

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records *



FIRST COMMITTEE
34th meeting
held on
Friday, 10 November 1978
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 34TH 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 TLA TELOLCO) (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 TLA TELOLCO) (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.34
13 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)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

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

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

U G'EE (Burma): This year's debate in the First Committee on a series of items related to arms control and disarmament takes place as we stand at the beginning of a new phase of efforts by the United Nations in the field of disarmament. Several of the items have been on our agenda for over a decade and are the subject of permanent negotiations. Taken together, all the items are aspects of the search for general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

The Final Document adopted by consensus at the recent special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament has given a new dimension to United Nations involvement in disarmament issues. That comprehensive document provides an integrated and universal strategy for disarmament. As the Secretary-General has rightly pointed out in his report,

"The fact that the Final Document was adopted by consensus enhances its significance and ensures a solid ground for future disarmament efforts."

(A/33/1, p. 12)

The delegation of Burma, therefore, believes that the same new spirit will motivate the work of this Committee, and the task now before us is to ensure that the conclusions and recommendations are effectively followed up and faithfully implemented. We express the hope that the United Nations will be utilized for reconciliation and affirmation and that decisions arrived at will reflect a consensus and determination to pursue the path of safeguarding disarmament.

As the delegation of Burma sees it, disarmament negotiations in the United Nations have come full circle. United Nations efforts on the subject have alternated between concern with single aspects of the total disarmament problem and concern with package proposals taking in many facets of the subject. In the most recent decisions of the special session on disarmament the world community wanted measures towards progress in disarmament to encompass both partial and comprehensive efforts. Clearly this is a step in the right direction for it is difficult to perceive that partial disarmament measures can hope to endure unless a general and complete disarmament treaty can be negotiated.

(U Gyee, Burma)

But progress towards general and complete disarmament is not only dependent upon the limitation and reduction of national armaments; it is also a question of values and relations between nations. It follows from this that the success of United Nations efforts will considerably depend upon resolving our differences and reducing international tension, as well as on the continuing identity of purpose of the Member States comprising it.

The question of the implementation of the conclusions of the first Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty inevitably raises the question of the right to utilize nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, access to nuclear technology, equipment and materials and the benefits of peaceful nuclear explosions. We note with satisfaction that the conclusions and recommendations relating to those questions adopted by the special session on disarmament are formulated on the basis of a universal non-discriminatory and non-restrictive approach in conformity with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Statute. We are of the view that that is an expression by consensus of the will of the entire membership of the General Assembly and should ordinarily prevail over current monopolistic tendencies in dealing with the important issue of the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

The need to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons was evident from the first days of the nuclear era. The establishment of internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free zones represents one effective means of curbing the spread of nuclear weapons and could contribute significantly to the security of the States concerned. Burma welcomes all measures genuinely intended to prevent extension of the nuclear arms race to geographical regions that are hitherto free of nuclear weapons. We believe, however, that no regional denuclearization arrangement can be fully credible or workable unless, first, the countries of the region themselves accept it, and, secondly, the nuclear Powers recognize and respect it. My country is accordingly guided by those principles in its approach to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world.

(U Gvec, Burma)

The Disarmament Decade is now drawing to a close and the original hope expressed by the Secretary-General for concrete, measurable progress towards general and complete disarmament by the end of the decade of the seventies remains unfulfilled. This has meant that one objective of the Disarmament Decade to channel the resources freed by disarmament measures to promote the economic, scientific and technological advancement of developing countries could not be attained.

Serious efforts are being made to fulfil another objective of the Disarmament Decade, namely, the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. Thus far, no agreement has been possible as to its structure, the elements, balances and priorities to be incorporated therein.

Burma fully supports the purposes and objectives of the Disarmament Decade, including the elaboration of a comprehensive disarmament programme. However, the fact must be kept in mind that this is not a "programme" in the ordinary sense, but is a grave political document having far-reaching political and security implications and carrying short, medium and long-term commitments for countries, large and small, aligned and non-aligned. Extreme care must therefore be exercised in preparing a comprehensive disarmament programme so as to ensure that it does not contain, inadvertently or by design, seeds of insecurity for any State, particularly for smaller countries like Burma which do not belong to military alliances.

Those are in brief the reflections of the delegation of Burma on some specific issues that relate to the items before us and which concern the most complex and pressing problem of the century - disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: While waiting for the next speaker, it might be useful to review the situation as far as draft resolutions are concerned. By "situation" I mean the various time-limits on which we have agreed for draft resolutions on various items.

The deadline for the draft resolutions under agenda item 125, as representatives will recall, expired a few days ago; that would therefore seem to be in order. It did not expire without my directing a special query to the whole Committee whether anyone had anything against its expiration - nobody did.

For our second item - agenda item 128 - concerning security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States, we have agreed to a temporary deadline of Wednesday, 15 November.

What we have left, then, are the bulk of the draft resolutions on agenda items 35-49. Earlier we had agreed to devote at least the whole week of Monday, 27 November, through Friday, 1 December, exclusively to discussing and voting on draft resolutions. If that is to function properly I would suggest - and this is no more than a suggestion at this time; I am perfectly willing to entertain a discussion on it - that the deadline for draft resolutions on items 35-49 be fixed for Friday, 17 November. The purpose is so that all delegations would have a full week to study them and obtain the requisite instructions.

Are there any views, suggestions or proposals?

Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina)(interpretation from Spanish):

My suggestion is that at a later point in our proceedings you be good enough to repeat that and ask for delegations' comments, because at this time the room is half-empty; even when you began to speak I do not think there was a quorum here, and this is a very important subject. I think that, in order for all delegations to be aware of the programme that you are suggesting - which, in principle, seems to me to be a very good one - it would be appropriate to repeat it at a later stage when there are a few more representatives here, and we would then be able to have the benefit of the views of all delegations.

The CHAIRMAN: It was indeed my intention to do what the representative of Argentina has suggested. I merely made a preliminary announcement as we were awaiting the other speakers. They have now arrived, and I call on the representative of Nigeria.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): The atmosphere in which the First Committee begins its consideration of the disarmament items this session is one of high expectancy. The optimism which was created by the special session devoted to disarmament should, in the view of my delegation be reflected in our debate and in the decisions we take after this debate. We should direct our attention to not reiterating and reaffirming previous resolutions which were adopted routinely in annual sessions of the First Committee. That ought not to be our intention this year. Rather, we should give the First Committee at this session, which is the first one which it is devoting entirely to disarmament and related international security issues, an action-oriented outlook. It is only thereby that we can sustain the hope which was generated by the consensus achieved in the Declaration and Programme of Action of the special session devoted to disarmament.

The situation which necessitated the convening of the special session still confronts humanity today. The escalating arms race gallops on daily, posing ever increasing danger to international peace and security. The present state of military technology, particularly nuclear military technology, has resulted in the development and deployment of weapons whose total destructive capacity will certainly signal the end of man if used. In spite of this over-kill capacity we still have not seen the end of the race for the development and deployment of ever more sophisticated weapons. The result of a breakthrough into a new weapon or weapons system in one of the nuclear-weapon States, particularly one of the super-Powers, inevitably sets the other to committing greater resources to its weapons programme if only to achieve parity in that particular type of weapon. And so the arsenals multiply and the process of disarmament becomes even more complex.

It is in this light that my delegation views the problem posed by the development of new types of weapons and in particular the immediate subject of the neutron bomb - or, as it is referred to, the reduced blast-enhanced radiation weapon. As my delegation understood it, this is a weapon likely to blur the demarcation line between conventional war and nuclear war; it is therefore a particularly dangerous weapon, not because it is more inhumane than nuclear weapons of greater blast capacity, but because it may well bring nearer to reality a nuclear war. Development of the neutron

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

weapon by one super-Power inevitably sets the other at work on a similar weapon, and the road to an escalation of the arms race, particularly in the nuclear field, will thereby again have been opened. Détente, we believe, should be reflected also in restraint on the development and production of new weapons and new systems of such weapons.

By unanimous consent nuclear weapons have been singled out as posing the greatest threat to mankind and his survival. Of the complex of measures which must be taken to avert the danger of the extermination of mankind by nuclear weapons, the General Assembly has often referred to the prevention of further refinement of nuclear weapons as being of the utmost urgency. The importance attached to the cessation of nuclear-weapons testing is sometimes seen by some as being over-exaggerated when compared with the task of dismantling the stockpiles already accumulated in the arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States. Be that as it may, the fact remains that an essential ingredient of effective measures for halting the arms race is a degree of consensus on concrete action to be taken at any particular time. Such a consensus has been achieved on the urgent need for the cessation of all nuclear-weapon testing as a vital step in checking the refinement of nuclear weapons, developing new systems of such weapons and preventing the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. Given the sophistication of the nuclear weapons which already exist in the arsenals of nuclear-weapon States, particularly in the arsenals of the two super-Powers, there can be no justification for those nuclear-weapon States to continue testing nuclear weapons while seeking to prevent other States from acquiring such weapons. Their moral authority in being the champions of non-proliferation will be greatly enhanced by their total cessation of further nuclear-weapon testing.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Resolution 32/78 which was adopted last year with the support of three nuclear-weapon States, has not been implemented, precisely because these three nuclear-weapon States have not made it possible for the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) to commence substantive negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban agreement. Resolution 32/78 was reaffirmed by the special session in paragraph 51 of its Final Document. From the report of the CCD contained in document A/33/27, it is clear that the negotiating organ did not even manage to begin substantive negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Attention must be drawn particularly to two features of resolution 32/78 when compared with previous resolutions adopted on a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

First, resolution 32/78 did not contain a condemnation, which had been one of the features in previous resolutions, on nuclear-weapon tests. Secondly, resolution 32/78 did not contain a call for a suspension of the testing of nuclear weapons as an interim step. This also had been an essential part of previous resolutions. Both these omissions were in deference to the assurance that the three nuclear-weapon States gave that they were close to agreement on a comprehensive test-ban negotiation. This assurance inspired operative paragraph 4 of resolution 32/78, which urged the three nuclear-weapon States to expedite their negotiations and submit the result to the CCD by the beginning of the spring session in 1978. As will clearly be seen from the report of the CCD, even at its summer session it did not receive the result of the tripartite negotiations.

If a moratorium on nuclear-weapon tests had been written into the Final Document of the special session as a mere observation of some delegations rather than as an injunction of the General Assembly, it was due to an optimism that the tripartite negotiations were on the verge of conclusion, and that there was therefore no need to settle for a moratorium when a total ban was almost completed. Unfortunately, the developments since July have not justified this optimism. On the one hand, there have been nuclear-weapon tests contrary to the general expectation that the nuclear-weapon States would exercise self-restraint. On the other hand, negotiations in the multilateral negotiating body, as the report of the CCD shows, were not even started.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

The statement made in the CCD on 8 August by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the tripartite negotiators indicated that progress was being made on the negotiations, but it was also clear from that statement that differences still continued to exist. The awareness and concern at these differences, which obviously had been significant enough to make it impossible for the tripartite negotiators to come out with an agreed text, prompted the Group of 15 in the CCD to demand that the details of the difficulties facing the negotiations be disclosed to the CCD.

It seems to my delegation that a clear political directive is required from the First Committee, and through the First Committee from the General Assembly on this issue. The elements of such a directive should be the following: first, an immediate moratorium on all nuclear weapon tests, since it is now clear that a comprehensive test ban treaty cannot be concluded this year. Secondly, commencement by the Committee on Disarmament during its first session in 1979 of substantive work on a draft treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear tests. Thirdly, in recognition of the valuable contribution which the tripartite draft may make to a comprehensive test-ban treaty, a call on the three nuclear-weapon States to submit their draft to the Committee on Disarmament even if the draft is incomplete, and to accompany the submission with an indication of the areas of divergence. This would enable the negotiating body not only to commence work but also to direct its attention on how to assist in breaking the deadlock that may have arisen on some of these areas of disagreement among the tripartite negotiators.

Fourthly, since the question of verification will be an important part of the comprehensive test-ban treaty, greater efforts should be set in motion to ensure that an international data exchange system is truly international. In this respect, I refer to the report of the group of seismological experts submitted to the CCD which indicated the weakness of the southern hemisphere in numbers of seismic stations. In this respect also, reference can be made to the proposal made by France for a satellite observation agency, since verification through the use of satellites may be an important part of the verification system.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Fifth, the duration of the treaty in our view should not be allowed to be the subject of controversy. A comprehensive test-ban treaty of limited duration will be no more than a prolonged moratorium which would envisage a permanent comprehensive test-ban treaty subject to periodic reviews. Of course, we would hope that all the nuclear-weapon States will be party to a comprehensive test-ban treaty, if possible from the beginning. This will make it most effective and prevent the excuse for a treaty of limited duration.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

If the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is to gain more significant adherence, then positive steps will have to be taken to assure the non-nuclear-weapon States that the nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty are ready to fulfil the obligation they assumed, especially under article VI, to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and to nuclear disarmament. The second Review Conference of the Parties to the Non-proliferation Treaty, scheduled for 1980, will again show how far these obligations have been discharged. The non-nuclear-weapon States that have renounced the acquisition of nuclear weapons will surely demand the concomitant assurance of positive steps to relieve them from the fear of having to live under a nuclear cloud. At the same time, the non-nuclear-weapon States would certainly wish to enjoy the benefits envisaged in the peaceful use of nuclear energy - a promise contained in the Non-Proliferation Treaty but one which has remained largely unfulfilled. The unenthusiastic reception by the nuclear-weapon States of General Assembly resolution 32/50, adopted last year, on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, seems to my delegation to give the impression that the nuclear-weapon States, once they have persuaded the non-nuclear-weapon States to commit themselves to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, cannot be hurried into taking steps to ensure that the benefits promised by that treaty become a reality.

Turning to the question of conventional weapons, my delegation has taken note of the report of the Preparatory Conference for the 1979 Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. We hope that the procedural recommendations made by the Preparatory Conference to hold another session in March and April 1979 and to hold the main Conference in September 1979 will be approved. As regards the substance of the work of the Conference, my delegation believes that it should seek to adopt legally binding instruments which will prohibit or, at the minimum effectively restrict the use of certain conventional weapons whose use, by common consent, causes injuries far beyond the requirements of war. In carrying out this task, the Conference should bear in mind General Assembly resolution 32/152, which mentions both humanitarian and military considerations

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

as forming the basis for the work of the Conference. Weapons in the category of incendiaries have to be considered with particular reference to their misuse by the racist régimes in southern Africa, which use these weapons indiscriminately and often in the territories of other sovereign States against innocent refugees. Therefore effective steps should be taken by the Conference to ensure that weapons in the category of incendiaries are dealt with in an appropriate and effective manner.

Regional action can be an effective step towards global disarmament; but again the situation caused by the racist régimes in Africa makes concrete regional action difficult at this time. How can African countries seriously consider regional limitation of arms when the apartheid régime of South Africa has been granted the licences and the technology to sustain an enormous arms industry? Rather too late, the Security Council last year declared an arms embargo on South Africa. However, in spite of that embargo, no action, as far as we know, has been taken to revoke the licences granted to South Africa for the manufacture of arms. Indeed the apartheid régime still manages to purchase huge quantities of sophisticated weapons, thus making it more and more of a threat to other African countries.

Of great concern also - still on the question of regional African issues - is the possibility that the apartheid régime may acquire nuclear weapons. The régime has continued to press ahead with its nuclear programme in defiance of the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council resolution 418 (1977). The South African nuclear-weapon programme runs counter to the nuclear non-proliferation intention of the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity when they proclaimed Africa a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Therefore it is distressing that the apartheid régime has continued to receive the collaboration of some Member States which clearly know the aim of the South African nuclear programme and are aware that much of South Africa's nuclear facilities are not subject to the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency and also that the apartheid régime is not a party to the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The United Nations, which has declared the acquisition

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

by South Africa of nuclear weapons to be a threat to international peace and security, will have to consider any collaboration leading to this end also as a threat to international peace and security. Part of the effective preventive action by the Security Council envisaged in resolution 32/81 should be any collaboration that fosters a situation which certainly will create a grave threat to international peace and security. It has become necessary for all States and indeed international organizations to suspend the transfer of nuclear equipment or fissionable material or technology to South Africa until it submits all its programme to safeguards. Such a total preventive embargo would be in line with the efforts to make Africa effectively a nuclear-weapon-free zone and to promote the aim of nuclear non-proliferation.

In its resolution 32/80 on "Effective measures to implement the purposes and objectives of the Disarmament Decade", the General Assembly reaffirmed its conviction that the peaceful use of human and material resources allocated every year to armaments of all kinds will have very positive effects for the future of mankind. The alarm of the international community at the limitless resources being devoted to the arms race as compared with the paltry sum devoted to international economic co-operation has been expressed every year - without much effect, unfortunately.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

The expenditure on armaments - which has now reached the staggering sum of over \$400 billion annually - continues to grow. Simultaneously, the amount available for economic co-operation shrinks, and it is estimated that, on the average, developed countries spend 20 times more for their military programmes than for development assistance. In fact, last year the total sum pledged for the development activities of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) did not exceed \$600 million.

In proclaiming a Disarmament Decade in resolution 2602 E (XXIV), the General Assembly called on Governments "to intensify without delay their concerted and concentrated efforts for effective measures relating to the cessation of the arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament and the elimination of other weapons of mass destruction, and for a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control." To this end, the General Assembly requested the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to work out a comprehensive programme of disarmament and recommended 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. None of the actions proposed for implementation during the Disarmament Decade has been carried out. Therefore, the objectives set out in the proclamation of the Decade "appear to be as far away today as they were then, or even further" (General Assembly resolution A/RES/S-10/2), to use the words of the Final Document of the special session devoted to disarmament. My delegation believes that it would be most disappointing if the Decade were to end on that same conclusion. We believe, therefore, that the present session of the General Assembly can accelerate action for the implementation of some of the measures envisaged in the programme for the Decade in three particular areas.

First, on the comprehensive programme for disarmament, we believe that, in keeping with the decision of the special session devoted to disarmament, the Disarmament Commission should consider elements of the comprehensive programme. However, we think that the General Assembly should call upon the Commission to give priority to this subject during its session in 1979 and to use its best endeavours to submit its recommendations thereon to the Committee on Disarmament through the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session. This will give the Committee on Disarmament an opportunity to undertake negotiations on the comprehensive programme during 1980.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Secondly, the General Assembly should call on the Group of Experts working on disarmament and development to expedite its work and to submit concrete recommendations that can form the basis for action.

Thirdly, we believe that progress should be made in efforts to achieve a reduction of military budgets and the diversion of the savings to economic and social programmes - in particular, of economic co-operation with developing countries.

In a study on world military and social expenditures conducted last year, Mrs. Ruth Sivard gave a list of what 5 per cent of present global military expenditures can do for world economic and social development. She indicated that 5 per cent of global military expenditures could provide the following: a vaccination programme to give protection against infectious diseases to all infants all over the world; a programme to extend literacy to all adults all over the world by the end of the century; a preventive and community-oriented training programme for a sharp increase in the number of medical auxiliaries; increased development aid to improve the capacity of the third world to grow its own food and to prevent malnutrition; an expanded minimum-shelter programme incorporating self-help construction for the urban poor; supplementary feeding to ensure full development for 200 million children suffering from malnutrition; supplementary feeding for 60 million pregnant and lactating women suffering from malnutrition to protect their health and to reduce infant mortality; a major increase in the number of primary schools with the addition of 100 million new places; hygienic water supply systems towards the goal of clean water for all humanity by 1990; the eradication of malaria in Africa.

In a similar vein, the group known as Reshaping the International Order (RIO), under the leadership of Professor Jan Tinbergen, concluded that a yearly instalment by the developed countries of from \$10 billion to \$12 billion, representing 4 per cent of their annual expenditures on weapons, for assistance to developing countries would in 10 years be sufficient to meet the basic needs of the developing countries. This was, in effect, also the conclusion drawn by the World Bank study.

The United Nations is soon to embark on a strategy for the Third Development Decade, which will be launched for the 1980s. For its objectives, which will certainly be linked to the New International Economic Order and are likely

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

to feature in the strategy to be realized, resources far in excess of those made available today for international economic co-operation will be required. These resources will not be beyond the international community to mobilize if only we reorder our priorities and place the provision of a decent standard of living for all mankind before the accumulation of weapons. It was the late General Eisenhower who said when he was President of the United States

"Every gun that is made every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, a theft from those who are cold and are not clothed".

President Eisenhower was a man who ought to know, being one of the most distinguished generals in history. If to the catalogue that he indicated in his statement just quoted by me, we were to add "every nuclear weapon deployed", then we could rightly conclude that the present world arms race is the cause of the tragic poverty that afflicts the overwhelming majority of mankind.

How to reverse this tragic poverty will be the crux of the development strategy for the next Decade. There is no doubt in my mind that unless resources are freed from their present wastage on armaments, the international community will not be able to muster the necessary resources for the eradication of poverty which, in turn, is a great threat to world peace.

Simultaneously, therefore, as preparations are made for the strategy for the Third Development Decade, it is the belief of my delegation that the United Nations should launch another United Nations Disarmament Decade. Disarmament and development are, in the words of Lord Noel-Baker, not two problems; they are one. He concluded, therefore, that "they must be solved together, or neither of them will be solved at all".

My delegation believes that this is a conclusion that we should all take to heart, and we will therefore submit a proposal accordingly to indicate this meaning.

Mr. VINCI (Italy): The special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament marked a truly important and historic step along the road to disarmament.

As the Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim, very pertinently recalled in his opening address and in his 1978 report on the work of the Organization, the special session was

"... the largest and most representative meeting ever convened to consider the problem of disarmament". (A/33/1, p. 12)

Indeed, this exceptional gathering entailed the participation of the entire membership of the United Nations, including the five nuclear-weapon Powers. The presence of many Heads of State and Government and Ministers of Foreign Affairs gave evidence of the high significance that all nations throughout the world attach to new and bold progress in disarmament efforts.

The special session provided, in fact, the first genuine opportunity, since the creation of the United Nations in 1945, for a comprehensive approach, at the highest level, to the problems of arms limitation and disarmament.

The accurate preparation of the meeting, from its initial stage, contributed positively to the elaboration of new ideas, concepts and proposals favouring a constructive debate and an authoritative appraisal of the wide range of basic disarmament issues. Italy feels that the special session produced reasonably favourable results in charting future endeavours in the field of arms regulation on a new, pragmatic and largely acceptable basis.

The very fact of the adoption of the Final Document by consensus - a consensus involving 144 States - has rightly been regarded as a most noticeable and tangible result of the special session. Consensus must, in fact, remain the essential rule for deliberations in matters such as disarmament which have direct and complex implications for the security of every nation.

I could not say that the various sections of the Final Document entirely satisfy my Government or fully meet our expectations. I refer in particular to some paragraphs on the nuclear arms race, the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), and the limitation of conventional weapons transfers which, in our view, could have found a more constructive and forward-looking formulation. However,

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

the Final Document of the special session has the merit of accurately reflecting the highest degree of consensus which could be achieved in that particular moment and which could concretely originate from a first meeting of such broad-based membership and on such a complex and crucial matter. Furthermore, the document contains most of the elements needed to begin a new phase in the United Nations commitment to disarmament.

The Programme of Action, in particular, establishes an order of priorities and re-emphasizes the pressure, on those States in a suitable position to do so, to negotiate prompt measures and to promote fresh and substantial developments in the arms limitation field. Meanwhile, we should not overlook the need - as Italy has reiterated for so many years - to elaborate without delay, as stipulated in the Programme of Action, a balanced and comprehensive programme towards general and complete disarmament under effective, strict international control, which remains the ultimate goal of our labours.

The Programme of Action's emphasis on the necessity for urgent measures in conventional, as well as nuclear, disarmament should also be stressed. The particular provisions of paragraph 85 of the Programme of Action state that

"Consultations should be carried out among major arms supplier and recipient countries on the limitation of all types of international transfer of conventional weapons, ...". (resolution A/S-10/2, para. 85)

My country fully supports this recommendation, all the more so since we have already signalled on numerous occasions the pressing need to take action, and indeed a number of specific suggestions on how to combine the global and regional approaches were offered in the statement I made before this Committee last year.

In fact, the Final Document underlined the value of the regional approach to disarmament as one facet of the global effort towards general and complete disarmament. We are especially concerned that progress should be promptly achieved in the regional mutually balanced force reduction talks designed to secure a more stable military balance at a lower level in Central Europe.

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

We appreciate the undertaking of consultations between the United States and the Soviet Union aimed at restraining arms transfer, and we are also watching closely the praiseworthy efforts at voluntary restraint being made in Latin America. We hope that this example will be followed in other parts of the world, especially in those areas where expenditures for conventional weapons are rapidly growing, thereby dissipating resources desperately needed for social and economic development.

In reviewing the Final Document of the special session, most of the previous speakers in this Committee have rightly noted that the first step taken along the new road to disarmament was in the field of machinery. The Italian delegation participated actively in this exercise at the special session, attempting to offer a positive contribution of ideas for rationalizing and improving multilateral disarmament mechanisms. While political will remains an essential prerequisite for any disarmament achievement, a better understanding and earlier agreement may result from the correct use of appropriate disarmament forums.

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

The creation of a new Committee on Disarmament that is scheduled to meet by January 1979 offers my Government cause for sincere appreciation and renewed hope. At that time we expect to have a negotiating body which, thanks to an enlarged and more representative membership and to new opportunities offered to all the States Members of the United Nations, will enable more countries to contribute their valuable opinions and the international community as a whole to follow the negotiating process more closely.

We welcome wholeheartedly France's decision to take part in the deliberations of the Committee on Disarmament and we strongly hope that China will also join that body at an early date. For its part, Italy is ready and willing to contribute effectively to the work of the new forum, as it has contributed to prior disarmament forums from their beginning.

My delegation believes that without delaying work on the substantive tasks entrusted to it, the Committee on Disarmament should give prompt and careful consideration to its methods of work and procedure.

As clearly indicated in the Final Document, decisions will be adopted by consensus on both procedural and substantive matters. It might be useful, however, to review other practices and arrangements in order to facilitate and possibly increase the pace of negotiations.

While assuming that delegations will maintain their right to raise and discuss any disarmament topic, we think that the Committee should try to reach an agreement at the beginning of its work on a specific agenda, formulated in terms as precise as possible and taking effectively into account the need for a timely and full implementation of the pertinent decisions of the special session.

We also believe that as soon as a sufficient number of members deems it appropriate, the Committee on Disarmament might consider establishing functional working groups which would negotiate draft treaties or consider specific items, when suitable, on an informal basis and with the aid of experts.

In addition, we expect the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) to play a catalytic role in the disarmament process, since its function will be to make recommendations on various disarmament issues and to follow up related decisions and recommendations made by the special session. The tasks of the UNDC will have to be more clearly specified, however, in order not to duplicate the activities of this Committee.

I shall turn now to the most crucial topics before this Committee, and express my Government's views on those items which call for a new commitment and intensified dedication.

As stressed in the Final Document, nuclear weapons have a high priority in disarmament negotiations. It is essential that the world be spared the constant risks of an uncontrolled strategic nuclear arms race. Therefore, the Italian Government would attach special significance to any political move or measure which might succeed in reviving hope or rousing confidence in the possibility of limiting and gradually eliminating nuclear stockpiles.

The Non-Proliferation Treaty remains, in our view, the main pillar of every effort aimed at halting both the vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. Because of that, we regret that the Final Document of the special session did not accentuate more strongly the crucial role of this instrument, to which the large majority of States have already acceded. We have stated time and again that universal commitment to the Non-Proliferation Treaty should be actively sought; that all States that have not yet done so should be urged to sign and ratify the Treaty; and that parallel efforts should be made by nuclear-weapon States with a view to honouring the obligations stipulated in article VI of the Treaty.

Furthermore, in the over-all system of non-proliferation, the need should be stressed for concrete and timely measures aimed at guaranteeing all States, as provided for in article IV of the Treaty, their inalienable right to develop the research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes under appropriate, multilaterally agreed safeguards and through increased international co-operation, and to enjoy the benefits of such energy.

We cannot ignore the growing concern of the international community over the risks of unbridled development and deployment of nuclear armaments and the implications of the spiralling strategic competition between the two major nuclear-weapon Powers. Modern weapons have reached a destructive potential that constitutes a real and alarming threat to the survival of mankind as a whole.

My Government considers the current Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) taking place between the United States and the Soviet Union a first encouraging response to the quest for increased global security based on a reduced quantity of nuclear armaments. While looking forward to the early

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

conclusion of a SALT II agreement, we cherish the hope that a third round of SALT negotiations will follow shortly, with a view to considering more substantial limitations of the strategic arsenals of both sides.

The United Nations General Assembly has repeatedly stressed the pressing urgency to conclude a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty. That task represented the item of highest priority on the agenda of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

We are aware that the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and the United States are actively engaged in direct consultations aimed at seeking agreement on the basic elements of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. We understand that the tripartite talks have met with some success, but some problems still remain unsolved, including a most essential one, that of verification.

The Ad Hoc Group of Seismic Experts, established under the auspices of the CCD in 1976, has done valuable work in exploring possible methods of international co-operation for the detection of seismic events, work which could prove very helpful in the elaboration of effective verification procedures for a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Action in this field requires resolve and persistence. In that respect, we hope that the new Committee on Disarmament will soon be able to make a substantive contribution to the concretization of a measure which is so widely anticipated.

The possibility of creating nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world, in support of the goal of non-proliferation, received considerable attention at the special session. My Government is in sympathy with the main purpose of the recommendations formulated on this subject in the Final Document. We wish to reiterate our conviction that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones under appropriate conditions and in areas of the world to be determined on the basis of agreements freely reached among all interested States can have a positive effect on the security of countries in such zones and can contribute to the achievement of the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament.

Chemical disarmament is another of the priority items which the new negotiating body should keep high on its agenda, in order to translate as soon as possible into a multilateral agreement the conclusions of current bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

As we all know, considerable quantities of chemical weapons are already present in the arsenals of many militarily significant States. That is a matter which, because of its immediate concern to all of us, should be discussed in all frankness and with a determined will to come to grips with it, if we want to avoid the risk of a further stockpiling of these lethal weapons.

As regards new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction we believe that the most appropriate course of action is for the Committee on Disarmament to keep the issue under constant review in order to be ready to negotiate a specific agreement for each specific category of weapons as soon as such categories have been identified on the basis of new scientific principles. A positive step in this direction might be the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of radiological weapons. That idea is currently under consideration by the United States and the Soviet Union in their bilateral talks.

I should like now to recall briefly the problem of conventional weapons, to which I referred to earlier in my review of the results of the special session. While recognizing the importance of nuclear disarmament, we cannot afford to lose sight of the serious threat posed by an ever-spiralling accumulation of conventional armaments, even in the poorest regions of this planet. The Italian Government is convinced that the peace and security of all States can rest only on a balanced reduction of both nuclear and conventional weapons. Such reduction must be pursued through either bilateral agreements or multilateral accords, or the two methods simultaneously, on a regional and/or global basis, with a view to breaking the spiral and lowering and maintaining at the lowest level possible the total volume of armaments throughout the world.

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

I should like to turn now to one of the most challenging issues in the disarmament field, the problem of verification.

The Final Document of the special session authoritatively states that:

"Disarmament and arms limitation agreements should provide for adequate measures of verification satisfactory to all parties concerned in order to create the necessary confidence and ensure that they are being observed by all parties. The form and modalities of the verification to be provided for in any specific agreement depend upon and should be determined by the purposes, scope and nature of the agreement. Agreements should provide for the participation of parties directly or through the United Nations system in the verification process. Where appropriate, a combination of several methods of verification as well as other compliance procedures should be employed." (A/RES/S-10/2, para. 31)

The Italian delegation, which has always stood firm on this matter, subscribes fully to such an approach. In this perspective, I should like to take the opportunity to remind the Committee of the proposal introduced by the Italian Government, both at the special session and in Geneva, to consider the establishment of an international verification body which would function within the framework of the United Nations and which would supervise from the technical and legal standpoints the implementation of disarmament treaties in force so as to ensure full compliance with their provisions. Comprehensive proposals along similar lines were made at the special session by France, the Netherlands and Austria. In our view, such proposals contain valuable elements which should be discussed thoroughly here in order that the problem of verification may be guided towards effective and generally acceptable solutions. For these reasons, my Government has decided to co-sponsor the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.13, submitted by France in this Committee, entitled "Monitoring of Disarmament Agreements and Strengthening of Security".

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

Lack of trust among countries was one of the original causes of the arms race and is one of the reasons it continues. Therefore, we believe that mutual trust must be restored in order for real progress to be made towards disarmament. Thorough studies on a variety of confidence-building measures should be pursued on the basis of agreed guidelines and terms of reference, especially in those areas referred to in paragraph 93 of the Final Document adopted at the special session.

I should like to stress the importance of undertaking more innovative and objective research in the field of disarmament. In this connexion, we were pleased to co-sponsor the draft resolution as contained in document A/C.1/33/L.14, submitted by France, and entitled "Programme of Research and Studies on Disarmament".

The fact that our present world, in which poverty and social and economic injustice are so widespread, uses 6 per cent of its total production for military purposes is a sad commentary on the state of its priorities. It has been stressed time and again that our global expenditure on armed forces and armaments is over \$1 billion daily.

We are convinced that reductions in military expenditure would help to slow down the arms race. However, the achievement of an international agreement on balanced reductions of military expenditure depends on global acceptance of a foolproof method for measuring and comparing such expenditures. In this connexion we welcome the standardized reporting instrument devised by the Secretary-General's Group of Experts. What is needed now is for this instrument to be tested under practical conditions by a representative sample of States. When the results have been reviewed, any refinements deemed necessary should be made so that the instrument may be adopted for general use by the United Nations. In that event, we would then have an agreed base for negotiating reductions in military budgets, since it seems obvious to us that the transparency of such budgets is an essential condition for their eventual reduction. We feel that this is a vital aspect of arms control in general, and we hope that this General Assembly will act accordingly.

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

Many speakers have mentioned the link between disarmament measures and development aid. Unfortunately, economic disparities throughout the world have become more striking in recent years despite the efforts made to increase economic co-operation with developing countries. Such extreme, profound and serious imbalances continue to present an obstacle to the economic and social progress of mankind. The relationship between development and disarmament has been repeatedly affirmed in recent years. There are reasons to believe that significant progress in disarmament will result in the mobilization of considerable resources and energies, which could be used in the future to improve the social and economic conditions of all peoples. As stated by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany speaking in this Committee on behalf of the nine member States of the European Community on 19 October 1978,

"The Europe of the Nine represents a community which at all times has given practical proof of its commitment to the cause of peace and to the promotion of the well-being of all. It is not only by far the largest trading partner of the countries of the third world, but also the biggest donor of development aid to those countries. The Community will continue to be guided by its commitment as expressed by the Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Genscher, when he addressed the General Assembly on 26 September 1978 on behalf of the Nine. He said:

'This Europe of the Nine wants to be a centre of co-operation in the world, and it sees itself on the side of those who seek to create an order for that co-operation founded on equality and partnership.' (A/33/PV.8, p. 53-55)"

In this same field of disarmament and development, Italy is one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution as contained in document A/C.1/33/L.12, submitted by France on 3 November 1978.

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

In my statement on 30 June 1978, I expressed our satisfaction for the inclusion in the Programme of Action of a chapter devoted to the comprehensive programme for disarmament. This chapter sets forth our original and deepest conviction that intense negotiations must be pursued at the same time as those for priority measures towards the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. To this end, the elaboration of a comprehensive programme for disarmament, as I said earlier, should be undertaken with fresh impetus. We are convinced that the long-term perspective must never fade from view if short-term efforts are to be infused with a sense of purpose and direction. Moreover, in order to achieve effective progress along the road to disarmament, every concrete disarmament measure should be accompanied by a parallel adoption of adequate steps towards collective security so that all countries may feel truly protected. In other words, each stage of disarmament should be accompanied by progress towards methods for the peaceful settlement of disputes, towards peace-building, and towards organizing international security forces. This last objective, set forth in Article 43 of the United Nations Charter, may appear at first glance to constitute the culmination of a fairly advanced stage in the process of disarmament and in the establishment of a new international order more responsive to the needs of our time. Even so, we have always held the opinion that it is never too early to start working in that direction, since any rapprochement of our respective viewpoints will make it easier to solve the essential problems facing us. We are most gratified that these basic concepts were included in the Final Document, and we stand ready to contribute to their elaboration in the forthcoming negotiations for the preparation of a comprehensive disarmament programme.

In this connexion, I may remind the Committee of the proposals I had the honour to introduce last year, proposals which were later elaborated in a working paper presented both at the special session and in Geneva.

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

The technical and scientific progress of the twentieth century, the aspiration of peoples, the obvious need for integration and the global challenges of our times have now linked the destinies of all nations to one another. Mankind is witnessing the dawn of a unity which was inconceivable in the past, both because the need for it was never felt before and because the means for achieving it were unavailable. Today each nation must act in the realization that only in unity lies the salvation of one and all. For this reason I would like to stress again the conviction I expressed before this Committee on 24 October that all countries should make the greatest effort to preserve that shared sense of purpose and commitment which characterized the conclusion of the special session and which appears to be essential for the success of any future disarmament effort.

It would be ingenuous to minimize the difficulties and obstacles of every kind which have yet to be surmounted, particularly as their origins go back thousands of years in the history of mankind. However, we should persevere in our common efforts, indeed intensifying them, without allowing ourselves to be discouraged by the obstacles, in order to break the vicious circle of distrust and the arms race. For its part, the Italian Government intends to continue to contribute ceaselessly and constructively to the advancement of disarmament, as it has always done.

I have set forth in this statement my Government's views on those items which, as I said earlier, we feel require most urgent attention and offer good chances for early progress. My delegation reserves its right to speak again, in the near future, on the remaining items.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other representative wishes to make a statement in the general debate this morning, and following the suggestion of the representative of Argentina, I propose that we conduct a preliminary discussion about various deadlines for draft resolutions.

To summarize, the deadline for submitting draft resolutions on our first item, agenda item 125, has expired. Before it expired a specific question was put to the Committee asking whether any delegation saw any inconvenience in its expiration, and none did.

The deadline for submitting draft resolutions on our second item - agenda item 128 - will expire on Wednesday, 15 November.

We come now to, if not the most important, perhaps until now, the most open draft resolutions, those on the block of agenda items 35 to 49. As previously agreed, they would come to a vote during the week of 27 November to 1 December. We expect that, as in previous years, we shall have at our disposal during that time Conference Room 3, which has electronic devices for recording votes. Given that, and also the fact that it is desirable to afford delegations ample time both to study draft resolutions and to obtain adequate instructions on them, it would seem to me that perhaps Friday, 17 November, would be an appropriate deadline for submitting draft resolutions on agenda items 35 to 49.

I shall be glad to entertain any other suggestion or a general discussion on that point.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): I regret very much that I have been away. Before I left I had announced in my statement that I would be submitting a draft resolution on agenda item 125. Yesterday, when I returned, I checked with the Secretariat and I was told that the time-limit had not expired. I intend to introduce a draft resolution by Wednesday of next week, and would ask the Chairman's permission in this regard. I came yesterday and cleared this with the Secretariat, and I was told that I could submit my draft resolution next week. I am sorry that, according to the announcement the Chairman has just made, the deadline in respect of agenda item 125 has expired.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure the Committee will find no inconvenience in accommodating the representative of Liberia.

Mr. OGISO (Japan): I should like to ask for clarification. We have not yet had time to discuss the various draft resolutions that have already been submitted, and I should like to know when the Chairman will allow us to do so.

The CHAIRMAN: It had been my intention to combine that with the voting on draft resolutions during the last week. However, since time is of the essence, and if we can condense the general debate, as it were, so that we have a few extra days in addition to that week, they also will be used for discussion of the draft resolutions. I hope that those time-limits will be sufficient and convenient.

Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): First, I assume that the deadlines suggested by the Chairman for the submission of draft resolutions do not apply to the possible submission of amendments, and that there will be an opportunity up to the time of voting for that.

Secondly, I wish to restate what I have said on earlier occasions - that we should allow for the possibility of advancing the date of beginning the voting on draft resolutions and should start voting before 27 November if developments in our work make that possible.

(Mr. Ortiz de Roza, Argentina)

If we have, as I believe to be so, more than 40 draft resolutions, not counting possible amendments, we are going to have to adopt approximately four draft resolutions per meeting if we have 10 meetings. That includes explanations of vote before and after voting, and any further comments on the draft resolutions. We may therefore find ourselves rather short of time. I think that you, Sir, with the consent of the Committee should have the opportunity to bring forward the dates if progress in our work so permits.

The CHAIRMAN: In reply to the remarks made by the representative of Argentina may I say, first, that amendments can be introduced at any time and are not subject to the deadline for draft resolutions. Secondly, on the problem of generally having ample time to discuss and vote, we will be looking into the possibility of bringing forward the date for starting to discuss and vote on draft resolutions.

Are there any other comments? I see none. I suggest, therefore, that we fix Friday, 17 November as the deadline for draft resolutions on items 35 through 49 and that we look at the possibility of extending the time that we can devote exclusively to draft resolutions. If there is no objection it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.