relating to agenda item 120.

In a letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations dated 18 June 1979, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic drew attention to this year's May Day appeal by the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Gustav Husak, for the adoption - on the broadest international basis, preferably in the United Nations - of a document that would help States to unite their efforts to solve the urgent questions of disarmament and that would set out the fundamental political principles of mutual co-operation aimed at the achievement of that objective. That document should express the political determination of States to approach disarmament negotiations constructively and to contribute also to the creation of an international climate conducive to the speediest possible achievement of desirable progress.

The actual basis of this idea - the fact that the complex set of urgent problems of disarmament can be successfully tackled only in broad mutual co-operation governed by jointly agreed principles - constitutes a phenomenon which has not yet found appropriate application in this crucial field, although it has found wide-spread expression in a number of other fields of international life and has had a positive influence on them.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

The history of our Organization has demonstrated by numerous examples that the principle of peaceful coexistence among States embodied in the Charter has led, and continues to lead, in the process of its concrete implementation, to the gradual achievement of the objectives set, and that it is effectively facilitating the solution of international problems of an economic, social, cultural, scientific, technological, as well as humanitarian nature. It suffices to recall the positive development of international co-operation in such areas as the peaceful use of nuclear energy, the exploration of outer space, and protection of the living environment. Thus the international community managed to find the ways and means of co-operation in a number of fields serving its advancement. Therefore it should not lack the courage to proceed likewise in an area that serves its self-preservation.

Today, when we are facing huge stockpiles of destructive weapons that despite all efforts have not yet been removed, the extension of the generally recognized principle of peaceful international co-operation also to the field of disarmament is more than timely and its urgency is growing from day to day. This co-operation must assume concrete forms on the broadest possible scale and must be filled with concrete content so that it might lead to the earliest possible tangible results.

Although primary responsibility in the field of disarmament rests with the countries possessing a nuclear potential, and the greatest contribution must therefore be made by them, all States carry their share of responsibility, as was confirmed by the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament.

There is practically no disarmament measure today - not a single disarmament proposal - that could be implemented without mutual constructive co-operation - be it on a bilateral, regional or multilateral basis, or, for that matter, on a narrower or on a universal basis. We are therefore firmly convinced that the spirit of this co-operation should become the common denominator of all efforts for the halting of the arms race and for the achievement of disarmament; it should be their unifying force. However important, or even decisive, the proposals

(Mr. Kejval, Czechoslovakia)

submitted by this or that side, or by this or that country, what is needed is for us to exert our joint efforts so that such proposals might be implemented.

Proceeding from the current situation in the field of disarmament negotiations, characterized by such events as last year's special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the signing of the SALT II Treaty last June in Vienna, we thought it desirable to raise the question of international co-operation in the field of disarmament as such. It is the purpose of our proposal to consider this question in its entire scope and to generalize in the adopted document all the positive experience and to further develop and concretize it on that basis -- in other words, to create an operative instrument that would strengthen the basis for constructive and effective negotiations on concrete questions of disarmament and facilitate their solution in mutual co-operation - a document that would serve as a set of unifying rules, a sort of political guideline, for the common approach by States to the solution of the whole complex of disarmament issues.

The idea of developing international co-operation in the solution of important tasks of our times has already found its fundamental expression in a number of United Nations documents adopted earlier. Thus, for instance, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, adopted by the General Assembly in 1970, points out, among other things, that the progressive development and codification of the principles relating to the duties of States to co-operate with one other in accordance with the Charter will facilitate the implementation of the goals of the United Nations.

In the drafting of our proplsal we proceeded from the Charter of the United Nations, which authorizes the General Assembly to study the general principles of co-operation for the preservation of international peace and security, including disarmament, and to submit recommendations on them to the States Members of the United Nations. The draft declaration that we are submitting is motivated by the necessity to approach the

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

elaboration and implementation of these important provisions of the Charter. We know from experience that as important individual problems in the world were becoming ripe, the situation demanded outright the embodiment of the basic provisions of the Charter in a number of important international documents that have played a positive role, for instance, in the solution of the questions of decolonization, advancement of human rights, status of women, youth and other issues. Today, when the greatest attention is focused on the issue of disarmament, it is necessary for the United Nations to take the proven path. This demand is justified even more by the fact that the United Nations has a primary responsibility for the sphere of disarmament in accordance with the Charter, as was emphasized in its Final Document by the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

As a European country, signatory of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, Czechoslovakia is also guided by the obligation accepted in that document, according to which all participating States will develop co-operation among themselves and with all countries in all fields, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

The Czechoslovak delegation has already had the opportunity of emphasizing the fact that regardless of its specific purpose and though raising an aspect of the solution of the disarmament problem that as yet has not been elaborated, the proposal has an important bearing on the conclusions of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, as well as on the efforts for their implementation. This fact was reaffirmed by the Czechoslovak Minister for Foreign Affairs, who emphasized in his statement in the general debate that our proposal is based on the need to intensify in every respect the comprehensive implementation of the objectives, decisions and recommendations adopted by consensus at the special session and, to that end, to secure as favourable an international climate as possible.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

Together with other socialist countries, we believe that renewed efforts must be exerted to fill the four-year period between the last and the next special sessions of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament through intensive negotiations and the greatest possible number of concrete measures set forth in the Programme of Action of the special session. That is why we fully support the appeal issued in this respect by the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, held recently in Havana. After all, the degree to which we shall be able to capitalize on the results of the last special session will be decisive in determining how far the 1982 session will be able to progress. The given time limits do not allow us to rely on automatic implementation of the set objectives. This calls for mobilization of the political will of States, for unification of their efforts to progress along this road much further and much faster than heretofore.

The Czechoslovak delegation is convinced, that if the cause of disarmament is to be served, then any recommendation on international co-operation for disarmament to be adopted by the General Assembly should take fully into account the conditions created in this field by the special session that are currently exerting a significant influence on the entire process of disarmament negotiations. The proposal that is being submitted by Czechoslovakia has been drafted in a sincere effort to express this fact as exactly as possible and in a balanced way.

It is not our aim to disturb the balance of the Final Document of the special session, or of any other document, but to secure optimum utilization of all provisions contained in the documents relating to international co-operation in the field of disarmament that are determining factors in the positive development of co-operation, not by mechanically repeating those provisions but by further elaborating them and linking them organically in one broadly applicable document.

We do not wish selectively to choose these or those provisions that might be suitable only for certain States or groups of States. What we strive for is a constructive generalization of all the positive experience gained in international co-operation in this field that would serve the general interests of the international community in the process of negotiations on limiting armaments and on disarmament.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

Also, we do not want to reopen discussion on any questions that have already been settled, but we should like conclusions reached to be brought to life more speedily. Nor is it our attention in this way to exert any one-sided influence on the substantive positions held by States on specific disarmament questions or to dispute their security interests. All we desire is to search for ways to bring positions closer together in the spirit of constructive co-operation and the achievement of mutually acceptable solutions.

Our motives are those of humanism. We want to contribute to the disarmament process because we believe that it is otherwise not possible to release the resources that are necessary for development and to remove from the face of the earth hunger, disease, illiteracy and other social disparities the consequences of which also undermine the structure of international peace and security.

We are firmly convinced that all of this is fully in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which emphasized the universal nature of the disarmament issue and the universal obligation of all States to contribute to its solution. We have no doubt that co-operation aimed at the achievement of that objective should be equally universal. And it is our belief that work towards that end cannot be in vain.

Document A/34/141/Add.1, which contains the draft declaration on international co-operation for disarmament submitted by Czechoslovakia, has been available to delegations practically from the beginning of this session of the General Assembly, and the Czechoslovak delegation has already had the opportunity to acquaint a whole number of Member States with its contents in detail, which facilitates my present task of explaining the principal ideas of the draft for the benefit of those who as yet have not had the time to study our draft thoroughly.

The preamble of the draft declaration stresses primarily the importance of the recommendations and decisions adopted at the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, and the urgent need for active and combined efforts further to intensify their comprehensive implementation. I should also like to draw attention to the ideas contained in the preamble: that it is imperative to secure a dynamic development of détente in all spheres of international relations throughout the world, which would contribute to the

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

achievement of the aims of disarmament, and that, at the same time, continuation of the arms race conflicts with the interests of the economic development and the social and spiritual progress of mankind. Other paragraphs of the preamble are devoted to the general questions of ensuring effective, constructive and systematic co-operation in the interests of the solution of disarmament problems and of creating, to that end, a favourable climate of confidence.

The operative part of the draft declaration is composed of four organically interconnected chapters, the common denominator of which is the appeal for mutual co-operation in the active implementation of the disarmament objectives set forth by the tenth special session.

All the provisions of chapter I are concerned with the initiative of States and their active, honest approach to negotiations and measures in the field of disarmament. In that context it calls also for an acceleration of disarmament talks, which should progress at a faster rate than the qualitative development and the stockpiling of weapons. This part also emphasizes the role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

Chapter II of the operative part is fully devoted to both joint and unilateral measures for the further improvement of the climate necessary for the full implementation of the Final Document of the tenth special session and for accelerating the progress of the respective disarmament negotiations. The provisions of this Chapter contain the urgent appeal for measures to reduce further the danger of the outbreak of military conflicts, to repudiate all concepts of seeking military superiority, of concepts based on military intimidation and policies of acting from a position of strength, to prevent propaganda for war, to halt the arms race and to take steps to promote actively the ideals of peace, disarmament and co-operation among States.

Chapter III urges all States to implement the political will expressed in the Final Document of the tenth special session, to strive to achieve concrete measures of disarmament and, in that connexion, emphasizes the most fundamental specific requirements intrinsically connected with all disarmament negotiations. These, in our view, include in particular the solution of disarmament questions in accordance with the generally recognized principles of internatinal law, the questions of undiminished security of each party, of ensuring the appropriate scope of effectiveness of the disarmament measures and appropriate verification measures, as well as holding consultations with one another on disarmament matters.

Chapter IV is devoted to the relationship between the provisions of the declaration and the Charter of the United Nations. It also stresses the inalienable right of every State to self-defence and to struggle for its national freedom and independence in accordance with the Charter.

The draft declaration that I have just introduced was in the course of several months, already in the process of its inception, subject to serious consultations with dozens of States Members of the United Nations and in its present form it reflects many comments and positions that were the result of those consultations. I should like to take this opportunity to extend our sincere thanks to all delegations whose valuable advice and recommendations have helped us to prepare the document now under consideration. Equally, I should like to thank, on behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation, those delegations

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

that have expressed support for this proposal from the rostrum of the current session of the General Assembly. The draft of the declaration is naturally open to all further constructive comments that may arise and the Czechoslovak delegation is ready to co-operate fully with all delegations that may express such interest in the further elaboration and finalization of the text.

The Czechoslovak delegation is submitting the draft declaration on international co-operation for disarmament in the conviction that co-operation in this field is a needed and useful instrument for the prevention of confrontation, the threat of which is posed by the arsenals of arms and their further stockpiling. We believe that the very concept of co-operation is an antipode to confrontation.

In the summer of 1978, the General Assembly unanimously adopted the Final Document of its tenth special session that, for the first time in history, was devoted exclusively to questions of disarmament. One year later the world welcomed with relief the signing of a new agreement between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the limitation of offensive strategic arms - the SALT II agreement. And in these very days peace-loving people in Europe and throughout the world welcomed another important step in the peace policy of the Soviet Union leading to a unilateral reduction of the military concentration in Central Europe. All these events have favourably influenced the international climate and improved the prospects for progress in other disarmament negotiations as well. The international community, and the United Nations at its head, must concentrate all their efforts to ensure that this positive capital is not wasted on the continued senseless arms race. The adoption of the proposal submitted to the current session of the General Assembly by the Czechoslovak delegation could be one of the steps heading in that direction.

Mr. WANYOIKE (Kenya): The United Nations, whose foundation in 1945 coincided with the emergence of atomic weapons, has always been concerned that this dangerous discovery should not be used again except for peaceful purposes. Consequently, almost every year since 1945, the United Nations has striven to live up to that objective, apparently without appreciable satisfaction.

(Mr. Wanyoike, Kenya)

Kenya fully supports the disarmament programme approved by the tenth special session of the General Assembly together with the establishment of the Committee on Disarmament as a negotiating body and the Disarmament Commission as a forum for all Members of the United Nations. Since the formation of this organ, strenuous efforts have been made to bring about the following:

An acceptable international convention or treaty banning underground nuclear-weapon tests.

Nuclear disarmament, including the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty and subsequent reductions of nuclear armaments, with the ultimate goal of their complete elimination.

A complete and comprehensive nuclear test ban remains one of the highest priorities before the Committee on Disarmament, and yet during the summer session of the Committee in Geneva, no progress was made in this very important area. The three countries called upon to come up with acceptable proposals for a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty have so far not succeeded in doing so and there appears to be no visible signs of improvement in this matter. Kenya with concern the delay in coming to grips with this burning issue and urges the three countries to reassess the urgency of the matter and to treat it as a top priority.

With regard to the prohibition of chemical weapons, we must move quickly to reach an international convention that will ban the development, production and stockpiling of these terrible weapons. Efforts to reach an agreement in this area were frustrated at the summer session of the Committee on Disarmament by the refusal of certain delegations to agree to the formation of an ad hoc working group that would have come to grips with the implications of this issue. It is our view that an agreement should be reached quickly and we urge all members of the Committee on Disarmament not to delay this work at the next session.

(Mr. Wanyoike, Kenya)

On the establishment of nuclear weapon free zones, including South America, the Indian Ocean, Africa and South Asia, our delegation has no difficulty whatsoever in agreeing that these areas should be declared nuclear weapon-free zones as a move towards making the entire planet a nuclear weapon-free zone because, if eventually we do not attain that goal and if, in fact, mankind does not boldly accept these steps as a necessary condition for survival, it would be difficult to imagine the continued existence of the human species on this planet should there be a nuclear war.

Regarding the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, the need to inhibit any country from developing such weapons should engage our urgent attention, particularly in the area of drafting about a convention to prohibit the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons. In the Committee on Disarmament, proposals were made towards this objective by a joint statement issued by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America. This statement should be studied very carefully. We feel that there should not be any further delay in bringing about a convention that will ban these terrible weapons.

(Mr. Wanyoike, Kenya)

On the subject of the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, one of the most urgent requests coming from the non-nuclear-weapon States is the need for an international convention that would bring security guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States. The best possible solution would be a move towards a nuclear-weapon test-ban and the eventual total destruction of all stockpiles of nuclear weapons. We therefore call upon nuclear-weapon States to agree to these proposals.

With regard to the prohibition or restriction of the use of certain conventional weapons which may be deemed excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects, a meeting to examine the indiscriminate effects of the use of such weapons has taken place in Geneva and soon its report will be made available to the General Assembly. It is our delegation's view that measures to build confidence and trust among nations should be speeded up. We support the need for all States to work towards arrangements for specific confidence-building measures on a regional basis. And in this context, respect for territorial integrity and regard for international boundaries would be imperative and would very much minimize regional tensions that have been responsible for over 30 regional wars all over the world since the Second World War. Kenya once again calls for the strengthening of friendly relations among States and appeals to all States to co-exist peacefully.

Through the efforts of the Seismic Centre in Sweden, it has been reported that last year alone 48 nuclear weapon tests were carried out, that is, nearly one per week. This is proof enough that the arms race is picking up momentum. We must therefore use this session to end any further nuclear weapon tests before we destroy the human race and this planet.

The current arms race is, in our opinion, a waste of resources, a diversion of scarce economic resources away from humanitarian purposes, a hindrance to national development efforts and an obvious threat to democratic processes. It undermines national, and regional, as well as international, security and makes it difficult for the creative capacity of humanity to be directed towards more positive goals. It is our view that the thirty-fourth General Assembly session should come up with positive measures that will help to lessen this intensifying arms race.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard the last speaker for this morning, but before I adjourn the meeting may I remind members that while I do not plan to state all the reasons for convening this meeting contrary to the decision of the Committee that four speakers should be inscribed, I must point out that I realize that to have done otherwise would have been tantamount to destroying the unmatched example which this Committee has set since its creation - that is, that its first meeting has never been cancelled either for lack of speakers or because of technical difficulties. But, most important, it gives me the chance to make an urgent appeal once more to representatives to inscribe their names immediately in order that the need for a cancellation need not recur.

In this connexion, the Bureau feels that the date for closing the list of speakers should be changed from 25 October to Friday, 19 October at 6 p.m. This deadline may help representatives to make up their minds more rapidly. But the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions remains 16 November.

I also request representatives to submit their draft resolutions before the deadline in order that delegations may have enough time to study them and, if need be, to seek instructions from their Governments.

I should like to thank members for coming to this meeting as early as they did, and I hope that this is the procedure that we will continue to follow.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.