

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records*



FIRST COMMITTEE
32nd meeting
held on
Tuesday, 15 November 1983
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 32nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEMS 43 to 63, 139, 141, 143 and 144 (continued)

Draft resolutions were introduced by:

Mr. Mrkic (Yugoslavia)	- A/C.1/38/L.26
Mr. Meiszter (Hungary)	- A/C.1/38/L.29
Mr. Tinca (Romania)	- A/C.1/38/L.44
Mr. Garvalov (Bulgaria)	- A/C.1/38/L.46 and L.47
Mr. Djokic (Yugoslavia)	- A/C.1/38/L.27
Mr. Krutzsch (German Democratic Republic)	- A/C.1/38/L.16
Mr. Garcia Robles (Mexico)	- A/C.1/38/L.31, L.40, L.43 and L.48
Miss Dever (Belgium)	- A/C.1/38/L.62
Mr. Ijewere (Nigeria)	- A/C.1/38/L.39
Miss Naga (Egypt)	- A/C.1/38/L.20

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

UN LIBRARY

IN/SA COLLECTION

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/38/PV.32
7 December 1983

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 43 TO 63, 139, 141, 143 AND 144 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will begin consideration of and action upon draft resolutions on disarmament items.

Mr. MRKIC (Yugoslavia): On behalf of the group of sponsors - Algeria, Argentina, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burma, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Madagascar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire and Yugoslavia - I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.26 on the "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session".

Five years have elapsed since the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. That is a considerable period of time during which numerous measures of substantial disarmament could have been initiated. We did not lack guidelines for political action or the machinery for negotiations on disarmament, since they were clearly determined in the Programme of Action of the Final Document of the first special session. What was lacking was the political will and resolve of the countries possessing the most significant nuclear arsenals to halt the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race. Potentials and resources continue to be exhausted in a direction contrary to that unanimously adopted as the general strategy of the international community in the field of disarmament.

This year's debate in our Committee is the best proof of the dimensions of this dangerous trend. Numerous arguments were expressed on the spiralling acceleration of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, and many negative aspects of the alarming situation in international relations were pointed out. Under the shadow of the arms race, the threat or use of force against the independence and territorial integrity of sovereign States became ever more frequent.

The negotiations on disarmament have yielded no tangible results. Substantial negotiations on some major disarmament issues given priority by the first special session have not even begun.

(Mr. Mrkic, Yugoslavia)

It is encouraging that the overwhelming majority of States is not reconciled to such a situation and that it strongly rejects options which are not complementary to the principles and goals unanimously adopted in the Final Document of the first special session. Their value has been unequivocally reaffirmed and their urgent implementation has been categorically expressed.

The sponsors of this draft resolution are steadfast in their belief that the greatest effort should be made to implement the decisions and recommendations of the first special session, which were unanimously and categorically reaffirmed at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and which have retained their full value to this day. They hope this draft resolution will stimulate efforts for halting the arms race and for the launching of disarmament, for which particular responsibility is borne by the nuclear Powers and by countries possessing more significant military potentials.

I should like to express the hope that it will meet with wide support, since it was motivated and guided by the common interests of all Member States.

Mr. MEISZTER (Hungary): On behalf of the delegations of Angola, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam and Hungary, I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.29 on "immediate cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests".

The most important task facing the world community and consequently having an absolute priority in the foreign policies of the aforementioned States is the prevention of nuclear war and the halting of the nuclear-arms race. The immediate cessation and prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests would be a major step in this direction. By preventing the development of new types of nuclear weapons and the emergence of other nuclear-weapon States, the test ban would put an end to both the vertical nuclear-arms race and the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons.

That is why this goal has been accorded the highest priority in the United Nations and has been at the centre of the concerns of many delegations participating in the debates of the present session.

At the same time, we are aware that, although the United Nations has already adopted more than 40 resolutions on this subject and that over the past years

(Mr. Meiszter, Hungary)

endless meetings of various forums have addressed this problem, the disarmament community has not yet succeeded in concluding a treaty on a comprehensive nuclear-weapon-test ban. Nevertheless, what was stated by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in 1972 to the effect that all the technical and scientific aspects of this question had been fully explored and that only the political will was needed for a successful conclusion of such a treaty remains an indisputable fact nowadays too. Incidentally, at that time that statement was endorsed by 124 States casting their votes in acceptance of the Secretary-General's report.

One might rightly ask: Are we now farther away from the possibilities of, and the need for concluding, an agreement than we were at that time? My delegation considers that we are not farther away; we are closer. During the last two years the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Sweden prepared and submitted draft treaties which were thoroughly discussed in the disarmament community. Yet we must note with regret that the clear mandate given to the Committee on Disarmament by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, namely, to prepare and transmit to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly the multilaterally negotiated text of a treaty on the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests has not been fulfilled.

My intention now is not to deal with who is responsible for this state of affairs. This has been done and amply proved by a considerable number of delegations during the recently concluded general debate and exchange of views in this Committee. Instead, I should simply like to make two points: first, the task of concluding a treaty is still timely; and, secondly, the recent work of the Committee on Disarmament provides sufficient material for proceeding without further delay with the negotiations of a nuclear-weapon-test-ban treaty.

The draft resolution is based on these main assumptions, which are summed up in a very concise form in the preambular part. In operative paragraph 1 the General Assembly urges all States to exert every effort for the speediest elaboration of a multilateral treaty on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests by all States, while in operative paragraph 2 it urges the Conference on Disarmament to proceed promptly to negotiations with a view to elaborating such a treaty. As a matter of substance, the proposal also underscores that all existing drafts and proposals and future initiatives should be taken into account. In order to deal

(Mr. Meiszter, Hungary)

effectively with this issue, it is suggested that a negotiating mandate be given by the Conference on Disarmament to its subsidiary body under an appropriate item of its agenda.

It is our impression that this proposal is consonant with the feelings of the great majority of delegations in the First Committee. Therefore I should like to express the hope of the sponsors that this draft resolution will be given favourable consideration by our Committee and command the widest possible support.

Mr. TINCA (Romania) (interpretation from French): In one of our previous statements, we mentioned the concern we felt over the rapid growth of military expenditures and the complex and profound negative impact of that phenomenon politically, economically and socially.

Romania continues to be firmly convinced that, in all the efforts aimed at the adoption of genuine disarmament measures, and primarily nuclear disarmament, the concerted adoption of measures on freezing and reducing military budgets would contribute to curbing the arms race, strengthening confidence among States and creating a climate favourable for genuine disarmament negotiations.

We should like to stress in particular the timeliness of the conclusion that can be drawn from the debates the General Assembly has for several years now devoted to that question and from the resolutions adopted and studies prepared by the Organization, that is, that the reduction of military expenditures would have a favourable impact on the economic and social development of all States and on the world economy as a whole. The reallocation to peaceful purposes of part of the enormous resources swallowed up by the unbridled arms race would contribute towards overcoming the present crisis, improving the economic situation, and at the same time, enhance the economic and social efforts of all States, in particular the developing countries.

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.44, which the Romanian delegation has the honour to introduce on behalf of the sponsors - Austria, Bangladesh, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Indonesia, Ireland, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sudan, Sweden and Uruguay - meets the need to continue action already undertaken in the framework of the United Nations to promote efforts to conclude specific agreements on the reduction of military budgets and reproduces a series of important ideas contained in previous resolutions on the subject adopted by consensus.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

As in the past, the draft resolution views this action on two levels.

First of all, given the enormous dimension of military expenditures, the sponsors consider that the General Assembly must reiterate the appeal it has addressed for four consecutive years to all States, first and foremost the more heavily armed States, to show restraint in their military expenditures while awaiting the conclusion of agreements on the reduction of such expenditures.

Secondly, the General Assembly calls on the Disarmament Commission to continue its activities with a view to further identifying and elaborating the principles which should govern further actions of States in the field of freezing and reducing military expenditures, keeping in mind the possibility of embodying such principles in a suitable document at an appropriate stage. That request addressed to the Disarmament Commission to continue its efforts in that field at its 1984 session is of particular importance, since the adoption of such principles would contribute to harmonizing the positions of States and increasing the confidence necessary to reach agreements on the reduction of military budgets.

The preambular part expresses the concern of Member States, given the acceleration in the arms race and the increase in military expenditures, and stresses the need to give new impetus to the efforts to reach agreements towards freezing and reducing military budgets in a balanced manner, including appropriate verification measures acceptable to all interested parties.

Also, it reaffirms the provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and of the Declaration of the Second United Nations Disarmament Decade, setting forth among the latter's priority objectives the adoption of specific measures to reduce military expenditures and reallocate to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries, the resources thus freed.

One of the important provisions of the preamble stipulates that identification and elaboration of the principles which should govern further actions of States in freezing and reducing military budgets, as well as other United Nations activities in the reduction of such budgets, should have the fundamental objective of reaching international agreements on the reduction of military expenditures.

The operative part declares once again the General Assembly's conviction that it is possible to achieve international agreements on the reduction of military

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

budgets without prejudice to the right of all States to undiminished security, self-defence and sovereignty. It also reaffirms the widely accepted view that the human and material resources released through the reduction of military expenditures could be reallocated for economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries.

The following paragraphs contain provisions relating to measures that should be undertaken at the next stage. Thus, paragraph 3 calls upon all States, in particular the most heavily armed States, to reinforce their readiness to co-operate in a constructive manner with a view to reaching agreements to freeze, reduce or otherwise restrain military expenditures. The next paragraph renews the appeal to exercise self-restraint with a view to reallocating the funds thus saved to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of developing countries. We cannot but stress here again the extraordinary importance of that appeal. There is no doubt that, in circumstances where military expenditures are at once a consequence and an aggravating factor of the international situation and are increasing at an unprecedented pace, the appeal to restraint addressed to all States, in particular the more heavily armed States, is of great political significance.

Paragraph 5 requests the United Nations Disarmament Commission, in accordance with that body's recommendations adopted by consensus at its session this year, to continue at its next substantive session the consideration of the item entitled "Reduction of military budgets", including consideration of the suggestions of the Chairman of the working group, as well as other proposals and ideas with a view to identifying and elaborating the principles which should govern further actions of States in the field of freezing and reduction of military expenditures, keeping in mind the possibility of embodying such principles in a suitable document at an appropriate stage.

The last paragraph provides for the inclusion in the provisional agenda of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly of an item entitled "Reduction of military budgets".

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

The draft resolution clearly demonstrates the concern of the sponsors and their efforts to contribute to the harmonization of the views expressed by States on the reduction of military budgets. Therefore, it contains only non-controversial ideas and provisions that have appeared in resolutions and recommendations adopted by consensus by the General Assembly or the Disarmament Commission on the question of the reduction of military budgets.

It is our firm conviction that we shall be able to begin negotiations and reach specific agreements on the reduction of military budgets only through a constructive and flexible approach likely to foster the identification of the elements capable of promoting convergence among the various ways of proceeding in this sensitive area.

In conclusion, the delegation of Romania wishes to thank all the delegations which participated in the preparation of the draft resolution and, in particular, those which joined in sponsoring it. The consultations we held on the text of the draft resolution, as well as the non-controversial nature of its provisions, lead us to hope that it will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria): Today I have the pleasure of introducing two draft resolutions: one contained in document A/C.1/38/L.47 and the other in A/C.1/38/L.46.

On behalf of the delegations of the People's Republic of Angola, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Ethiopia, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and of my own country, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, I have the honour of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.47 under agenda item 52, entitled "Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

As in the past, this draft resolution underlines the primary significance its sponsors attach to the question of strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons as one of the most important disarmament issues. It has been the opinion of its sponsors that nuclear disarmament and the elimination of all types of nuclear weapons would be the most

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

effective and reliable measure to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. However, pending the attainment of that ultimate goal, the non-nuclear-weapon States are fully entitled to receive effective security guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

We believe that recently this question has become even more important and urgent. In the present circumstances, the international community has even more reason to demand of nuclear-weapon Powers which still abide by war doctrines providing for the possible use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States having no such weapons on their territories to show the political will and respond to the appeals of the overwhelming majority of States in the world to strengthen in the most effective way their security which is now endangered.

Thus the draft resolution follows in general the basic provisions set forth in resolution 37/80, adopted at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

Operative paragraph 1 reaffirms once again the ever more urgent necessity to reach agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Accordingly, the position which, in our view, has an essential role to play in achieving the aforementioned goal is again reflected in the preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution.

The sponsors of the draft resolution note with regret that the negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament have not achieved the desired progress in this field in 1983. As pointed out in the recommendations of the Working Group of the Committee on this matter and in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, the main reason for this state of affairs is related to differing perceptions of security interests of some nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States. It should be pointed out also that, despite the difficulties, there is once again no objection in principle in the Committee on Disarmament to the idea of an international convention on the strengthening of the security guarantees of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Proceeding from that premise, we consider that the General Assembly should encourage the readiness of the Committee on Disarmament to continue to explore ways and means for overcoming the difficulties encountered in the negotiations so as to reach an appropriate agreement on effective international arrangements to

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. This is our position, as set out in operative paragraph 4.

We acknowledge the relevance of this flexible approach in the future consideration of the item and, in our opinion, the possibilities it offers should be used to the fullest. I should like to reiterate that, in order to achieve progress in our work, it is essential for all nuclear-weapon States to display the political will in this respect.

Operative paragraph 5 reaffirms our position of principle that the basic goal of the negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament concerning on subject-matter under consideration is to conclude an international instrument of a legally binding character to meet most effectively the legitimate concerns and security interests of non-nuclear-weapon States.

Since the draft resolution is mainly procedural, its sponsors hope that it will receive wide support in this Committee.

The second draft resolution, under agenda item 63 (g), which I have the honour of introducing on behalf of the delegations of the Mongolian People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Romania, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and my own, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, is contained in document A/C.1/38/L.46 and entitled "World Disarmament Campaign: actions and activities".

I should like, first of all, to emphasize that in preparing the draft resolution its sponsors followed completely the generally acknowledged principles and goals of the World Disarmament Campaign. Hence the ideas and provisions in it are designed to contribute to the successful carrying out of the World Disarmament Campaign and the effective attainment of its objectives. In our view, of particular importance in this respect are the efforts to ensure broad-based participation in the Campaign and to initiate within the framework of the Campaign various practical actions and activities conducive to the effective attainment of the ultimate goal: the mobilization of world public opinion on behalf of peace and disarmament.

In that connection we view as also important the common understanding expressed in paragraph 7 of document A/37/548, that

"The United Nations system, Member States with respect for their sovereign rights, and other bodies, in particular non-governmental

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

organizations, all have their role to play in achieving the objectives of the Campaign." (A/37/548, para. 7)

It is important to note also that

"... the Campaign as envisaged by Member States is structured in such a way that Member States and non-governmental organizations can undertake, on their own, certain types of activities to complement those undertaken by the United Nations." (ibid., para. 27)

The draft resolution we are now introducing to this Committee is based on all the aforementioned premises and as a whole reaffirms the ideas contained in General Assembly resolution 37/100 H, adopted at the thirty-seventh session, which

"Invites Member States, in the implementation of the activities within the framework of the World Disarmament Campaign, to take into account various views and opinions expressed at the twelfth special session, including the proposal on launching world-wide action for collecting signatures in support of measures to prevent nuclear war, to curb the arms race and for disarmament." (resolution 37/100 H, para. 1)

We note that in various countries of the world, in accordance with local conditions, actions for collecting signatures in favour of peace and disarmament are being carried out along with various other activities.

The report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the World Disarmament Campaign (A/38/349) notes in particular that petitions were received to that effect which have accordingly been covered by the press. This demonstrates that the world-wide action for collecting signatures on behalf of peace and disarmament constitutes an effective instrument for accomplishing the goals of the World Disarmament Campaign.

Proceeding from this understanding, the draft resolution reaffirms

"the usefulness of further carrying out actions and activities which are an important manifestation of the will of world public opinion and contribute effectively to the achievement of the objectives of the World Disarmament Campaign and thus to the creation of a favourable climate for making progress in the field of disarmament with a view to achieving the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control". (A/C.1/38/L.46, para. 1)

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

Operative paragraph 2 deals with the need for ensuring a better flow of accurate information and avoiding the dissemination of false and tendentious information with regard to the various aspects of disarmament as well as the actions and activities of the world public in support of peace and disarmament. In the opinion of the sponsors this would be in full conformity with the goals and principles of the World Disarmament Campaign.

In conclusion I should like to express the opinion of the sponsors that in view of the thrust and formulation of the draft resolution it will be generally acceptable to this Committee.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): On behalf of the group of sponsors - Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burma, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Madagascar, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire and Yugoslavia - I have the honour of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.27 on the report of the Committee on Disarmament.

The past year has seen a further dangerous deterioration in international relations. The arms race in all its aspects, particularly nuclear, continues unabated. The accumulation of ever more sophisticated means of destruction and killing is constant. We are faced with the immediate implementation of earlier plans of deployment of new systems of nuclear weapons which, coupled with the previously deployed weapons, will give new impetus to the further qualitative development of the arms race. Never has concern over such developments been greater than it is now, since in the course of the past year we have become even more aware of the dangers of the outbreak of nuclear war and of the devastating consequences it would have for the future of mankind. That is why, more seriously than ever before, the international community has been faced with the task of resolutely undertaking measures aimed at halting the lethal arms race and opening up new prospects for peace and security in the world.

Unfortunately, once again we can only state that the efforts undertaken last year to that end have not brought any genuine improvement. The negotiations between the two leading nuclear Powers on the elimination and reduction of some systems of strategic nuclear weapons, as well as medium-range nuclear missiles, have remained without results and are in a critical phase. The negotiations

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

between the two blocs on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe have for years been in a state of stalemate.

The situation is no better either in the negotiations that are being conducted in the Committee on Disarmament, the single multilateral negotiating organ in the sphere of disarmament. The report that Committee submitted on its work this year has again given rise to the gravest concern. It proves that the Committee, despite the efforts of a great number of its members, again could not contribute to the successful outcome of negotiations and was unable to achieve concrete results on any substantial issue on its agenda. The report testifies to the fact that last year the Committee was again unable to launch negotiations on some substantial issues of disarmament to which we had given priority at the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, in the first place on halting the arms race in nuclear weapons and on nuclear disarmament. We can only state now that some members of the Committee, among them some nuclear Powers, continue to oppose the Committee's negotiating on those issues. They are thus assuming great responsibility, because they are preventing the Committee from fulfilling one of the major goals entrusted to it by the international community. We have to note with great concern that the Committee was unable to begin genuine negotiations on measures for the prevention of nuclear war, as requested by the great majority of its membership, or to achieve a successful solution regarding the resumption of substantive negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

The sponsors of this draft resolution are again pointing to the absolute unacceptability of the fact that the Committee on Disarmament is being prevented from conducting negotiations on the major issues of disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, which concern the further development and even the survival of the international community. They are deeply convinced of the need for the Committee to begin negotiations on those issues, without any further delay, as well as of the Committee's ability and competence to be the genuine multilateral negotiating body for substantial disarmament issues.

In submitting this draft resolution the sponsors have once again been guided by the wish to render their greatest support to the work of the Committee on Disarmament and to help it most effectively to fulfil its mandate.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

In conclusion, allow me to express the sponsors' belief that the draft resolution will meet with wide support in our Committee.

Mr. KRUTZSCH (German Democratic Republic): On behalf of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic, I have the honour of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.16, entitled "Obligation of States to contribute to effective disarmament negotiations".

Taking into account the growing risk of nuclear war threatening mankind, the draft resolution is based on the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and the commitment of States undertaken in various treaties and agreements to conduct negotiations on arms limitation and disarmament measures. The conclusion must be drawn therefrom that States have the political and legal obligation to conduct disarmament negotiations in good faith according to the priorities established by the United Nations. The renunciation of any attempt to pursue one's own security interests at the cost of the legitimate security interests of others, the preservation of a sense of reality and, not least, the strict adherence to commitments undertaken - these are elements which should essentially determine the substance of negotiations in good faith. These demands have become increasingly manifest recently.

For instance, in this year's report of the Committee on Disarmament to the United Nations General Assembly it is said that:

"The obligation to undertake urgent negotiations for cessation of the nuclear arms race and for nuclear disarmament flowed from the very nature of these weapons and was not contingent upon any other factors like international stability and security or rules of international behaviour." (A/38/27, para. 39)

Another example is the draft wording for the texts for the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament submitted by the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Committee on Disarmament, contained in Chapter III of the report of the Committee on Disarmament. It envisages measures to guarantee that:

"... there is the required 'political will' to proceed along the road of uninterrupted negotiations in good faith in the field of disarmament."

(A/38/27, p. 147, para. 6)

(Mr. Krutzsch, German
Democratic Republic)

The preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution before us emphasize the importance of the Final Document of the first United Nations special session devoted to disarmament for conducting negotiations on arms limitation and disarmament. They particularly stress that the prevention of nuclear war is the most urgent task of the present day. This requires serious negotiations. Furthermore, they point to the necessity of maintaining the existing system of bilateral, regional and global agreements on disarmament. These are treaties and conventions on first steps towards the cessation of the arms race and the achievement of disarmament, which constitute an important basis for successful and more extensive negotiations on disarmament.

The statement made in operative paragraph 2 is of fundamental importance: It says it is the obligation of all States, in particular the nuclear-weapon States and the other militarily significant States, to live up to their commitment undertaken in international instruments and in the Final Document of the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament - that is, to conduct serious negotiations in good faith on disarmament on the basis of equality, reciprocity and undiminished security of each side.

Operative paragraph 6 calls upon all States to refrain from any actions which have or may have negative effects on the outcome of disarmament negotiations.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic expresses the hope that the purpose of this draft resolution will meet with the support of the Member States.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I shall introduce four draft resolutions which the delegation of Mexico, among others, is co-sponsoring. The first is the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/38/L.43, which deals with the item on a nuclear arms freeze and is sponsored by Ecuador, Indonesia, Pakistan, Sweden, Uruguay and Mexico.

It is very similar to resolution 37/100 B, which was adopted on 13 December 1982, by 119 votes in favour but which despite that impressive vote remains implemented.

There are some additions, to which I should like to draw members' attention. In the first preambular paragraph we recall not only what was said in the 1978 Final Document but also that that document was unanimously and categorically reaffirmed last year at the second special session devoted to disarmament.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

As a fourth preambular paragraph we have now added a new paragraph relating to the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in March 1983 in New Delhi, which, obviously, could not have appeared in the previous resolution since it took place after its adoption. That paragraph notes that that Conference declared

"... that the renewed escalation in the nuclear arms race, both in its quantitative and qualitative dimensions, as well as reliance on doctrines of nuclear deterrence, has heightened the risk of the outbreak of nuclear war and led to greater insecurity and instability in international relations".

We have also added two paragraphs at the end of the preamble explaining why the operative part expresses full confidence in that the procedures already adopted would be sufficient for monitoring compliance with the commitments entered into in the undertakings derived from the freeze and also why we think that, while the draft resolution is, first and foremost, addressed to the two States having the biggest nuclear-weapon arsenals, it is to be expected that other States, for their own benefit, would follow the example of the two major nuclear-weapon Powers.

The draft resolution deals with three points which, I feel, require a brief explanation. The first one is the fact that while the immediate freeze that is the purpose of the draft resolution is requested of the United States and the Soviet Union firstly, it faithfully reflects the letter and the spirit of the Final Document, paragraph 48 of which states:

"In the task of achieving the goals of nuclear disarmament, all the nuclear-weapon States, in particular those among them which possess the most important nuclear arsenals, bear a special responsibility".

(A/S-10/4, para. 48)

On the other hand, as I have just said, we hope that with a clear notion of what is in their self-interest, the other nuclear-weapon States, as we say in the operative part, would join in the example we expect of the two which are usually called the nuclear super-Powers.

The other point is the fact that the draft resolution also notes that at present conditions are very favourable to such a freeze, since the United States and the Soviet Union are equal in military nuclear power. It would seem that, generally speaking, there exists approximate parity between them.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

In my statement on 19 November 1982 in this First Committee introducing the draft resolution which served as the basis for resolution 37/100 B to which I referred at the beginning, I made a detailed presentation of the various facts and authoritative opinions on which this preambular paragraph in the draft resolution is based. I will not repeat it today; I think it would be redundant. But I should simply like to recall one from among the many opinions I quoted, that of Professor Hans H. Bethe, who was the head of the division of theoretical studies of the Los Alamos scientific laboratory from 1943 to 1945 and a member of the strategic military group advising the President of the United States from 1957 to 1959. In 1967 he was awarded the Nobel Prize for studies on nuclear reactions in the stars. In his testimony given on 13 May 1982 before the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, Professor Bethe said, inter alia, the following:

"Various members of the Government have repeatedly stated that, in regard to strategic weapons, we are now in a situation of inferiority as compared with the Soviet Union and that we need to increase our armaments. In my opinion, there is no such inferiority. We have more nuclear warheads than the Soviet Union, and I consider that this is the most important measure of relative power.

"We are told that there is a vulnerability gap because the Soviet Union could use its long-range intercontinental ballistic missiles to destroy our land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles. ... Leaving aside the question of technological feasibility, I believe that a first strike would not give the Soviet Union any important military advantage.

"The reason for this is that intercontinental ballistic missiles represent only a quarter of our strategic nuclear force, calculated in terms of warheads. A quarter of our power is invested in invulnerable nuclear-powered submarines and another quarter in bombers, many of which can take off from their airfields, which are widely dispersed, in the event of an alert. Consequently we would have an adequate attack force, even if all our intercontinental ballistic missiles were destroyed." (A/C.1/37/PV.38, pp. 32-35)

As a conclusion from the foregoing, that distinguished scientist unequivocally stated:

"In summary, our strategic forces are, if anything, superior to those of the Soviet Union.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

"The greatest threat to our national security and to that of our allies is the grotesque size and the continuing growth of the nuclear arsenals of both sides.

"Those are the basic facts. Once they are recognized, the essential features of a rational policy of national security becomes obvious." (ibid., p. 36)

The third point on which I should like to say a few words is on verification and control. To allay in advance any fears as to strict compliance with the commitments entailed by this freeze, the draft specifically provides that it would be subject not only to all relevant verification procedures and measures already agreed to by the parties in the case of the SALT I and SALT II treaties - which give rise to much more complex verification problems than those which might arise in the case of this freeze - but also to those which have been agreed upon in principle by the parties themselves during the preparatory trilateral negotiations on the comprehensive test-ban held at Geneva from 1977 to 1980.

In view of the above, and because of the draft resolution's contents, the sponsors dare to hope that it will be adopted by an even more impressive majority than that of last year's, and that this time the nuclear Powers to which it is addressed will comply with it. As we have said, in recalling in the first preambular paragraph, what was said in 1978 and 1982 we should be deeply concerned over the "threat to the very survival of mankind posed by the existence of nuclear weapons and the continuing arms race".

In conclusion, I should like to draw attention to the fact that the scope of the freeze requested and described in operative paragraph 1 (a) basically corresponds - as I am sure all members will have realized upon reading a full page of The New York Times of Sunday, 13 November - to what we were told there by 11,500 physicists from all over the world, among them 1,500 physicists, from the United States, of whom 22 have been awarded the Nobel Prize. What did that impressive number of scientists call for? They wrote:

"We call for an agreement to halt the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons delivery systems. Meanwhile, no further nuclear weapons or delivery systems should be deployed anywhere."

That completes my introduction of the draft resolution on the nuclear arms freeze.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The second draft resolution I should like to introduce is contained in document A/C.1/38/L.48, entitled "Cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons"; it is sponsored by the delegations of Bangladesh, Ecuador, Kenya, Mexico, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

As in the case of the draft resolution on a nuclear arms freeze, this draft resolution basically reflects resolution 37/72 of 9 December 1982, which last year was approved by 114 votes in favour and only 2 against - the United States and the United Kingdom.

The first four preambular paragraphs reproduce verbatim the same paragraphs of the resolution to which I have just referred, which, in turn, reproduced verbatim the text of those paragraphs in the 1981 resolution, resolution 36/84. Why? Because these paragraphs clearly sum up what has occurred for a quarter of a century - something for which the nuclear-weapon States, especially the three acting as depositaries of the so-called 1963 partial test-ban Treaty and the 1968 Non-Proliferation Treaty should be embarrassed.

This year's draft resolution contains some additions, which I shall now explain. The fifth preambular paragraph adds a reference not only to the preamble of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons but also to its article VI, in which the three depositary States - the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union - assumed the solemn and legally binding commitment to take

"effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament".

The next two preambular paragraphs are also additions to last year's text. They read as follows:

"Bearing in mind the growing negative influence that the total lack of compliance with those undertakings had both on the first and the second review conferences on the non-proliferation treaty held in 1975 and 1980, respectively,

"Convinced that the maintenance of such a situation would not augur well for the third review conference of that treaty which is to take place in 1985 and even for the future of the treaty itself,".

What those two paragraphs contain are evident facts for anyone wishing to pass judgement on the situation which arose in 1975 and 1980 - one which, it is feared, might come up again in more acute form.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The sponsors of the draft resolution feel that these points must be made clearly, so that the nuclear Powers, in particular the three depositary States of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons - which often tell us that they are greatly interested in the future of that Treaty - would realize that that future rests largely in their hands by means of their compliance with the commitments they entered into under that Treaty's preamble and article VI. We must bear in mind that, while the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was of course a horizontal non-proliferation treaty, it was also one of vertical non-proliferation.

That fact is also emphasized in operative paragraph 3, which

"Reaffirms also its conviction" - the General Assembly's - "that such a treaty would constitute a contribution of the utmost importance to the cessation of the arms race and an indispensable element for the success of the non-proliferation treaty since it is only through the fulfilment of the obligations under the treaty that its three Depositary Powers may expect all other parties to comply likewise with their respective obligations".

That is the very purpose the sponsors have in mind in operative paragraph 7, which

"Calls upon the States Depositaries of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, by virtue of their special responsibilities under those two Treaties and as a provisional measure, to bring to a halt without delay all nuclear-test explosions, either through a trilaterally agreed moratorium or through three unilateral moratoria;"

Finally, there is something which gives the sponsors some reason for optimism. We believe that what we request in operative paragraph 6 - "to initiate immediately the multilateral negotiation of a treaty for the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests" in what will henceforth be called the Conference on Disarmament - will be facilitated by the fact that, as is stated in the last preambular paragraph,

"... the Conference on Disarmament has already received various concrete proposals on this question including a complete draft for the eventual text of the treaty as a whole" -

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

which was submitted by the delegation of Sweden. There are also two documents: one submitted by the Soviet Union, containing a selection of those points which might be considered fundamental to the treaty, and the other by the delegation of the United Kingdom on nuclear explosions in general.

That concludes my introduction of the second draft resolution. The remaining two draft resolutions require but a brief introduction.

I shall now introduce the draft resolution in document A/C.1/38/L.31, on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament; it is sponsored by the delegations of Algeria, Bangladesh, Mexico, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

The text is self-explanatory. The first preambular paragraph refers to the fact that the Assembly has examined the report of the ad hoc working group on the comprehensive programme of disarmament which is an integral part of the report of the Committee on Disarmament on its 1983 session.

The second welcomes the progress achieved in the preparation of the programme during the period covered by the report.

The third notes, however, that it has not yet been possible to complete the elaboration of a comprehensive programme which, as provided for in the 1978 Final Document should encompass:

"... all measures thought to be advisable in order to ensure that the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control becomes a reality in a world in which international peace and security prevail and in which the new international economic order is strengthened and consolidated."

Those provisions contain the basic elements which in 1983 guided the working group in its work in preparing the comprehensive programme.

Representatives may recall that at the meetings devoted to consideration of this item, it was clear that, unfortunately, there are still several differences of opinion which made it impossible to reach complete agreement at this session. Thus the last paragraph of the draft resolution urges the Conference on Disarmament:

"... as soon as it considers that the circumstances are propitious for that purpose, to renew its work on the elaboration of the comprehensive programme of disarmament previously requested and to submit to the General Assembly, not later than at its forty-first session, a complete draft of such a programme."

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The sponsors of this draft resolution, which is very modest but which, in our view, faithfully reflects the situation which has existed in our debates here and continues to exist at present, venture to hope that it will be adopted by consensus.

Lastly, the fourth draft resolution I should like to introduce is contained in document A/C.1/38/L.40; it deals with the item entitled "World Disarmament Campaign" and is sponsored by the delegations of Bangladesh, Egypt, Mexico, Sri Lanka, Sweden and Yugoslavia. I feel anyone reviewing the various documents mentioned in its preambular part will become familiar with everything essential concerning the background to the present situation and to that which may be expected in the World Disarmament Campaign.

Operative paragraph 1 takes note with satisfaction of the implementation of the programme of activities of the World Disarmament Campaign for 1983 as described in the report of the Security Council of 30 August this year.

In paragraph 2, note is also taken with satisfaction of the voluntary contributions made by Member States to the trust fund for the World Disarmament Campaign prior to and during the first United Nations Pledging Conference, held on 27 October last.

In paragraph 3 the Assembly decides that at its thirty-ninth session there should be a second United Nations Pledging Conference for the World Disarmament Campaign in order that all those Member States which have not yet announced their voluntary contributions - many of which said at the 27 October Conference they intended to do so - may have an opportunity to announce their pledges.

Paragraphs 4 and 5 are intended to ensure that work relating to the Campaign may be as effective as possible and yield maximum results.

Paragraph 4, recommending that the voluntary contributions made by Member States should not be earmarked for specific activities, is intended to leave the Secretary-General free to take whatever decisions he deems fit within the framework of the World Disarmament Campaign previously approved by the General Assembly. We must bear in mind that it was approved from the beginning that the Secretariat and the Secretary-General would have responsibility for co-ordinating the activities of the Campaign, and co-ordination obviously includes deciding the manner in which available resources will be used. This recommendation basically follows the recommendation of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies at its last session held in September.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Paragraph 5 requests the Secretary-General to instruct the United Nations information centres and regional commissions to give wide publicity to the World Disarmament Campaign and, whenever necessary, to adapt in so far as possible United Nations information materials into local languages.

Finally, paragraphs 6 and 7 are the standard paragraphs in this type of resolution.

Paragraph 6 requests the Secretary-General to submit to the Assembly at its next session a report covering both the implementation of the programme of activities during 1984 and any suggestions contemplated by the System for 1985.

Paragraph 7 decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-ninth session the item entitled "World Disarmament Campaign".

Given the overall objectivity of the draft resolution and the absence of any controversial element, the sponsors hope that, as in previous cases, it will be adopted in the General Assembly by consensus.

Miss DEVER (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Thirty countries have joined Belgium as sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.62 on regional disarmament, which I should like to introduce to the Committee.

The number and the list of these countries confirm once again the wide support the idea of a regional approach to disarmament enjoys in every part of the world regardless of political régimes. The sponsors are: Austria, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy, Liberia, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Zaire.

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.62, which will, we hope, obtain the support of all States, is designed essentially to ensure the implementation of resolution 37/100 F, which the General Assembly adopted unanimously. As the Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Leo Tindemans, stated last June in the Committee on Disarmament, that resolution created

"a system which makes it possible to compare experiments in regional disarmament undertaken with total respect for the freedom of both States and regions themselves".

(Miss Dever, Belgium)

One of these experiments is now being undertaken in Europe. "The security of each being the business of all", it seems to us important that the whole international community should be informed formally of the convening in Stockholm of a conference on confidence and security-building measures, and disarmament, as a substantial and integral part of the multilateral process initiated by the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

We hope that in the spirit of resolution 37/100 F the General Assembly will take note of this decision, which is the result of the consensus of the States of the region, and express its satisfaction in this respect.

In a first stage, it will devote its efforts to the negotiation and adoption of confidence and security-building measures applicable to all Europe which should be militarily significant, politically compelling and verifiable. These measures as a whole should lead to reduce the risk of a military confrontation in Europe.

The report the Secretary-General has just devoted to the question of regional disarmament constitutes a first step in the initiatives adopted hitherto in this area. We hope that in future the General Assembly will have a document covering all activities related to the regional approach to disarmament. That is the main thrust of operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

By mentioning resolution 37/100 F, that paragraph requests, on the one hand, that Governments and existing competent regional institutions communicate to the Secretary-General whatever measures they are undertaking within the regional approach. Furthermore, the draft resolution also specifies - and I want especially to stress this - that the Department for Disarmament Affairs inform the General Assembly of its activities in the field of the regional approach to disarmament.

We are grateful to the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) for its efforts to ascertain with greater precision the doctrines and concepts of security with respect to specific regions. We are following with great interest the evolution of the research programme entitled "Security of States and reduction of armament levels", which is concentrating in particular on some specific cases of regional approach. We have also noted with interest the recommendation of the Advisory Council on disarmament studies in its capacity of Governing Board of UNIDIR, relating to the study project entitled "Sub-Saharan Africa: problems of security and regional arrangements".

(Miss Dever, Belgium)

The general debate in the First Committee has on many occasions brought out the importance of the regional dimension of disarmament.

I should like to point out here the Liberian suggestion that there be organized a conference of research institutes and other parties interested in African security, with the collaboration of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

I should like also to mention that the General Assembly, in its resolution 37/100 F, calls upon States

"to consider the possible establishment or strengthening at the regional level, where appropriate, of institutional arrangements capable of promoting the implementation of [regional disarmament] measures".

Disarmament measures could be viewed, if I may use this image, as a graphic with two axes: the abscissa axis would register measures taken to prohibit particular types of weapons, such as nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction and conventional armaments; while the ordinate axis would register functional measures, such as transparency, confidence-building measures or regional approaches.

The optimum combination of these measures should lead to the achievement of general and complete disarmament. It is in this context that we situate the regional approach to disarmament. The latter is all the more necessary since regional tensions always run the risk of unleashing a global conflagration. If theoreticians can easily come up with a scenario for peace, unfortunately another scenario can just as easily be devised, namely, the dreadful spectre of war.

The regional approach to disarmament is designed to contribute to the elimination of these factors leading to war. In the years which have followed the study on all aspects of regional disarmament, that concept has been well received by the General Assembly. Let us now endeavour to implement it. Once again I hope the General Assembly will support any efforts in this direction.

Mr. IJEWERE (Nigeria): I wish to introduce the draft resolution entitled "United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament", contained in document A/C.1/38/L.39 of 11 November 1983, on behalf of the delegations of Algeria, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Nigeria, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Uganda, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

(Mr. Ijewere, Nigeria)

We should like to reiterate our commitment to the question of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The importance we attach to disarmament issues derives from our conviction that peace, security and social and economic development are indivisible and carry with them corresponding obligations and responsibilities for all States.

In accordance with paragraph 14 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament,

"Since the process of disarmament affects the vital security interests of all States, they must all be actively concerned with and contribute to the measures of disarmament and arms limitation". (resolution A/S-10/4, para. 14) In order to enable all countries to participate, and particularly developing countries, in contributing to the objectives of disarmament, the United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament was established in 1978 to promote expertise in disarmament.

We note with interest that the Programme was carried out this year in accordance with the decision contained in the Concluding Document of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly, which called for an increase in the number of fellowships from 20 to 25 in 1983.

We also note with satisfaction that this year the Programme was extended to cover, in addition to Geneva and Vienna, study visits to the Federal Republic of Germany, the Soviet Union, Sweden, Japan and the United States. We are equally satisfied that the Programme has already trained 104 public officials from 67 countries.

It is gratifying to note from the report of the Secretary-General that Governments have continued to show a high level of interest in the Programme. Eminent and highly placed personalities in Government and industry have addressed participants in the Programme. Such personalities have included Vice-Ministers for Foreign Affairs, Ministers of Government responsible for disarmament, Permanent Representatives of Member States to the United Nations, Directors of disarmament research institutes and organizations, and so on.

We have noted that the Secretary-General undertook a thorough review of the operations of the Programme and decided to relocate it in Geneva. We welcome that decision and express the hope that the Secretary-General will ensure the deployment of appropriate staff to meet its increasing level of activities. In this

(Mr. Ijewere, Nigeria)

connection we should like to propose a new expansion of the Programme in order to enliven it even further. We propose that the Department of Disarmament Affairs consider publishing some of the research papers written by the Fellows in the United Nations Disarmament Periodical. That would provide a source of reference for future Fellows. In this regard the Department may also wish to consider awarding prizes to the best Fellows for the year.

We should like to express our appreciation to the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States of America, Japan, Sweden and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for inviting the Fellows to their capitals and thereby contributing to the overall objectives of the Programme. We commend both the Secretary-General and Mr. Jan Martenson, the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, for their leadership in the implementation of the Programme. We are satisfied with the manner in which the Programme has been carried out and look forward to similar productive work in the coming years.

Miss ABOUL NAGA (Egypt): I am happy indeed to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.20 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, since it is almost a reproduction of General Assembly resolution 37/75, adopted last year. I wish however to state why we thought it necessary to repeat last year's resolution now.

For nine years now Egypt has been taking the initiative on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and assuming the responsibility of keeping it afloat to date and perhaps until circumstances allow its actual establishment. It has always been and still is our conviction that the effective realization of the objective of establishing such a zone necessitates the widest possible international support both inside and outside the region of the Middle East.

The consensus achieved on this issue during the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly was a clear demonstration of the importance the international community attaches to the realization of such a zone. Indeed, this importance stems from the fact that such a zone would be a positive step contributing not only to reducing tension and threat in the Middle East but also to enhancing security in the region of the Mediterranean and Europe and in fact reducing world tension and strengthening international security. Although, on the one hand, we have

(Miss Aboul Naga, Egypt)

entertained high hopes, particularly because this question has been enjoying the consensus of the General Assembly for several years, that an appropriate mechanism would be created for the implementation and realization of the zone, we are fully aware of the political realities in the region. We do recognize that the time might not yet be right to work on a practical approach acceptable to all the parties concerned. On the other hand, we firmly believe that there is yet a necessary minimum that should be maintained, bearing in mind the basic positions of the parties concerned - and that is what draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.20 indeed represents.

We therefore hope that, as in previous years, this draft will commend itself for consensus in the First Committee. I should also add that it has been the subject of consultations among all concerned.

Finally, I wish to reiterate once again Egypt's determination to exert every effort and to pursue every possibility for the realization of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East until this hope becomes a reality. Egypt will spare no effort in seeking a secure, stable and prosperous Middle East, and our aim will be, as always, to promote the prospects for a just and lasting peace in that region.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: The Secretariat has received 68 draft resolutions. Almost all of them have been reproduced and will be available shortly. All delegations will receive them at their Missions by tomorrow morning at the latest.

I am now in the process of studying all the draft resolutions we have received in order to submit to the Committee on Thursday my suggestions on how to proceed in taking action on them. I had hoped to be more specific at this meeting, but I am sure representatives will bear with me in view of the number of draft resolutions before us - 68 altogether.

However, we shall start taking action on them next Monday. We shall hold two meetings on Monday, two on Tuesday, two on Wednesday and two on Friday of next week; if that is not enough, we can hold night meetings if need be. We hope to conclude action on the draft resolutions on disarmament items by the end of next week.

(The Chairman)

On Monday I intend to submit to the Committee for action draft resolutions on which we can expect consensus, or at least broad agreement. I shall give members the symbols of those draft resolutions at our meeting on Thursday.

On Tuesday next week we shall take up draft resolutions relating to nuclear questions; I suggest we act upon those draft resolutions cluster by cluster, that is, those draft resolutions dealing with the same, or at least closely related, subjects will be grouped together and acted upon in clusters, in the sense that we shall hear explanations of vote before we take action on each cluster. Then there will certainly be an opportunity for delegations to explain their votes after the voting on each cluster. But, as I said, I shall give the Committee more specific information after we have taken decisions on draft resolutions relating to nuclear questions. To the extent possible, we shall take up the remaining draft resolutions also cluster by cluster. For instance, we shall take action on them in groups of draft resolutions relating to chemical weapons questions, outer space questions, naval arms race, reduction of military budgets, world disarmament campaign and so on.

That is just to give the Committee an idea of how I intend to proceed, with the Committee's approval. Delegations wishing to speak on draft resolutions will certainly be given an opportunity to do so. However, as I stated at our last meeting, I sincerely hope delegations will respond to my appeal to limit the number and also the length of their interventions. In doing so, I would ask the Committee to bear in mind that we have just concluded four weeks of general debate and exchanges of views, during which delegations have had ample opportunity to express their views.

As I indicated, I shall revert to this matter on Thursday and give the Committee more precise information as to the number of the draft resolutions we shall be taking up on Monday. I shall then also give advance notice on how the Committee will deal, cluster by cluster, with the draft resolutions relating to nuclear questions.

I shall do my best at all times to see to it that the Committee is well informed in advance as to what will be the draft resolutions on which we shall be taking action, so that delegations may have their instructions and be prepared.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.