

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records *



FIRST COMMITTEE
27th meeting
held on
Monday, 7 November 1977
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 27th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOATEN (Ghana)

CONTENTS

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN ON THE OCCASION OF THE SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

AGENDA ITEM 33: ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ARMAMENTS RACE AND ITS EXTREMELY HARMFUL EFFECTS ON WORLD PEACE AND SECURITY: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 34: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 3473 (XXX) CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL I OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TIATELOLCO): REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 38: INCENDIARY AND OTHER SPECIFIC CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WHICH MAY BE THE SUBJECT OF PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS OF USE FOR HUMANITARIAN REASONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 39: CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 40: URGENT NEED FOR CESSATION OF NUCLEAR AND THERMONUCLEAR TESTS AND CONCLUSION OF A TREATY DESIGNED TO ACHIEVE A COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 41: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 31/67 CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL II OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TIATELOLCO) (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 42: EFFECTIVE MEASURES TO IMPLEMENT THE PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DISARMAMENT DECADE (continued):

(a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 43: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE DENUCLEARIZATION OF AFRICA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 44: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN THE REGION OF THE MIDDLE EAST (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.1/32/PV.27
11 November 1977

ENGLISH

AGENDA ITEM 45: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN SOUTH ASIA:
REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 46: 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 47: REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
(continued)

AGENDA ITEM 48: 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 49: CONCLUSION OF A TREATY ON THE COMPLETE AND GENERAL PROHIBITION
OF NUCLEAR-WEAPON TESTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 51: 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 52: SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT:
REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL
ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 53: WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE
ON THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN ON THE OCCASION OF THE SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
OCTOBER REVOLUTION

The CHAIRMAN: Before the Committee proceeds to the consideration of the items on its agenda for this morning, I should like to mention that today, 7 November, the Soviet Union celebrates the sixtieth anniversary of the October Revolution and founding of the Soviet State. I congratulate the delegation of the Soviet Union and, through it, the Soviet Government and people on this occasion.

The October Revolution has a special place in history. It has world-wide significance. It generated radical changes throughout the world; it opened new horizons for the oppressed people seeking freedom, independence and social justice.

I take this opportunity to convey to the Soviet people our good wishes for further progress, continued peace and greater achievements.

AGENDA ITEMS 33, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45,
46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52 and 53 (continued)

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): Today, 7 November, the Soviet people - that fighting and internationalist people, a creative and pioneering people of the first socialist State of the masses in the world - together with the whole of progressive mankind is solemnly marking the great occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of the Socialist Revolution, which was the most momentous event of the twentieth century.

This day is of particular significance for the working people of Mongolia too and indeed for all those who cherish peace, social progress and disarmament.

In the course of the recent celebrations in Moscow, the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, the President of the Praesidium of the Great National Khural of the Mongolian People's Republic, Comrade Tsedenbal, in his address stated:

"The call of Red October found a warm response in the hearts of the freedom-loving Mongolian people. Our people is proud of the historical fact that it was one of the first to take up the torch of Great October and to rise to the

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

struggle for freedom, independence and happiness. The vast and far-reaching changes which have occurred in our ancient homeland and the inspiring prospects of the further flourishing of our land are primarily due to the outstanding achievements of the workers of Mongolia and the result of their revolutionary enthusiasm. At the same time - and we say this with pride - they are the fruit of the unbreakable class alliance of the Mongolian people and the working class of the Soviet land, the fruit of the tremendous force of international friendship of our peoples, and there is no force in the world which could do anything to sunder the eternal indissoluble friendship and fraternal union of the peoples of Socialist Mongolia and the Soviet Union."

I should like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the Mongolian delegation, most warmly to congratulate the delegations of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic upon this glorious anniversary, which is a common festive occasion to us, and to wish them ever new successes in their fruitful efforts on behalf of the triumph of our common ideals.

Before stating certain views to confirm the position of the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic on the contemporary issues of disarmament, I should like to make a brief comment of a general nature. The main point which, in our view, should be particularly stressed here is that, in present circumstances in which détente has become a decisive feature of contemporary international life, it is imperative to strive for further effective measures in bringing the arms race to a halt and bringing about disarmament. Thanks to the pioneering efforts of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and all peace-loving States, important steps have been taken towards the consolidation of the results already achieved in this direction.

In the interest of making major progress and important changes in restraining the arms race and a radical break-through in solving the urgent problems of disarmament, the Soviet Union has come forward with some constructive proposals which have met with widespread support from the international community. Further proof of this is the question raised by the Soviet delegation at this session of the General Assembly entitled "Deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war". As was demonstrated by the general debate in the General Assembly and the discussion of that item in our own

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

Committee, the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations reaffirmed their profound interest in the deepening and developing of the positive changes in international life and in consolidating them by practical measures in the field of restraining the arms race and bringing about disarmament.

(Mr. Erdembileg Mongolia)

The Mongolian delegation also pointed out that the new Soviet initiative focuses the attention of the world community on the crucial problem of contemporary international life, the problem of further deepening the process of international détente and protecting mankind from the threat of nuclear war.

In stressing the position of principle of the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic on the question of détente and disarmament, the President, Comrade Tsedenbal, at a meeting with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Waldheim, during the course of Mr. Waldheim's recent visit to the Mongolian People's Republic, stated that the most important task of the hour was that of deepening détente so as to make it irreversible and extend its effects to all the continents of the world, and that a decisive material basis for attaining that goal would be a cessation of the arms race and the taking of concrete practical measures in the field of disarmament, together with the development of mutually advantageous and equal co-operation among States.

In the course of the general debate on disarmament items, the majority of delegations in the Committee have been pointing with profound concern to the growing rhythm of the arms race, which represents a threat to international peace and security. Indeed, we cannot fail to note that those circles connected with military-industrial monopolies, the opponents of détente and disarmament are sparing no effort to undermine those measures designed to restrain the arms race and to ensure that a start is made on genuine disarmament. In those circumstances it is the duty of all peace-loving States to redouble their efforts to deepen and expand political détente even further so that it may be supplemented by military détente. The times dictate the urgent tasks of the hour, which are the implementation of genuine disarmament, primarily that of nuclear disarmament; that is something which was clearly and distinctly reflected in all its aspects in the Soviet memorandum on the question of ceasing the arms race and on disarmament.

Quite recently, the Soviet Union put forward a new, extremely important initiative which has met with widespread support and a favourable response from public opinion. I have in mind the proposal of the Soviet Union for the simultaneous cessation by all States of the manufacture of all nuclear weapons which, if it were adopted, in our view would facilitate to a decisive extent a cessation of the nuclear arms race and would eliminate the threat of nuclear war.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

Among those measures designed to limit the arms race, to bring about disarmament and to prevent the threat of nuclear war, we should like to highlight the measures for the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon testing. The reaching of practical decisions made in this area would do a great deal to facilitate the halting of the qualitative improvement of these arms of mass destruction.

As we see it, that purpose can be achieved by producing an appropriate international agreement prohibiting all nuclear-weapons tests by all States, without exception.

It will be recalled that in the talks now going on the question of control is one of the most important. However, we should beware of complicating the issue and protracting the adoption of a decision, in particular because the Soviet Union submitted to the thirty-first session of the General Assembly a supplementary draft treaty which allows for the carrying out of verification on the spot on a voluntary basis. We warmly welcome the new and important step of the Soviet Union, which has expressed its willingness to come to an agreement that, along with the prohibition of all nuclear-weapons tests for a definite period, a moratorium be declared on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. We should like to express the hope that the adding of this new element to the already well-known proposal for the establishment of a moratorium, in agreement with the United States and the United Kingdom, for a specific period of time on underground tests of nuclear weapons even before the remaining nuclear Powers become parties to a future treaty, will lead to agreement at an early date upon the text of the Treaty. It should be stressed particularly that for the final solution of this problem a major condition remains - as it does indeed throughout the realm of nuclear disarmament - the absolute necessity for the participation of all States possessing nuclear weapons.

I should like to point out that the task of strengthening the régime governing the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is one which is assuming even greater urgency. The performance of that task is made more difficult by the fact that two nuclear Powers and a number of so-called near-nuclear States are not yet parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Furthermore, the problem is made more difficult because of the intention of the racist régime of the Republic of South Africa, with the co-operation of certain Western States, to acquire the nuclear weapon. That is a naked challenge on the part of South Africa, which not only intensifies the danger of the spread of nuclear weapons, but also will lead to a

(Mr. Erdembileg Mongolia)

sharp exacerbation of the situation in southern Africa and is fraught with the gravest possible consequences for international peace and security. What we need are the concerted efforts of all States to prevent the Republic of South Africa from acquiring nuclear weapons, and in that, an important role can and must be played by the United Nations.

We should also like to point out that something which warrants the most careful attention and consideration is the idea of preparing a new report on nuclear weapons, an idea put forward in the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the United Nations in 1977 (A/31/1).

In the work of easing the threat of nuclear war and halting the nuclear arms race the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks between the Soviet Union and the United States are of decisive importance. Obviously, the successful conclusion of those talks, in particular with regard to producing a new agreement on the limitation of offensive strategic armaments, would largely depend on the extent to which the principle of equality and equal security is observed.

We are encouraged by the progress which has been achieved in narrowing the difference between the sides, and this is something which may facilitate further progress in this important matter.

I should like particularly to stress the present relevance of the question of the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. We hold the view that the time has come to make a start on a more specific consideration of this question, with a view to achieving a universally acceptable international agreement which would ban any activities on the part of States connected with the creation of new forms of weapons of mass destruction. Our experience has confirmed that in present circumstances, with the absence of any limitations at all on the use of the advances in science and technology for military purposes, new forms of weapons of mass destruction could emerge at any time. In other words, the more far-reaching will their pernicious effects be; their impact may even exceed that of chemical or bacteriological weapons.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

It is worth while recalling that not all that long ago here in this Committee, when the discussion began on this item, there were people heard saying that it was impossible to ban something which did not actually exist. We also heard the view that it was very complicated to produce a definition of a new weapon. However, the facts have confirmed that the idea of creating radiological weapons was not an idea that began yesterday, and it was not only today that the world began to witness attempts to embark upon the production of cruise missiles and the neutron bomb. Furthermore, attempts are being made to represent such an inhumane weapon as the neutron bomb as a weapon with a clean effect and a humane character. Such heights of hypocrisy have aroused a wave of alarm and indignation among peace-loving peoples who categorically oppose the manufacture and the deployment in Western Europe of this monstrous means of the mass destruction of people.

For that reason the task of the timely adoption of preventive measures is something which has become a matter of acute urgency, measures designed to serve as a reliable barrier against the emergence of new types of systems of weapons of mass destruction. We are convinced that the achievement of a new international agreement on this question is entirely possible provided that we can have a spirit of realism and a mobilizing of the political will and efforts of all States, particularly all major States in the military sense.

The Mongolian delegation would like to see soon more concrete results in talks on this item in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. A good basis for this could be the supplemented draft agreement submitted by the Soviet delegation on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, which takes into account the useful ideas and points put forward by a number of delegations in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

I should like to mention the importance of new fixed elements in this draft. First of all, underlying the concretization of the subject of the prohibition, there are the decisive factors involved in it which take into account current requirements and tasks in the field of disarmament. Furthermore, with an all-embracing approach, provision is made for the addition of a specific list of new forms of weapons that are banned, a list which in future, as the need arises, can be supplemented. Finally, a less flexible approach to the problem was

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

reflected in the special annex to the draft agreement which provides for the possibility of the conclusion of separate agreements on any given concrete new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. As we understand the matter, the harmonizing of views on partial measures in this area should not serve as an impediment to the conclusion of a general agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction.

The Mongolian delegation believes it advisable for the General Assembly to appeal to all States to refrain from any action liable to make more difficult international talks aimed at producing an agreement or agreements to prevent the use of advances in science and technology for the creation of new forms and systems of weapons of mass destruction. The genuine possibility for the producing of such agreements was convincingly demonstrated by something approved at the last session of the General Assembly and opened for signature by its States Members, which was the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques (resolution 31/72).

Mongolia, which was one of the first to sign this convention, views it as an important step towards the halting of the arms race and the taking of effective disarmament measures, and particularly steps aimed at preventing the emergence of new means of mass destruction. The important thing now is for this convention to become universal.

In the question of prohibiting chemical weapons we take as our principal point of departure the fact that what should underlie it and the solution to it should be a comprehensive approach, that is, the achievement of agreement on the effective prohibition of the production, manufacture and stockpiling of all forms of chemical weapons and their total destruction. Such a constructive approach would serve the end of eliminating from the arsenals of States chemical means of mass destruction and would be a genuine measure in the realm of disarmament.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

On the other hand, we note that there have been some important advances in the bilateral Soviet-American talks. In the talks in the CCD we also see a general agreement taking shape with regard to the definition of the scope of the prohibition on the basis of the criterion of the purpose as is provided for in the draft convention submitted by the Socialist countries in 1972. We hope that efforts will then be taken towards the earliest possible attainment of agreement on a system of control to be based on national means of detection and identification.

As the Committee will recall, the Soviet Union and other socialist States have demonstrated **flexibility** with regard to the method of control with the use of appropriate international procedures in addition to national means of verification. Our assumption on this is that such a method of control would not be allowed to affect the sovereign rights and the interests of the national security of each State. In our **view**, the important thing now is a political solution to this urgent problem.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

It will be recalled that as a result of the conference held in Geneva in June of this year to review the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement on the Sea-Bed and Ocean Floor and Subsoil thereof of Nuclear Weapons and Other Types of Weapons of Mass Destruction, a number of important recommendations were adopted. The delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that the General Assembly should support the final Declaration adopted unanimously by the Conference, which in particular addresses an appeal to States that have not yet become parties to the Treaty and in particular to States which possess nuclear weapons or any other types of weapons of mass destruction to become parties to it as soon as possible. This would be an important contribution to the strengthening of international confidence.

The next logical step supported by the Conference was the continuation of earnest, conscientious efforts to achieve further measures leading to the total demilitarization of the sea-bed and ocean floor.

At this session of the General Assembly an active discussion is going on on the question of preparations for the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly to be devoted to disarmament questions. That is only natural. In our view, the special session should perform the task of formulating fundamental provisions and principles for talks on disarmament and to determine priority tasks upon which the efforts of States should be concentrated. That was the principle guiding the Mongolian delegation when on 7 September 1977 it, along with other socialist countries, sponsored in the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session working documents relating to the fundamental provisions of the Declaration and Programme of Action on Disarmament (A/AC.187/81 and 82). These working documents, which duly take into account the views expressed and points made by many States, are in our view a good basis for harmonizing views and coming to agreement on the final documents of the special session. We hope that in the time remaining the work of the Preparatory Committee will be further marked by its constructiveness and businesslike approach to the achievement of universally accepted agreement on the items under discussion.

The Mongolian delegation takes a favourable view of the inclusion in the agenda of the special session of the item on the convening of a world disarmament

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

conference. We see such a conference as an authoritative international forum well qualified to consider the whole range of disarmament questions and to take effective decisions thereon. On this basis, we believe it necessary in the future to continue intensifying the work of the Special Committee for the World Disarmament Conference. There can be no doubt that consistent efforts on the part of all peoples to limit the arms race and to bring about disarmament and the taking of practical measures in this vital area will promote the attainment of the ultimate goal, complete and general disarmament, and the establishment of lasting peace throughout the world.

Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, since this is the first time I have spoken in this Committee I am very happy to congratulate you, the two Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur. Your ability and your devotion are guarantees of the success of the work of the present session.

There is no field of action in the United Nations in which progress is more to be desired than that of disarmament, since disarmament implies the strengthening of peace and the encouragement of economic and social development.

When he addressed the General Assembly during the general debate, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ecuador stated that:

"It is in the area of general and complete disarmament that the United Nations commitment to improve conditions for mankind is of the greatest importance; yet it is also the area where the least progress has been registered." (A/32/PV.9, p. 4-5)

Speaking of the impressive world expenditure on armaments, he added:

"The arms race, both nuclear and conventional, is an expensive aberration whose price, paid in terms of lives and universal regression is the senseless offering that mankind makes to death and destruction." (Ibid.)

The question is how countries may try to reduce their armaments in accordance with the fundamental desires of the international community and at the same time counter the danger of the complacency, with all its grave dangers to mankind, that might come about if years go by without any concrete progress being achieved.

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

The complete prohibition of all nuclear-weapons tests, the prohibition of the development, production, and stockpiling of chemical weapons, the prohibition of environmental modification techniques for hostile purposes, the banning of new forms of mass destruction, the limitation of conventional weapons - all are desirable and not necessarily impossible targets. The action to be undertaken depends on the awareness of certain sovereign States of their primary duty to mankind arising from their prominence in history, their great combined wealth and their armed strength all over the world.

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

If we are already saying that the two super-Powers alone have accumulated enough destructive power to liquidate 100,000 million human beings, which is 25 times the present population of our world, it is obvious that the question of disarmament must be of unanimous interest to all mankind, since nothing unites people more than a common danger.

We must channel our hopes now towards the special session of the General Assembly and its Programme of Action on Disarmament which, I might as well say here and now, is not expected to be a panacea but a process that is to begin by adopting positive measures in order to counteract the scepticism that is starting to gain ground among the majority of peoples of the international community. Thus we wish to voice our support and our acknowledgement to Mr. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas for the admirable work he has been doing in presiding over the Preparatory Committee for the special session of the General Assembly.

We must break the deadlock in disarmament talks and develop a strategy in this matter. We trust that this will be the main substance of the final document of the special session, apart from the declaration, the importance of which we do not under-estimate. We believe that just as important as the Programme of Action will be the machinery for disarmament negotiations so that once and for all we may be able to reach solutions that have been awaited over so many years of discussion.

We also trust that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) which for many years has had before it as a priority item the task of drafting a treaty prohibiting all nuclear-weapons tests, will contribute positively to the work of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, thus concluding that task successfully in the course of its next session which is due to begin on 31 January 1978. In many of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly we have pressed for the need to conclude this treaty to which we attach importance. My delegation, as well as many other delegations, believes that that such a ban would constitute the most effective measure to put an end to the proliferation of nuclear weapons both vertically and horizontally. We would venture to hope that the

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

tripartite negotiations taking place on this matter will be successful within a reasonable period of time thus allowing the CCD to prepare a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear tests before the eighth special session of the General Assembly on disarmament.

We must point out that those countries that are in the majority, namely those that are not nuclear-weapon States, have been very gratified at certain recent events such as: the declaration of President Carter in the United Nations on the readiness of the United States to limit and reduce nuclear weapons on a reciprocal basis by 10 per cent, 20 per cent, or 50 per cent; the fact that the time has come to put an end to all explosions of nuclear devices for whatever reason, whether peaceful or military; the possibility that fuel cycles will be handled safely on a global basis, and the declaration not to use nuclear weapons except in the case of self-defence.

Another event was the statement by the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Andrei Gromyko, when in this General Assembly he said:

"... under an arrangement with the United States and Great Britain we have consented to suspend underground nuclear-weapon tests for a certain period of time even before the other nuclear Powers accede to the future treaty." (A/32/PV.8, p. 73-75)

There is also an acknowledged détente in the international atmosphere that has overcome the dangers of the cold war and is beginning to pave the way to concrete negotiations.

There is the fact that the SALT talks continue within their framework of negotiation, and may I say that we hope that both parties will be able to submit encouraging results to the world during the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament.

Furthermore, there is the recent declaration by the Soviet Union of its readiness to come to an agreement or a moratorium covering both nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes and a total ban on all nuclear-weapon tests for a given period.

(Mr. Alborno, Ecuador)

It is also imperative that we obtain an effective ban on the production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons, yet here again the results expected have not been achieved. Besides, with terrifying calm, we, the other countries are told that a nuclear war may not have such grave consequences, which would imply that brainwashing of a psychological nature has begun, surrounded by the orchestration of all the modern methods of swaying world public opinion. The truth of the matter is that the multiplication of all these weapons and their incessant progress proves that the greater Powers are still preparing themselves for a pre-emptive strike under optimum conditions despite it having been proved ad nauseum that no country will really win a nuclear war.

The situation has reached such a point that the eruption of a nuclear holocaust that might wipe out our entire civilized systems becomes more probable every day. But year after year we hear the warnings and the appeals of the majority left unanswered by the minority so far as action is concerned.

In the ratio of expenditure between nuclear and conventional weaponry in the world we are impressed by the size of the investments that are made which bear no relation whatever to the dangers inherent in one or other type of weaponry so far as the destructive potential of nuclear weapons is concerned. It is there, therefore, that the most urgent imperative lies. Of course, of the world's expenditure on armaments a mere 20 per cent is spent by the developing nations, of which 1.5 per cent is accounted for by Latin America. Here I should stress the need to make one point very clear regarding that proportion of conventional weapons needed to maintain the domestic security of each State. Where the greatest danger, the greatest production, the greatest squandering and the greatest need for immediate action are to be found becomes clear, namely among the great Powers where disarmament might be easier from a political standpoint.

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

Another disquieting aspect is that of a possible war by miscalculation. There have been more than 100 nuclear accidents which have taken place since the end of the Second World War. The danger of an even greater accident that will lead to an exchange of nuclear attacks is daily greater and with nuclear proliferation the day may not be far off when these weapons may be turned to by private agencies of violence and terrorism with all the consequences likely to ensue, and events would go from the apparently innocuous field of science fiction to the tragic awakening of an annihilated mankind.

Thus we are gratified that the Soviet Union has signed agreements with other nuclear Powers on the prevention of an accidental outbreak of nuclear war.

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

What is serious, however, is that the smaller countries are even more affected by the danger than the larger Powers. We cannot consider as adequate the present system of the balance of terror which is the only aspect that contains an element of moderation shown among the great nuclear Powers.

If we reject an armed solution to conflicts and if we seek peaceful settlement to disputes, then disarmament is a legal and political imperative which will, in the longer run, benefit a world that can live in peace.

The problem of the transfer of weapons has many connotations apart from that of accumulation of huge profits on the part of the merchants of death, whether these be States, transnational corporations or private individuals. Although very often they assume roles that seem to be peace-making, they still continue to arm the weak or try to leave others unarmed, but all this against a background of advocating and encouraging skirmishes that are so many other ways of getting more profits and postponing the economic and social improvement of the needy of the world.

The cessation of all nuclear-weapons tests, regardless of the environment in which they take place, is one of the standing and permanent dreams of mankind, because of the danger inherent in them to the health and even the survival of present and future generations; it therefore is imperative that some agreement be formalized that, once and for all, will prohibit such tests. Furthermore, since the threat spread into the atmosphere and the resources, particularly the resources of the sea, we have constantly stressed the need to suspend all types of nuclear-weapons tests, particularly those that are carried out in the Pacific Ocean.

But if we want to proceed in good faith and goodwill, the prohibition of all nuclear-weapons tests must go together with the firm commitment not to develop or manufacture new types or systems of weapons of mass destruction. Otherwise, we would gain nothing if the relief that would follow a complete cessation of nuclear-weapons tests were to be interrupted by the accelerated desire to produce increasingly murderous weapons, some possessing the sarcastic benefit of respecting material goods, whilst overlooking the more positive aspect of human life.

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

The efforts of the international community, however, must not cease in the nuclear field. They must also tend to put an end to the arms race as far as conventional weapons are concerned. The replacement of so-called obsolete equipment by highly sophisticated weapons is certainly no contribution to the creation of a spirit of understanding. On the contrary, it merely creates walls of justified competition. Any shattering of the balance becomes an implicit threat that forces a search for new ratios in the relative balance of forces, and each State is forced legitimately to seek its own security although at the costly price of increasing the possibility of conflicts and thus delaying the economic and social development of their respective peoples.

Ecuador fully shares and participates in the Declaration of Ayacucho signed, in 1974, by eight Latin American countries, and in it each and every one of these countries committed itself "to encourage and to give support to the setting up of a permanent order of peace and international co-operation and to create conditions that will allow of an effective limitation of weapons and put an end to their purchase for offensive war-like purposes", and to devote all available resources to the economic and social development of Latin America.

My country, as a State party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Treaty of Tlatelolco, must view with great concern the devastating consequences that might flow to mankind as a whole and to the maintenance of international peace and security if nuclear weapons were to be developed in other areas of the world that are potential arenas of possible outbreaks of hostility. Thus, we trust that all bilateral and multilateral efforts will be made in order to avoid any catastrophic imbalance that would flow from the existence of such weapons in such areas.

The creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace are just so many forms of progress in which States that are not nuclear-weapon States and that are the majority of the world could co-operate.

Thus, my country is very gratified that the United States, the United Kingdom, France and China are parties to Additional Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Furthermore, the United States has subscribed to

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

Additional Protocol I in May of this year and has announced that measures are being taken to ratify it. With other countries, we wish to express our hope that France also will sign and ratify Additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. And in item 41 of our agenda, we are among those countries that plead with the Soviet Union in turn to sign and ratify Additional Protocol II to that same Treaty.

Ecuador is concerned over the proliferation of nuclear weapons of all types. Whilst on the one hand we are gratified at seeing science develop as far as scientific discoveries and technological application are concerned, we cannot overlook the fact that the accumulation of the waste material of nuclear uses does constitute a potential danger that can in due course be the means of war-like attack and nuclear outbreaks.

However, as our Foreign Minister stated a short while ago, Ecuador is aware of the problems of energy limitations that affect the world today and of the fact that an accumulative projection of such deficits may occur in the future. And so we are very interested in the proposals of the Secretary-General for a study of the technical aspects of this factor of human progress. On a non-discriminatory basis and respecting a full and complete system of safeguards by the international organizations competent and specialized in the subject, all countries have the full right to take advantage of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for development. Therefore, we have to strengthen the system of safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency, set up pursuant to the provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty that I mentioned, which have so effectively been helping the developing countries in many different fields of the utilization of nuclear energy for constructive and peaceful purposes.

It has been said that today the international community is confronted by a dramatic choice: the destruction of its spiritual and cultural heritage amassed over so many centuries, if the spectre of a nuclear cataclysm were to materialize; or the preservation of that enormous and tremendous treasure house, if we bow to right and justice, if we accept a peaceful solution to disputes, and if we renounce the use of force in international relations. These are the targets on which we have based our constructive steps, targets which we must achieve in a noble and honest process, which is the basic way of tackling the most fundamental subject that underlies the entire system of the United Nations, namely, disarmament.

Miss FEROUK (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, speaking for the first time in this Committee, I should like to convey my warm congratulations to you, our distinguished brother, and also to the other officers and to assure you of the co-operation of my delegation.

There is really no need to stress once again the profound concern of the international community at the balance of terror and the frenzied arms race which the super-Powers are engaging in, the colossal expenditures resulting from this to the detriment of resources which should be devoted to economic and social development and the growing importance today of disarmament items in international relations. After all, our Committee has been devoting itself exclusively to disarmament questions, with 17 items on its agenda, seven of which relate to nuclear disarmament.

Is there any need to recall the recent creation of the United Nations Disarmament Centre and the convening next year of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament questions, following a decision taken by consensus. We see a favourable sign in this return to the United Nations.

Of course, quite rightly, several delegations have mentioned and expressed their gratification at the progress made in the course of multilateral negotiations which are going on elsewhere in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) and also the bilateral consultations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America on strategic armaments and the current trilateral talks between the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States on the total prohibition of nuclear tests. However, the partial measures which are about to be adopted in specific areas of disarmament should in our view all form part of a global strategy.

Since the thirty-first session the objectives we are aiming at have become clearer. The major military Powers seem to be abandoning a measure of their reluctance. Small and medium-sized countries, particularly developing countries, are succeeding in heightening the consciousness of the rest of the international community with regard to their own concern for the peace and security of their areas; and the idea of the link between disarmament and development is more markedly being conceded by a number of countries.

(Miss Farouk, Tunisia)

In spite of a situation which remains very alarming, the heightened consciousness which permitted the consensus on the convening of the special session reflects a sufficiently favourable development in the approach to the complex problems of disarmament to win some pessimists over to the camp of the cautious optimists. It is important to highlight the need to reassign to the United Nations its essential role, that of maintaining international peace and security and hence one of its paramount objectives, that of disarmament.

My delegation has already supported recommendations aimed, inter alia, at improving the working methods of our Committee, strengthening the resources of the United Nations Secretariat and endowing our Organization with an increased capacity in the field of information and research. My delegation will continue, as it has in the past, to support any initiative aimed at strengthening the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

Last year my country supported the idea of convening a special session of the General Assembly as something which could provide a framework where the majority of small and medium-sized countries, developing countries, would be able to participate on an equal footing in the search for a solution to a problem of the greatest concern to all, the responsibility for which rests with the major military Powers, and particularly the two nuclear super-Powers. The session should also mark a turning point in international relations and make possible a reassessment and a redefinition of relations between States which geo-political developments and technological advances make inevitable.

Furthermore, this session should constitute a point of departure in the international process of negotiation and decision-making with a view to bringing about general and complete disarmament under effective international control. It should not be allowed to remain an outstanding but isolated event. Indeed, it should constitute a landmark along the arduous and long road to disarmament.

(Miss Farouk, Tunisia)

I should like to support the proposal made here by Mrs. Inga Thorsson of Sweden, for the convening of a second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, after a period of three to five years. This is a long-term undertaking requiring continuity. We have no illusions about the difficulty of this undertaking. The hopes aroused by the special session do not succeed in dispelling the many serious reasons for concern for which concrete measures should be sought.

The risks of proliferation, both horizontal and vertical, of nuclear weapons, the prohibition and elimination of which Tunisia considers a matter of highest priority, should not cause us to forget that the arms race has led to an extremely dangerous reduction in the gap between nuclear and conventional weapons, whose destructive power and accuracy is growing ceaselessly.

Another aspect of the arms race to which we draw the attention of the Committee at its thirty-first session, on which we believe it worth while to revert, is that of the arms trade in developing countries, which threatens regional stability and jeopardizes our efforts to establish a more just international economic order. The industrialized supplier countries find in this a very advantageous market. The importing developing countries, in their turn, are embarking upon an insensate arms race in order to acquire conventional weapons very likely to be used to settle regional conflicts.

If this nefarious trend continues, the countries most reluctant to arm themselves to the detriment of their development needs, will be forced to do so. We, in Tunisia, are therefore ready to consider with interest any realistic proposal likely to contribute to the search for an equitable solution at the level of regional disarmament. The problem of security for medium-sized and small countries - and I am thinking in particular of those which have signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty - is a serious one, and measures to strengthen this security should be adopted. These States, taking into consideration particularly the needs of the developing countries, are entitled to derive full benefits from the advantages of the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

(Miss Farouk, Tunisia)

My delegation is therefore studying with great interest and sympathy the draft resolution submitted by Finland in document A/C.1/32/L.3 on the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

It is a fact that the countries which have had to suffer from the effects of conflicts with which they were not concerned, are more deliberately motivated than others to see mankind use technology for constructive purposes likely to result in a higher level of well-being for all. Tunisia, for its part, is ready to support any proposal from nuclear or non-nuclear countries, whether industrialized or developing, beneficial to the long-term interests of the world community as a whole and in keeping with the principles of our Charter.

(Miss Farouk, Tunisia)

The activities of the Nordic countries on different aspects of disarmament seem to us to be particularly praiseworthy.

My delegation reserves its right to speak again when the draft resolutions to be submitted to us are introduced.

At this stage of our work, I should like to recall that, at the same time as the progressive and continuous action to be undertaken - and which must be undertaken - towards disarmament, the elimination of the deep-lying causes which generate tension and of anachronistic causes of conflict and flagrant inequalities which are the sources of instability remains the foundation of international peace and security. Only if the major nuclear Powers shoulder their responsibilities properly and effectively and if we have the genuine participation of all will it be possible to engender the international confidence without which technical solutions would be of only relative significance.

Mr. CAMARA (Guinea) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, I should like to join the speakers who have already congratulated you, an eminent representative of Ghana, a country with which my own, the Republic of Guinea, enjoys special ties of friendship, on your unanimous election to the high post of Chairman of our important Committee. I wish also most warmly to congratulate the other officers of the Committee, the two Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur. The dynamic and highly skilled team that you constitute in our Committee is a guarantee of the successful outcome of the very diverse and complex work with the conduct of which you have been entrusted.

My delegation, speaking so late in this debate on such a timely matter as disarmament, wished to limit itself to its declaration of 6 October in the General Assembly, in which I stated on its behalf the position of the Republic of Guinea.

With regard to the subject now under discussion, I said the following:

"Peace and security remain the concern of all peoples; hence the Republic of Guinea once again declares that disarmament is a matter of concern to all our States. Hence, we unreservedly support the initiative to convene, in May 1978, a special session of the General Assembly

(Mr. Camara, Guinea)

which will constitute a step towards the convening of a world disarmament conference. But any logical disarmament must necessarily be based on respect for the desire of peoples to rid themselves of imperialist domination. This of necessity implies the elimination of any subordinate relationships, the abolition of colonialism and exploitation and the building of a just economic order.

"Hence, any measures taken to bring about détente and co-operation in Europe and in America can be effective only if they are applied to the other continents. Unfortunately, we see that, more and more, imperialism is fanning hotbeds of tension in Africa, the Middle East and in the Indian Ocean." (A/32/PV.23, pp. 14-15)

That is to say, the Republic of Guinea, which remains deeply attached to the realization of general and complete disarmament, believes that that solution alone will allow us to achieve true peace. Hence my delegation will support any proposal aimed at having all countries participate in the consideration and the solution of this problem.

The imperative need of today - to put an end to the arms race and reverse the trend to armaments - is the ardent desire of all peoples attached to peace, justice and freedom. Disarmament has at last become a matter of universal concern.

In his report on the work of the Organization the Secretary-General of the United Nations quite rightly stated that

"... the United Nations cannot hope to function effectively on the basis of the Charter unless there is major progress in the field of disarmament. Without such progress world order based on collective responsibility and international confidence cannot come into being. The question of disarmament lies at the heart of the problem of international order, for, in an environment dominated by the international arms race, military and strategic considerations tend to shape the over-all relations between States, affecting all other relations and transacti ns and disturbing the economy." (A/32/1, p. 12)

(Mr. Camara, Guinea)

As we belong to the group of non-aligned and developing countries, my statement will be based in part on agenda item 33 on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race.

I shall not dwell at length on recalling the close link between disarmament and economic development. That subject has been inscribed on the agenda since the twenty-fourth regular session of the General Assembly. Indeed, operative paragraph 6 of resolution 2602 E (XXIV), which was adopted at that session, recommended, inter alia,

"... that consideration be given to channelling a substantial part of the resources freed by measures in the field of disarmament to promote the economic development of developing countries..."

Nine years have elapsed since that resolution was adopted and no military budget has been reduced with a view to helping developing regions. On the contrary, all of science, all of man's genius is devoted to research for the most murderous means of destruction and the manufacture and stockpiling of the most sophisticated weapons. This unrestrained arms race is still keeping mankind in a war psychosis and States in the mutual distrust of one another that led to the cold war which characterizes relations among the Powers that are largely responsible for peace or war in the world. Hence the stockpiling of both nuclear and conventional weapons has become one of the most dangerous aspects of international relations.

(Mr. Camara, Guinea)

So far as my country is concerned, the Republic of Guinea cannot accept the fact that billions of dollars are spent annually on armaments, while the world of today has to endure watching millions of human beings suffer for lack of housing, clothes and food, even the basic minimum necessary to live in dignity as human beings, when we, as Members of the United Nations, collectively undertook to promote a higher standard of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development for the international community.

Quite clearly, there is a flagrant contradiction between what we say and what we do.

To cite the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, those contradictions are laid bare in the following statement:

"For several years annual world military expenditure has been about \$300 billion. By contrast the World Health Organization has spent about \$83 million over 10 years to eradicate smallpox in the world - a sum insufficient to buy one modern supersonic bomber. That organization's programme for eradicating malaria at an estimated cost of \$450 million - half of what is spent daily for military purposes - is dragging for lack of funds."

(A/32/1, pp. 12-13)

In the same way, the substantial aid of \$6 billion called for by the countries producing raw materials to compensate them for the loss of income from the export of raw materials is refused. Is it possible to conceive of a new international economic order which will give the non-oil-exporting developing countries substantial help while at the same time denying those countries a stable income? The answer is no.

It is those outstanding facts, apart from many others, that lead my delegation to deplore the fact that no progress has been made on the question of disarmament and that there has been no releasing of resources for economic development. Our concern over the arms race is based not only on our desire for peace and security in the world, but also and above all for the substantial economic possibilities that would flow from the stemming of that arms race. We in the developing countries believe that the resources that would thus be released, as preceding speakers have said, would to a large extent meet the nutritional, housing and clothing requirements of those in need.

(Mr. Camara, Guinea)

In the view of my delegation, disarmament implies the following: first, a complete cessation of the manufacture and stockpiling of nuclear and conventional weapons; secondly, the freezing and progressive reduction of military budgets; thirdly, the commitment by the great Powers to be sincere with each other; fourthly, the continuation of discussions by representatives of all countries on the limitation of armaments; fifthly, the prohibition, progressive reduction and ultimately the elimination of nuclear weapons; sixthly, denuclearization of Africa, the countries of the Indian Ocean and the Middle East as part of the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones; seventhly, the peaceful use of atomic energy by all countries to overcome the energy crisis; and eighthly, the conclusion of an agreement on general and complete controlled disarmament.

Finally, my delegation would venture to state that the report on the "Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security" (A/32/88/Corr.1) should be brought up to date, and that it should be studied very carefully by all the developing countries which, more than any others, are affected by the evils of the arms race in the controversial world in which we sometimes live in a state of anxiety because of the behaviour of the great Powers which will bear a large share of the responsibility if these appalling weapons are used.

In deploring that situation, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, stated in his report this year:

"We have become used to living in a highly unnatural state of affairs where the shadow of nuclear weapons and of vast and increasing arrays of conventional armaments has virtually come to be accepted as the normal light of day." (A/32/1, p. 12)

A previous speaker also added the following:

"More than at any other moment in history, this shadow clouds the horizon of all nations, regardless of their level of development or the geographical region in which they find themselves. Furthermore, the arms race is one of the principal factors that impose and call for the maintenance of the policies of force and diktat and interference in the domestic affairs of other States, and feed the hotbeds of tension and conflict in many parts of the world."

It is for all these reasons that my delegation welcomes the convening of a special session of the General Assembly. I am confident that it will give a new

dimension to the search for adequate solutions of these burning problems of crucial importance to mankind as a whole. We know that we shall in due course enter into the debate in the full awareness of our responsibilities and with the conscience of free men.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has listened to the last speaker inscribed in the list of speakers in the general debate for this morning's meeting. The Committee has thus concluded its general debate on the agenda items relating to disarmament.

To sum up briefly, I would say that the Committee has benefited from the useful exchange of ideas, from which many constructive proposals and suggestions have emerged. That will help the Committee in its further consideration of the items on disarmament.

I should also like to say that in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee at its seventh meeting, after the conclusion of the general debate, the Committee will allot the remaining 14 meetings for the discussion of the draft resolutions.

At its 16th meeting, the Committee also set the deadline for submitting draft resolutions as 9 November at 12 noon, and furthermore it has decided to devote the meetings on Monday, 7 November and Tuesday, 8 November to the introduction of all draft resolutions which have already been submitted by those dates, as well as to a discussion of all or any of those draft resolutions.

Up until this moment, the following draft resolutions have been submitted to the Committee on several disarmament items: the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/32/L.4 and L.5, both under item 46; the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/32/L.3, L.6 and L.8, all under item 51; the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.7 under item 45; the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.9 under item 39; and the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.10 under item 43.

(The Chairman)

Therefore, I would invite those members of the Committee who have not introduced any of the aforementioned draft resolutions to do so at the meetings of this afternoon and Tuesday. I would also earnestly request the members to inscribe their names in the list of speakers in order to enable the Committee to make use of the time which has been allotted for the consideration and adoption of the draft resolutions and to avoid unnecessary extension of meetings beyond the scheduled deadline. If there are no comments, we shall now discuss the draft resolutions.

Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia): The general debate just concluded on the question of disarmament in the First Committee during the thirty-second session of the United Nations General Assembly has once again demonstrated that the ideas of peaceful coexistence and co-operation among States, regardless of their social and economic systems, are gaining ever more ground throughout the world, that there is growing determination by the majority of Governments to safeguard international security and peace, and that those who would clamour for war and hostilities among nations are condemning themselves to profound international isolation.

Today, when the progressive forces throughout the world are commemorating the sixtieth anniversary of the glorious victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, let it also be recalled in this forum that it was this event which initiated in Soviet Russia a new epoch in man's history, an epoch of the construction of a world without wars and violence, without exploitation of man by man and of one nation by another.

As a representative of Czechoslovakia and on behalf of the delegations of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic and the Socialist Republic of Romania, I should like to extend, on the occasion of today's sixtieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, our sincere comradely congratulations to the delegation of the Soviet Union and the delegations of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic on this outstanding jubilee, and wish them further success in the building of a Communist society in the USSR, as well as in the struggle for international security and world peace.

The very first document signed by the founder of the Soviet State, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, was the Decree on Peace. The inspiring ideals of peace and the liberation of nations from exploitation and colonial oppression, the ideals of human dignity and equality for the sake of which the October Revolution was undertaken, met with an immense international response and are exerting an ever stronger influence on the development of world events. A retrospective glance through those 60 years that have elapsed since the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution shows that it was the ideals of socialism, applied purposefully in practice, that succeeded, in a historically brief period of time, in guiding the world out of the unending quagmire of wars, exploitation and oppression, and it is because of their influence that all peace-loving countries are able to look into the future with greater assurance. The guarantee of this is the establishment of the world socialist system and its growing strength, as well as the rise of dozens of new independent States that have freed themselves from colonial subjugation and have taken the road of peaceful construction and co-operation among nations. The Soviet Union, as the first socialist State of workers and peasants, has always been at the head of the struggle for positive transformation in the world. It has espoused and in day-to-day practice continues to espouse the ideas of peaceful coexistence which are a direct legacy of the Great October Revolution. This is borne out also by all the peace initiatives submitted year after year by the Soviet Union in the United Nations and to which this year new important proposals were added that strive to deepen and consolidate international détente and to prevent the danger of nuclear war. And again, the peace tradition of the 60 years of Soviet history has been remarkably proved when Comrade Leonid Brezhnev, Secretary General of the Communist Party and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, called for simultaneous halting by all Governments of the manufacture of nuclear weapons and the prohibition of all nuclear testing for a given period of time.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

The noble objectives of safeguarding lasting peace in the world have this year been embodied also in the new Soviet Constitution which we can rightfully call the constitution of peace, socialist democracy and humanism. As a firm component of the socialist community of nations, my country fully associates itself with these objectives.

I would like to proceed with the questions that are on our agenda today and explain the position of the Czechoslovak delegation in respect of the draft resolutions submitted in documents A/C.1/32/L.4 and L.5 and in document A/C.1/32/L.3, relating to the question of the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, and to problems of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

In our endeavour to achieve progress in disarmament and the liquidation of the already amassed stockpiles of weapons, we have in recent years ever more frequently been encountering indications that military technology has not yet pronounced its last word and that further new weapons are within its reach which in their destructive effects would surpass anything we have known so far. As repeatedly mentioned in the current session of the General Assembly, as well as in this Committee, an alarming example of such developments is the so-called neutron bomb. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has from the very beginning supported the 1975 proposal by the Soviet Union to work out and conclude a broadly conceived international treaty that would prevent, in time, the development of all new types of weapons of mass destruction. The two years of negotiations on the Soviet proposal in the Geneva Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), with the participation of experts, helped to clarify some of the most timely and most dangerous trends which the development of new types of these weapons and their systems could take. What we have in mind are the so-called radiological weapons of a non-explosive character, devices using the effects of a radioactive stream of charged or neutral particles, and the so-called infra-sound and electromagnetic weapons. In the course of the expert talks it was clarified that all these trends of military research had sufficiently advanced to provide a basis from which to proceed with the development and

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

subsequent mass production of such weapons. Particularly alarming is the fact that these types of weapons have not been limited by any measures adopted up to now in the field of disarmament, and that this qualitatively new stage of the arms race could be taking place with the participation of a great number of States. There can be no doubt that a similar development, unless prevented in time, would have an outright destructive effect on international security and peace in the world. The said new types of weapons were therefore listed in an annex to the revised draft agreement submitted this year by the Soviet delegation to the CCD. The advantage of this proposal is that the list of weapons subject to prohibition could be further completed at any time in the future and it would be possible, if need be, also to conclude separate agreements.

The proposal also contains an effective system of verification as to the fulfilment of the obligations adopted by the signatories of the future agreement. The system has already proved its usefulness in the preparation of the Convention Prohibiting the Military or any other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques signed last May in Geneva. The recent events in the field of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction confirm the view that it is necessary to continue intense negotiations and to strive for the earliest possible conclusion of an appropriate international agreement. At the same time the United Nations General Assembly should appeal to all States to refrain, for the duration of these negotiations, from any acts that would complicate the successful solution of this complex issue. The draft resolution submitted by the delegations of the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic and the Soviet Union in document A/C.1/32/L.4 in our view reflects correctly the need for continued negotiations on the adoption of an appropriate international agreement or agreements as necessary, if we really want to prevent the intensified continuation of hectic armament and to ensure progress in disarmament. It is for this reason that the Czechoslovak delegation fully associates itself with the draft resolution that has been submitted and wishes to be included among its sponsors.

The delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has also studied the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.5, submitted by Canada, Great Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany and other Western countries, entitled "Weapons of mass destruction based on new scientific principles". We appreciate the fact that these countries also share our concern and renounce the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction, as attested to by operative paragraph 1 of the said draft resolution. We nonetheless believe that the question of the complete prohibition of the development and manufacture of all new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction has now already advanced further and that the danger of these weapons is too great to allow us to rely on mere appeals and to take it for granted that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament will be able to act successfully after weapons of this type have been included in the equipment of armies. Just such an

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

incomplete solution is envisaged in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution. If we were to rely on a similar procedure only, we should necessarily lose sight of the most important aspect of this whole problem, namely the preventive nature of the proposed prohibition, and thus also its prospective importance in an effective limitation of the arms race. That is why the Czechoslovak delegation cannot support draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5 and appeals to its sponsors not to insist on its being put to a vote.

The Czechoslovak delegation has also carefully studied document A/C.1/32/L.3, relating to agenda item 51, dealing with the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency, which has been submitted to the First Committee by the delegation of Finland. The Czechoslovak delegation has at the current session of the United Nations General Assembly in the plenary explained in detail its position in regard to the main questions concerning the activities of the International Atomic Energy Agency and its report. I would therefore only reiterate that the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic fully supports all measures designed to strengthen the existing system of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and to enhance the universality of the Non-Proliferation Treaty with the exception of measures that would obstruct the positive development of international co-operation in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy or would provide advantages to one group of countries to the detriment of other countries. In this connexion we ascribe great importance to the safeguards and control activities provided by the International Atomic Energy Agency, to which all States, not just some of them, should contribute to the greatest extent possible. It is on this basis that the Czechoslovak delegation supports draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3 and holds the view that it should be adopted by consensus.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, I should like first of all to support the working procedure you have proposed on the submission of draft resolutions, and I should like to state that the Soviet Union will express its views on those already proposed and will conclude consultations on a number of draft resolutions which will be submitted along with those of the Soviet delegation within the time-limit you have laid down.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

I should now like to confine myself to making a general comment which has a direct bearing on this stage of our work.

The Soviet delegation wishes to appeal to all delegations in these last few days before the time-limit for the submission of draft resolutions to attempt to narrow down as far as possible the differences between States on the various issues and agenda items relating to disarmament. Recently, and in particular in the last few days, serious events have occurred and important statements have been made which cannot fail to have an effect upon our adoption of decisions on the items under discussion. At this point, and in this connexion, I should like to draw attention to agenda item 40, "Urgent need for cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament", and agenda item 49, "Conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests". I should like to express the hope that delegations which have actively been working on the preparation of relevant draft resolutions will do everything in their power to ensure that the decisions of the General Assembly on these questions facilitate the successful continuation and, I hope, the successful conclusion of the most important talks relating to the prohibition of the testing of nuclear weapons in all environments and the prohibition of nuclear tests.

Furthermore, I should like to appeal to the sponsors of the draft resolution on the report of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly on Disarmament to take into account the wishes - the persistent wishes, I would say - expressed by the Group of Eastern European Countries with regard to the possibility of expanding the composition of the Preparatory Committee.

In conclusion, permit me on behalf of the delegations of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, to express my warm gratitude to the Chairman of the First Committee, the Permanent Representative of Ghana, Mr. Boaten; the Deputy Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia, Comrade Vejvoda, who spoke on behalf of a number of delegations, and all other representatives for the congratulations they have addressed to our delegations on the occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. That historic date, which is

•
(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

being marked by the Soviet people today, is being celebrated at a time when the First Committee is discussing in detail the problems of limiting the arms race and of disarmament. For our State, this problem is of particular significance. Disarmament is the ideal of socialism. In short, that is how the founder of the Soviet State, Lenin, formulated it as the major foreign-policy objective of the Soviet State. The task of disarmament is the key to the foreign policy of the Soviet Union today, and evidence of our adherence to this line is the action taken by Leonid Brezhnev, the leader of the Soviet Union, in making a new proposal designed to limit the arms race and to bring about the speediest possible decision and solution of the most urgent tasks in this field.

I should like to take this opportunity to assure my colleagues in this Committee that the Soviet representatives in the United Nations will unswervingly work towards this ultimate and important goal and will together with them strive for complete and general disarmament under strict international control.

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the those members who have asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, may I remind this Committee of a decision taken by the General Assembly as follows: in the light of the recommendation of the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organizations of the General Assembly, rules of procedure annex V, paragraph 78, the General Assembly has decided that delegations should exercise their right of reply at the end of the day whenever two meetings have been scheduled for that day and whenever such meetings are devoted to the consideration of the same item. The General Assembly has also decided that statements in the exercise of the right of reply should be limited to 10 minutes.

I now call on those members who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): When I last spoke in this Committee I expressed Israel's hope that Arab representatives in this Committee would respond to Israel's initiative to reduce their military budgets, as Israel had done, to accept Israel's proposal to discuss arms control in the Middle East, and to enter into negotiations with Israel with a view to establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region.

I also made an appeal to Arab representatives to abandon their sterile recriminations and to address themselves to the problem of disarmament in the region.

It would appear that Israel's appeal for the cessation of verbal warfare in a Committee dedicated to peace went unheeded. The representatives of some Arab States saw fit to return with monotonous regularity to what has become for them an obligatory ritualistic incantation, coupling Zionism with imperialism, neo-imperialism, racism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, and so on. I do not know if I have exhausted the long list of political expletives that some Arab delegations feel obliged to use when discussing Israel; I can only say in regard to one of them - since they seem to have difficulty in pronouncing the word "Israel" - that I on my part am very proud to represent a country which is indeed a Zionist entity.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

This Committee deals with disarmament and in the exercise of my right of reply I wish to address myself to the subject under discussion. To those Arab representatives who use such absurd terms as "nuclear intimidation" or "nuclear blackmail" I can only say that the invitation to hold a conference to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone can hardly be described as nuclear intimidation by any party sincerely wishing to free the Middle East from the threat of nuclear war.

In this context I should like to refer specifically to the statement of the Egyptian representative on 4 November. I have before me the press release as I do not have the verbatim record yet. I quote him as saying:

"The representative of Israel should realize that the international community had the intelligence to see through lies. Israel was the only State which opposed the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East."

The representative of Egypt apparently banks heavily on the failure of the collective memory of this Committee. Rather than accuse me of mendacity he should have done his homework better and read the statement of the Foreign Minister of Israel in the General debate on 10 October. I have no choice but to read again the relevant passages of my Minister's statement. He said:

"With regard to another crucial aspect of disarmament, Israel has frequently called on its Arab neighbours to join it in direct negotiations with a view to establishing a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. Indeed, on this issue as on others, the Foreign Minister of Egypt, Mr. Fahmy, has deliberately misled this Assembly. Israel firmly believes that such negotiations should lead to the conclusion of a formal, contractual, multilateral convention between all the States of the region, on the lines of such notable precedents as the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America and the proposals for similar agreements in the areas of south Asia and the south Pacific. Unfortunately, the Arab States have totally rejected this call by Israel which, after all, is in the interests of all the people of the Middle East. On this occasion I repeat our proposal."

(A/32/PV.27, p. 71)

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

I leave it to the Committee to judge whether in the light of this statement Israel can be judged to oppose or support the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

As for the fantastic stories about nuclear theft, they were denied by the Embassy of Israel in Washington on 26 October and again yesterday by the Prime Minister of Israel. This James Bond type of story appeared for the first time, appropriately enough, in a magazine that calls itself the Polling Stone. The veracity of the statement can best be judged by the journalistic level of the original source.

It has been said by an Arab spokesman - an Israel newspaper has been quoted - that Israel has the highest military budget in the world. The quotation was, of course, inaccurate. On the other hand, what is true is the fact that Israel probably has the highest per capita military budget. This may unfortunately be true. I doubt there is another country in the world that is obliged to spend nearly 30 per cent of its gross national product on defence. Yes, my countrymen carry a very heavy burden. We would be very happy if we could devote much more of our budget to development, education and social welfare. However, if the tone adopted by some Arab representatives in this Committee is any indication of their countries' intention towards Israel, little wonder that the Israel taxpayer has to carry so heavy a burden in order to survive.

The military confrontation of the Arab countries with Israel is truly grotesque in its disproportion. Their population numbers over 100 million, our population is three and a half million; they occupy territory of 5,378,000 square miles, in other words a territory the size of the whole of Europe and Russia up to the Ural Mountains; Israel's territory is approximately the size of the State of Rhode Island. Among them there are some of the richest countries in the world with a per capita income equal to or higher than that of the United States, outstripping in wealth and financial power some of the most industrialized countries in the world.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

A large amount of this income is being spent on armament. Since the beginning of 1976 the Arab countries have contracted to make purchases worth \$7 billion from the Eastern bloc countries and \$21.6 billion from the West, a total expenditure of \$US 28.6 billion, and they have the audacity to come to this Committee and preach disarmament.

According to the International Institute of Strategic Studies in London and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the following ratios existed in 1975 as between Arab States bordering on Israel, plus other Arab States expected to contribute to those States, and Israel itself. The authoritative figures, as representatives know very well, are: armed forces, 5 to 1 in favour of Arab countries; combat aircraft, 3 to 1 in favour of Arab countries; tanks, 3 to 1 in favour of Arab countries; artillery, 9 to 1 in favour of Arab countries; surface-to-air missile batteries, 12 to 1 in favour of Arab countries. This is an aggregate advantage in armaments of 6.4 to 1. If one takes into account what has been acquired by those countries in the last two years, the ratio is probably nearer 7 to 1.

Surely, one would expect the representatives of Arab countries who spoke in this Committee to have more confidence in the military prowess of their armies than to feel threatened by Israel, outnumbering us as they do in various weapons by nearly 7 to 1 and by 30 to 1 in manpower. The sheer logic of numbers speaks for itself. The Arab States have nothing to fear if it is peace they seek. Conscious as we are of being able to repel any manner of attack by Arab countries on Israel, we nevertheless appeal to them not to disregard Israel's offer to discuss the establishment of a nuclear-weapons-free zone in the Middle East, arms control and peace, and, if they so wish, independently of each other.

Mr. ALFARARGI (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): I would reserve my right to exercise my right of reply at some future meeting in order to answer what the representative of Israel has said, because it is very late in the day and I wish to cast some light on his allegations on the basis of specific statistics.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.