

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records \*



FIRST COMMITTEE  
37th meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 14 November 1978  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 37TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PASTINEN (Finland)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 35: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE FIRST REVIEW CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SECOND CONFERENCE (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 36: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 32/76 CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL I OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TLAHELCO) (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 37: CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 38: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 32/78: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 39: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 32/79 CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL II OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TLAHELCO) (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 40: EFFECTIVE MEASURES TO IMPLEMENT THE PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DISARMAMENT DECADE: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 41: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE DENUCLEARIZATION OF AFRICA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 42: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN THE REGION OF THE MIDDLE EAST (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 43: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN SOUTH ASIA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL

A/C.1/33/PV.37  
15 November 1978

ENGLISH

AGENDA ITEM 44: PROHIBITION OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND MANUFACTURE OF NEW TYPES OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION AND NEW SYSTEMS OF SUCH WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 45: REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 46: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE INDIAN OCEAN AS A ZONE OF PEACE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 47: GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT (continued):

- (a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;
- (b) REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY;
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 48: WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 49: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS OF USE OF CERTAIN CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WHICH MAY BE DEEMED TO BE EXCESSIVELY INJURIOUS OR TO HAVE INDISCRIMINATE EFFECTS: REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY CONFERENCE (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

ACENDA ITEMS 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48 and 49  
(continued)

The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the first speaker, I should like to call the attention of the members of the Committee to a draft resolution that has been circulated today bearing the symbol A/C.1/33/L.18 concerning the reduction of military budgets, agenda item 45.

Mr. PALMA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): The balance sheet of the Disarmament Decade is, unfortunately, a negative one. The arms race has continued and accelerated in a truly alarming way, leading us to believe that the situation may be beyond reasonable control. As a consequence the world is today more heavily armed than ever, and certainly much more heavily armed than it was at the end of the Second World War. At the same time the world is more insecure, more tense and certainly poorer.

This is the reasoning according to which increases in war materials and personnel result in increased security, as recognized in the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, at which this subject was discussed in substance. In these circumstances the voice of the vast majority of mankind speaks with increasing urgency, and must be heeded by all those who in one way or another bear the responsibility in these matters.

My delegation therefore believes that although there may have been important gaps the special session of the General Assembly should be considered a turning-point in the treatment of this important problem since it opened up prospects that must be continuously taken into account and explored further. The Final Document, which, let us repeat once again, was adopted by consensus, contains an analysis of a situation that desperately needed the over-all consideration we are now at last able to give it.

(Mr. Palma, Peru)

Our action here and in other international forums, as in all disarmament efforts, should be guided by the conviction that we have already expressed in saying that mankind is today facing an unprecedented threat of destruction that derives from the massive competitive accumulation of the most destructive weapons ever produced.

That, and that alone, is what we are talking about today when we speak of disarmament, because that is the possibility of destruction to which all peoples are subjected. It is very difficult for us to understand the argument that mankind has become accustomed to that possibility, much less that it has accepted it. We must repeat what we have already stated on other occasions: while all States bear a responsibility in the field of disarmament, it is evident that some bear more responsibility than others. Those that bear the greater responsibility are the States possessing gigantic arsenals and weapons of mass destruction, since only they can threaten us with extinction. What other countries could so threaten the whole of mankind?

Thus there is no doubt that those countries bear a responsibility that is not only of primary importance but also must have priority. We cannot expect the nations with fewer arms to set an example they are not in a position to set.

(Mr. Palma, Peru)

We understand that the strategies of mass destruction and the weapons systems which support them are extremely complex. But we should also like it to be clearly understood that that complexity has certainly not been created by the developing countries; that those problems did not exist a few decades ago: that they have been increasing in complexity as we see no readiness to limit the sophistication of such weapons; and that we shall certainly be part of the possible consequences of a confrontation with those weapons, and therefore believe it our duty to express our views on them and to call for measures which we believe to be relevant in order to reduce the real threat which we all face. Those measures can be none other than to halt the production of such weapons and to begin their dismantlement.

That is why my delegation, in this forum and in others, supports all efforts aimed at changing the present state of affairs, which even the main protagonists consider unsatisfactory. That is why we support the resolutions calling for a halt in the arms race and for the limitation and progressive but urgent reduction of weapons of mass destruction, until their complete elimination is achieved, beginning with the cessation of all nuclear tests. That is also the reason why we request that the consideration of disarmament items should be conducted with the sense of urgency called for by the agreement of the special session based on an analysis of present circumstances.

Peru has commemorated the first disarmament week and is preparing to commemorate such weeks in a more complete form in the years to come. In our Ministry for Foreign Affairs a special working group on disarmament has been set up which will centralize on a continuing basis all questions related to this problem. Our country has adhered to the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, and has ratified the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction.

(Mr. Palma, Peru)

On the other hand, we are ready to maintain our active participation in the deliberative and negotiating bodies - the Disarmament Commission and the Committee on Disarmament.

Furthermore, my country, together with other sister nations, continues to search for means which may make possible the limitation of weapons in the Latin American continent.

Everyone knows of the progress made with respect to the implementation of the historic Treaty of Tlatelolco, which proscribes nuclear weapons in Latin America. We invoke the additional efforts which are still required for it to be fully implemented, which would show the world that it is possible to eliminate those sinister instruments of destruction from a densely populated area.

In like manner, the efforts that began with the Declaration of Ayacucho are continuing - efforts which my country supported and is endeavouring to bring to full fruition, efforts whose latest manifestations are the Declaration of Washington, which expanded the scope of the Declaration, and the meeting of Latin American and Caribbean countries on conventional weapons held recently in Mexico.

We should like to emphasize that in the political Declaration issued by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the non-aligned countries at their Conference held recently in Belgrade, the following was said with respect to the Declaration of Ayacucho:

"The Conference took note with satisfaction of the Declaration signed on 23 June 1978 by the Foreign Ministers of 8 Latin American countries broadening the scope of the Declaration of Ayacucho on limitation of armaments in Latin America, signed by those countries in 1974." (A/33/206, para.131)

Furthermore, my delegation would like to express its pleasure at the manner in which many delegations in the general debate in the Assembly or in this Committee have deemed it appropriate to refer to those initiatives taken by Latin American countries aimed at promoting disarmament, security and peace in a sovereign manner and in accordance with their own systems and decisions, and I would recall that these initiatives were mentioned specifically in paragraphs 63, 67 and 84 respectively of the Final Document of the special session.

(Mr. Palma, Peru)

We do not intend to refer in detail to the items contained in this section of our programme of work and we hope in due time to offer additional comments.

But in a very general way we should like to say that we support the measures aimed at the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various areas; that we favour the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; that we shall co-sponsor draft resolutions aimed at completing the Treaty of Tlatelolco; that we support the holding of a world disarmament conference with universal participation and appropriate preparation; that we hope that the Preparatory Conference which will deal with prohibitions or restrictions of the use of certain conventional weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects will overcome its present difficulties and will, on the basis of a system of taking decisions such as that followed by the Preparatory Committee for the special session, find the means to address itself to the important substantive matters entrusted to it; and that we believe also that the work under way concerning military budgets might enable us to have a clearer awareness of the nature of military expenditures, and in due time increase not only mutual trust but also the possibilities of using part of such military budgets for the priority purposes of development.

In like manner, concerning the fundamental question of the relationship between disarmament and development, we hope that the task entrusted to the Group of Experts may be completed as soon as possible with the co-operation of Governments and institutions. The results they achieve will no doubt show the indivisible nature of these problems and the need to face them as a whole.

We believe today, as we have always believed, that the proliferation of nuclear weapons considerably increases the risk of nuclear confrontation and seriously disrupts the security of all nations. But we are also certain that if there is an overriding risk it is undoubtedly that of expansion and growing sophistication, almost beyond control, of the arsenals of the countries possessing nuclear weapons and that there can be no better antidote to horizontal proliferation than the daily more urgent initiation of a process of effective nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Palma, Peru)

Herein lies the essential counterpart, which has not been forthcoming as yet, to the unprecedented and voluntary renunciation by a considerable number of States under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the second Review Conference of which, precisely for these reasons, must be adequately prepared.

We repeat also that the objectives of non-proliferation, to which we unreservedly subscribe, should not be used as a discriminatory means to limit utilization of nuclear power for peaceful purposes, which is so necessary for the developing countries.

Our delegation deplores the fact that the almost always imminent attainment of substantive agreements called for by the international community on the prohibition of nuclear tests and the limitation of strategic weapons between the two States with the most powerful arsenals seems unlikely to come by the time we end our work. Once again we shall support delegations which urgently call for the conclusion of those agreements.

We should also give similar consideration to the Treaty on chemical weapons. We repeat our call for information on an approximate date for concluding the attempts now under way in this connexion.

The ending of the arms race is necessary because there are more than enough weapons, and above all more than enough weapons of mass destruction, to wreak indescribable devastation. The criterion of economics is sufficient to justify such limitation, as also in the fact that the continuation and acceleration of the arms race in themselves are factors which affect security and make more difficult the task of safeguarding peace.

Reversing the arms race is desirable not only because the resources which might then become available for other purposes are needed, given the real needs of all peoples, and not of the developing countries alone, but also because we believe it should be recognized that all the weapons available have not made mankind more secure.



(Mr. Palma, Peru)

They have merely made ourselves more dangerous to each other, to our environment, and unfortunately we must recognize it, they have even jeopardized the possibility of there being future generations.

Mr. SAHINGUVU (Burundi) (interpretation from French): Items 35-49 on the agenda of the General Assembly at its thirty-third session are all familiar questions to the United Nations. The General Assembly has been considering them for a number of years now. The oldest of them goes back to the fourteenth session of the General Assembly and the more recent of them to the twenty-ninth. On repeated occasions, all delegations have expressed their views and recommendations on these questions, and the delegation of Burundi regrets that none of them has yet found any final solution because, of course, of the absence of political will on the part of certain States in this area, a political will, we venture to repeat, which is a sine qua non of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of international institutions. The delegation of Burundi is convinced that although they may be considered a well-ploughed field, the questions contained in items 35-49 of the agenda of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly are no less important than the other items on the agenda of the First Committee.

While we understand perfectly well the reasons for priority being accorded to halting the nuclear arms race in the light of the constant spectre of a world conflagration of catastrophic proportions which it poses to mankind, the delegation of Burundi believes that sustained efforts to reduce and eliminate other kinds of arms have proved equally indispensable and urgent. Indeed, in the view of the delegation of Burundi, chemical, biological and what are called conventional weapons can also cause effects sufficiently harmful and devastating for it to be to the advantage of mankind to be spared the effects of these weapons, just as mankind wishes to be spared the effects of nuclear arms. Wars fought with conventional weapons have throughout history already caused enormous loss of human life in various continents and a tremendous loss of material and human resources which are constantly being diverted from economic and social development of third world countries to what are generally called non-nuclear arms.

(Mr. Sahinguvu, Burundi)

Nevertheless, the delegation of Burundi is very pleased to see that some progress has been achieved towards solving the problems raised by these items of the General Assembly's agenda, in particular the statements, and international conventions which have already been achieved with regard to certain questions. We hope that these international commitments will increase in number and encompass all the questions with which we are concerned. We are particularly pleased at the conclusion of an international convention on the prohibition of the development, manufacture and stockpiling of biological weapons, and also with the signing and ratification of Additional Protocols I and II to the Treaty of Tlatelolco by a number of nuclear Powers. We would hope to see more countries sign these international instruments.

Within the same context, my delegation would like to appeal to States and to the Committee on Disarmament to promote the early conclusion and ratification of the treaties on the prohibition of the manufacture and stockpiling of chemical weapons, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the cessation of nuclear tests, the reduction of military budgets and the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction. We would also like to appeal for compliance with and the application of the declarations of the General Assembly which have proclaimed some parts of the world to be denuclearized zones or peace zones, in particular with regard to Africa, the Middle East and South Asia. To this end, Burundi became co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1 and intends to support a resolution on the denuclearization of Africa.

The delegation of Burundi also believes that it would be in the interests of the international community for the commitments which the militarily powerful States undertook at the tenth special session and at this session of the General Assembly, in particular on the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States, to be enshrined in international conventions which, because of their binding and legal nature, could better contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security. Therefore, we support the proposal of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of security guarantees for non-nuclear States.

(Mr. Sahinguvu, Burundi)

However, as other delegations have stressed, the delegation of Burundi believes that if it is to be effective and enjoy broad support from other States, the Soviet draft should be examined and supplemented by the Committee on Disarmament, the committee entrusted by the General Assembly with the task of negotiations on disarmament. We would like to stress particularly that the conclusion of such a convention should not be an end in itself, but should form part of a global programme of complete disarmament, which is the only true guarantee that nuclear force would not be used, and a guarantee against the unnecessary squandering of material and human resources.

Without wishing to dwell on the indispensable link which must exist between disarmament and development - a point we believe we stressed sufficiently in any case in our first statement - my delegation feels that it ought to say a few words on the subject. We would like to appeal to the developed countries to see to it that the funds saved as a result of the reduction in military budgets should be devoted to the social and economic advancement of the developing countries by increasing their contributions to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) or to another development agency which might be selected subsequently for the purpose of supporting the work of the UNDP.

Like the other non-aligned countries, Burundi believes that the holding in 1981 and 1982 of the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, followed at a reasonable interval by the world conference itself, would be quite in keeping with the aspirations of the international community in regard to the process of general and complete disarmament. We support draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.11, of which we have become a co-sponsor.

Mr. BOATEN (Ghana): Statements made so far by the various representatives who spoke earlier on clearly show that the urgency of tackling disarmament is fully appreciated. The problems that prompted the convening of the tenth special session are still with us, and the arms race continues to escalate at an enormous rate. This has involved the diversion to armaments of resources that should have gone to areas of economic and social development to provide shelter and food for millions of people living in poverty and want. It is the hope of my delegation, therefore, that the motives that inspired the special session will be supported by the necessary political will to ensure that the decisions adopted by consensus at the special session are implemented. The international community expects that, after the unique opportunities offered by the tenth special session, meaningful progress will now be made on disarmament. Before touching on some of the items that are now under discussion, I wish to say what, in the opinion of my delegation, should guide us in our consideration of disarmament.

The present levels of nuclear-weapon stockpiles and the mutual suspicions of the East and the West make it quite clear that it will be difficult to achieve general and complete disarmament overnight. National security considerations alone indicate clearly that negotiations are bound to be slow, to the point of creating frustrations for a number of delegations which would have preferred to see agreements concluded without delay. My delegation, however, would advocate a pragmatic step-by-step approach to this sensitive but important question. We feel in this regard that attention should be concentrated on those aspects of negotiations that can have immediate results. This approach, in our view, will ensure that particular disarmament negotiations and related issues are thoroughly examined and that appropriate provisions for their implementation are defined. In this way we shall all be sure that a solid base for further co-ordinated progress is ensured. To be over-ambitious and take on too many issues at the same time might, in our view, create disillusionment and even lead us away from the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament. In this connexion, we believe that ongoing negotiations should be pursued and brought to fruitful conclusions. We urge the nuclear Powers engaged in those negotiations to show flexibility in their positions; their conduct should show that they seriously want disarmament and that they are assiduously pursuing it.

(Mr. Boateng, Ghana)

The Final Document of the special session devoted to disarmament clearly emphasized the special responsibility devolving on the two super-Powers if meaningful progress is to be made in slowing down the arms race. This responsibility, in our view, makes necessary the exercise of maximum restraint, particularly in the scale of nuclear-arms expansion by those Powers. In other words, the international community expects that each of those nuclear Powers will behave in such a way that the other does not feel it is falling behind in the over-all military balance of strength between the two.

Recent reports, however, do not seem to indicate that those special obligations have been discharged. My delegation has in mind the concern expressed by the delegations of Hungary and of the Soviet Union when they spoke last week about the United States Government's decision to go ahead with the manufacture and deployment of the neutron bomb, which is also called the reduced blast and enhanced radiation bomb. It appears, on reading the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, that the United States decision to go ahead with the manufacture and deployment of this type of weapon derives from the concern of the United States Government and its Western allies that they have fallen behind in military strength in face of alleged military improvements in the arms of countries of the Eastern bloc.

That claim, of course, has been denied by the Eastern side, as the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament also shows. We, for obvious reasons, do not have the technological capability to verify the truth of that claim by the United States and its Western allies or its denial by the Soviet Union. One thing is clear, however: that as a result of such mutual distrust the international community may yet be faced with another dangerous phase of the nuclear-arms race.

In the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament the Soviet reaction is clearly stated as follows:

"The Soviet Union is decisively against the development of a neutron bomb ... but if this bomb is developed in the West - developed against us, which no one even attempts to conceal - then it should be clearly understood that the USSR will not stand by as a passive observer. We shall be faced with

(Mr. Boaten, Ghana)

the necessity of meeting this challenge in order to ensure the security of the Soviet people and its allies and friends. In the last analysis all this will raise the arms race to an even more dangerous level. We do not wish this to happen and therefore we propose that agreement be reached on the mutual renunciation of the production of the neutron bomb so as to save the world from the emergence of this new weapon of mass destruction of human beings." (A/33/27, para. 117)

I believe that the deeply-held preference of the delegations assembled here must be for both super-Powers to replace attempts to achieve a balance through ever-increasing and ever-more-costly armed forces by a balance based on a mutual reduction in their forces. It is the view of my delegation that at this session we should again remind the two super-Powers that they owe it to humanity and it is their duty to fulfil in all sincerity the special obligations that the fact of their being nuclear Powers imposes on them.

Talking about responsibilities and restraints brings to my mind the need to ensure in all disarmament measures that no particular country gains an advantage over another. Countries will not renounce the further building-up of military power, still less take the first steps in reducing armaments, if they see that others have an advantage over them. We believe, therefore, that if disarmament measures are to have a meaningful impact there must be adequate provision for verification. We note with deep satisfaction that at the special session devoted to disarmament due recognition was given to the institution of appropriate procedures of verification that are non-discriminatory and will not constitute undue interference in the domestic affairs of States or jeopardize their economic and social development. In its report (A/33/27), the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament also indicates that this subject is receiving the attention of the Committee.

(Mr. Boatén, Ghana)

In the view of my delegation, however, verification by non-seismic means such as on-site inspections or by satellite observations should be carried out with international participation. In this connexion, my delegation will support the draft resolution initiated by the French delegation calling for an expert study of the proposal made by President Giscard d'Estaing during the special session on disarmament for establishing an international satellite monitoring agency and the conditions under which such an agency might operate.

Having said this, I will now turn to some of the items under discussion. I wish to refer in this regard to item 37 which deals with chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons.

By resolution 32/77, the General Assembly requested the Committee on Disarmament to continue as a matter of high priority the elaboration of an agreement on effective measures for banning chemical weapons. My delegation has studied paragraphs 157-187 of the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. We note with interest the report on the joint initiative of the Soviet Union and the United States made to the Committee on 22 August 1978 by the United States delegation to the effect that the two countries were making progress in the bilateral negotiations on their joint initiative for the prohibition of chemical weapons.

The report of the United States delegation further indicates that a number of outstanding issues remains to be resolved before the draft treaty banning these types of weapons can be concluded. Among those outstanding issues, according to the report, is the question of developing an adequate verification system. It is the view of my delegation that the verification measures should be able to monitor all testing or field trials and should ensure that the production of chemical weapons is halted and existing stocks destroyed.

In view of the urgency of this matter it might help the speedy conclusion of a treaty if the two nuclear Powers would transmit a preliminary text, indicating areas where outstanding issues are yet to be settled, for the consideration of the negotiating Committee. We feel that

(Mr. Boateng, Ghana)

the negotiating body could be helpful in narrowing areas of difference which the two Powers, because of their particular interests, may not be in a position to resolve easily.

On the question of a comprehensive test-ban treaty my delegation has already stated its position during the consideration of item 125, namely, that in view of the urgency of the matter the ongoing trilateral negotiations among the three nuclear-weapon States should be pursued with additional vigour with a view to bringing them to a positive conclusion. In resolution 32/78 the General Assembly urged the three nuclear-weapon States to expedite their negotiations with a view to concluding an agreement. It is quite clear from the wording of that resolution that the General Assembly was optimistic that at this session positive results would have emerged from the trilateral negotiations between the three nuclear-weapon States. However, reading through paragraphs 54 to 88 of the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament contained in document A/33/27, one notes that the expected results are nowhere near. We note the assurance by the three nuclear Powers that intensive negotiations are in progress to narrow areas of difference with a view to concluding an agreement.

My delegation shares the deep concern and disappointment of the Group of 15 of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament with regard to the present status of the comprehensive test-ban issue. It is also the view of my delegation that the only multilateral negotiating body be informed without further delay about the details of outstanding substantive issues. In this the three nuclear Powers should have the benefit of the views of the members of the Group of 15 who, because of their impartiality, could help in narrowing the differences and, among other things, in ensuring the widest possible support for the draft treaty.

We feel that unless considerable progress is made and a comprehensive test-ban treaty concluded, non-nuclear weapon States will have no incentive to encourage them to renounce the acquisition of nuclear weapons. This in turn might defeat the whole purpose of promoting nuclear non-proliferation. In the view of my delegation, therefore, this Committee should, through the General Assembly, give clear political directives to the three nuclear Powers.



(Mr. Boateng, Ghana)

These directives should have as one of their key elements the importance of transmitting whatever preliminary treaty they may have agreed upon to the multilateral body for its full consideration. We strongly recommend this course of action; otherwise, the prospects of concluding an agreement on this important aspect of disarmament will continue to elude us.

I now turn to the question of conventional weapons. Reading through the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, it is clear that views differ as to the degree of priority which should be attached to the question of limitations on conventional weapons and the arms trade. While some delegations think that, in addition to nuclear weapons, urgent measures to control conventional arms should receive equal attention, others think otherwise.

My delegation is quite aware of the enormous resources being spent on conventional weapons which could go to areas of economic and social development where they are desperately needed. We are also aware that statistics indicate that a large proportion of this expenditure on conventional weapons is, ironically, incurred by the developing countries for whom there is by far a more urgent need to provide food and shelter for their millions.

As a delegation from the continent of Africa, however, where the racist Pretoria régime has been encouraged, wittingly or unwittingly, by some Members of this Organization to build its enormous arsenal through the granting of licences and patents, I might be tempted to ask what choice is left to African countries. In recent months the apartheid régime either has directly attacked neighbouring independent African States with impunity or organized jointly with its rebel bedfellow, Ian Smith, to conduct military aggression against neighbouring African countries.

(Mr. Boaten, Ghana)

It is also well known that, through nuclear collaboration by a Member of this Organization, Pretoria is now a potential nuclear Power. Confronted with such a situation, African States might find it difficult to accept restraints on the acquisition of conventional weapons for fear that that would weaken their capability to defend their countries against military attacks by the racist régimes.

It was to avert a situation in which they would find their international obligations in conflict with the need to legitimately defend their sovereignty and independence that in their wisdom the African Heads of State, at their summit meeting in 1964, declared the continent of Africa a denuclearized zone. This Organization, through its numerous resolutions, has taken cognizance of the wishes of the African Heads of State. But Pretoria's nuclear-weapon ambitions have hindered the full implementation of, and the benefits deriving from, the denuclearization of the African continent. My delegation calls upon Member States of this Organization to respect the wishes of the African countries and desist from collaborating or associating with the racist régime in the area of nuclear weapons development. We also request that South Africa submit its nuclear facilities to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards system.

The danger of nuclear war continues to hang over mankind like the sword of Damocles. It is our duty, therefore, not only to take cognizance of this fact but to use the opportunity provided by any international forum to advance the cause of removing that danger and preventing that horror.

Reading through the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference (A/33/28) it is clear that the views of nuclear-weapon States as regards the convening of the world disarmament conference vary. The report also shows that while some of the nuclear-weapon States participated in the work of the Committee by virtue of the mandate given to the Committee, two nuclear-weapon States merely maintained contact with the Ad Hoc Committee through its Chairman.

(Mr. Boaten, Ghana)

In sum, the final report of the Ad Hoc Committee shows that of the five nuclear-weapon States which the Committee was expected to consult only one of them unequivocally expressed its support for holding a world disarmament conference.

The idea of holding a disarmament conference to maintain the momentum of disarmament efforts is welcome. However, it is the view of my delegation that the conference should not be held within the next five years, to give enough time for major decisions taken at the tenth special session to be implemented and their impact properly assessed. In this way, we shall be able to know the areas where additional efforts are needed and therefore press for the necessary political will.

When the Disarmament Decade was launched some years ago the expectation was that by the end of the Decade, in 1980, the world would have advanced very close to curbing the arms race and releasing resources for the desperate areas where they are most needed, especially in the developing countries. It is clear that we are nowhere near our objective. After the impetus provided by the special session devoted to disarmament, the international community will be expecting us to rechart our course with a view to achieving the objectives of the Decade. It is the hope of my delegation that we shall not fail them.

I have spoken at length because there are several items on the agenda on the subject of disarmament and I do not propose to speak a second time.

The CHAIRMAN: The delegation of Congo wishes to announce it has become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.7, A/C.1/33/L.9 and A/C.1/33/L.12.

The meeting rose at 4 p.m.