



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 45TH 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 TLATELOLCO) (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 TLATELOLCO) (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.45
22 November 1978

ENGLISH

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

AGENDA ITEM 45: REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS (continued)

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

AGENDA ITEM 47: GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT (continued)

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

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 11.20 a.m.

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

The CHAIRMAN: I must apologize to the First Committee and particularly to the first speaker for this morning for the delay in starting, owing to circumstances beyond the control of the Committee.

Mr. KEATING (Ireland): We hope the year 1978 will long be remembered as a significant one in the history of disarmament negotiations. Not only did the United Nations special session on disarmament from 23 May to 1 July reaffirm the central role played by the United Nations in this area, but participation in that session by all 149 Member States and the attendance of 23 Heads of State or Government - including my own - reflected the importance attached by the nations and peoples of the world to the concept of general and complete disarmament. The Final Document of the special session is itself a truly comprehensive blueprint for disarmament negotiations for some time to come. Indeed, by United Nations standards, the achievement of a consensus on so large a document does ultimately reflect a degree of confidence in the United Nations which is as heartening to the working delegate as it is to the Government he represents. The 45 interpretative statements at the final eight-hour marathon session on the night of 30 June/1 July nevertheless reflected the varying degrees of acceptability of the contents of the Final Document to the Governments represented here.

However, the year 1978 is also memorable for the impetus which the holding of the special session gave to individual Governments to appraise their own attitudes to the central issues of disarmament. My own Government is no exception. Indeed the 10 points suggested by Mr. Lynch, Prime Minister of Ireland, in his statement at the special session on 25 May reflected a mature, realistic appraisal by my Government of the priorities we wished to see adopted in a comprehensive programme in the disarmament field.

(Mr. Keating, Ireland)

In all our countries, the preparations for, and negotiations during, the special session brought about a new awareness of and commitment to disarmament issues. Efforts for regional disarmament received fresh momentum as a consequence of the special session. Ireland notes, in particular, the positive attitudes demonstrated by France, the United States and the Soviet Union towards the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America - the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Again, Ireland welcomes the joint decision of the Foreign Ministers of eight Latin American countries on 22 June to apply the 1974 Declaration of Ayacucho through a willingness to explore, together with other Latin American countries, possibilities for reaching an agreement on limiting conventional arms in that region.

Finally, in assessing the events of 1978, Ireland has been encouraged to note that agreement may soon be reached, after six years of negotiations, between the United States and the Soviet Union on a second strategic arms limitation agreement (SALT II). It is heartening that the United States and the Soviet Union continue to show recognition of the fact that they cannot go ahead indefinitely with unchecked competition in strategic arms.

In any event, if the year 1978 is already recognized as one of special significance in the history of disarmament negotiations, it is equally true that the progress identified with the present year has resulted from a long series of developments over the third of a century which now separates us from the end of the Second World War.

Ireland can claim some share in that process. Twenty years ago, in 1958, the Irish Foreign Minister, Mr. Aiken, submitted a draft resolution to the thirteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly on the question of restricting the spread of nuclear weapons. Then, as now, Ireland was concerned that the danger of nuclear weapons to humanity would not merely increase in direct ratio to the number of those possessing them. There were signs even then that the danger would increase in geometric progression. Our proposal was thus conceived as a step towards the restriction of nuclear weapons - a restriction which in its turn would be a step towards their complete abolition.

(Mr. Keating, Ireland)

The beginning in 1958 was modest enough. Ireland in fact withdrew its draft resolution in that year after the Assembly had voted positively on a single preambular paragraph of our draft, recognizing

"that the danger now exists that an increase in the number of States possessing nuclear weapons may occur, aggravating international tension and the difficulty of maintaining world peace and thus rendering more difficult the attainment of a general disarmament agreement".

In the following year, 1959, Ireland requested the inscription on the agenda of the fourteenth session of an agenda item entitled "Prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons". Resolution 1380 (XIV) adopted on this subject, known for years as the Irish resolution, suggested the procedure for achieving

"an international agreement, subject to inspection and control, whereby the Powers producing nuclear weapons would refrain from handing over the control of such weapons to any nation not possessing them and whereby the Powers not possessing such weapons would refrain from manufacturing them".

Thus was born the central formula for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which was finally opened for signature on 1 July 1968. If 10 years separated the original Irish initiative from the realization of the agreement itself, then 10 years later we are entitled to ask: To what extent have the aims and aspirations of the Non-Proliferation Treaty been achieved? To what extent have they fallen short of full realization?

In strictly numerical terms, it is true, the results have been impressive enough. A total of 104 countries have ratified or acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Some of the countries which have not yet formally ratified or acceded to it, nevertheless, indicate that they apply its provisions. However, as Mr. Eklund, Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), warned in his statement to the General Assembly on 2 November 1978,

(Mr. Keating, Ireland)

"some non-nuclear-weapon States that have nuclear facilities are still not parties to the Treaty. One of those countries has already demonstrated that it is capable of producing nuclear explosives". (A/33/PV.41, p. 6)

The Irish delegation echoes an appeal made by the Director-General of IAEA for a truly effective universal application of a safeguards régime. As a matter of plain common sense, Ireland continues and will continue to attach the highest priority to securing the universal application of the Non-Proliferation Treaty or of equivalent safeguards.

(Mr. Keating, Ireland)

This applies not only to countries that have nuclear plants that are not safeguarded but also to those countries where the situation could change because of the absence of any legal barrier to the construction of plants without safeguards. Between 1976 and 1977 the number of nuclear plants under safeguard rose by 50 per cent. The total amount of nuclear material under safeguards increased by more than 100 per cent.

The amount of plutonium under safeguards - nearly all incorporated in irradiated fuel - rose from 3 tons in 1972 to 36 tons in 1977. There is some expectation that the growth will level off in the years after 1979. It is our earnest hope that by then all nuclear plants in all non-nuclear-weapon States will be under safeguards.

It is not enough that in its reports on the application of safeguards in 1976 and 1977 the IAEA said that it had not detected the diversion of any significant quantity of nuclear materials from the declared peaceful nuclear activity. We should not assume that continued vigilance in this area can be taken for granted.

Indeed, only if there are absolute assurances that the peaceful uses of nuclear energy will not increase the risk of military use of the nuclear materials will it be possible to create conditions for the adequate development of the nuclear technology to serve the ends of peace and development and especially the development of the developing countries. We must at all costs prevent the conversion of nuclear fuel into weapon-grade fissionable material. Though 486 nuclear installations all over the world operated under IAEA safeguards at the end of 1977, there were 73 non-NPT installations which nevertheless applied IAEA safeguards. Some of those installations, as we know, have the capacity to produce plutonium, which can be substituted for uranium in the making of nuclear weapons. According to one estimate there will soon be enough plutonium in production in this way to provide weapon-grade fissionable material for several thousand Hiroshima-sized bombs. Nor can we derive much consolation from reports that with information readily available today anybody with the technical competence can build a small nuclear device in a tool shed. The Princeton student who designed a prototype bomb to demonstrate the need for stronger safeguards on fissionable material certainly made his point. It is up to us to draw the consequences.

(Mr. Keating, Ireland)

In other words, what was seen in 1958 as a relatively distant prospect has now become a very real danger indeed. Governments have been forced to become more and more stringent in regard to the safeguards applied on their national territory and to consider ways and means of meeting the ongoing challenge of threats to their own and to international security. With this aim in mind, 53 States, including my own, now participate in the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation, which opened last year in Washington. Ireland shares the concern shown by all participants that this evaluation should be carried out in a spirit of objectivity, with mutual respect for each country's choices and decisions in this field and without jeopardizing their respective fuel-cycle policies or international co-operation, agreements and contracts for the peaceful use of nuclear energy, provided that agreed safeguard measures are applied.

While, therefore, such extensive exchanges at the technical level are taking place between nations on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, we have reason to question the continued need for the testing of nuclear devices - for either peaceful or military purposes. We need a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests in all environments. Until such a ban has been negotiated, we question the value of continued testing and call upon nuclear-weapon States to respect the wishes of the international community in this regard. We realize that a particular burden of responsibility in the matter of nuclear restraint rests on the two nuclear super-Powers.

But the non-nuclear States have their responsibilities too. Indeed in recent years military expenditure has been increasing at an alarming rate in the non-nuclear-weapon States. Expenditure on conventional arms now represents four fifths of the total world expenditure on weaponry of all types. An ever increasing share of the world's expenditure on arms is expenditure by developing countries - 18 per cent in 1977, as against only 4 per cent 20 years earlier. The stockpiling of weapons designed to destroy is a frightening diversion of resources from productive purposes, especially when one recalls that the amount spent for military purposes is 20 times the total aid given by the industrialized countries to the third world. Indeed, my Prime Minister put it forcefully at the special session on disarmament when he said:

(Mr. Keating, Ireland)

"It is unthinkable that countries whose people live in poverty should buy arms, and be encouraged to buy arms, of great sophistication and on a large scale, and that they should be trained to use them against their neighbours whose people, though just as poor, have been similarly armed and trained."

(A/S-10/PV.4, p.28-30)

Without prejudice to the right of individual or collective self-defence under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, surely we must ask ourselves whether a balanced reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments cannot be achieved through better and more comprehensive understandings between nations, negotiated either bilaterally or collectively.

During the special session we accepted the principle of "undiminished security of the parties with a view to promoting or enhancing stability at a lower military level" (A/S-10/4, para. 22). The continuation of ever higher levels of expenditure makes a mockery of our continued efforts to achieve complete and general disarmament under effective international control. We all agree that it is a matter for each State to strike its own balance between the needs of its national security and the amount it spends on arms. But even a cursory examination of the figures published in annex III of the 1977 report of the Committee on Contributions shows to what extent military expenditure, expressed as a percentage share of total national income, would seem to bear little logical relationship to any quantifiable guidelines for the assessment of national security requirements. This may be due in part to the absence of any standardized reporting instrument for the measurement of military expenditure itself. I need not recall that this highly complex issue has been receiving welcome attention in this Committee for some years under the heading of "Efforts for the reduction of military budgets", but if we are to reduce such budgets we must first define them. Pilot studies are clearly necessary to avoid the sort of confusion that bedevilled efforts by the League of Nations in this sphere. Should axles of gun carriages be considered military if the same item is identical with an axle on a non-military vehicle? Should the grease used to lubricate a military axle be similarly classified? I appreciate that considerations of this nature may not be easy to resolve, but we should not allow our determination to founder on the classification of items such as these.

(Mr. Keating, Ireland)

Once a statistical base has been established and an agreement reached on an internationally acceptable standardized reporting instrument, then it should be possible for individual countries to assess their own expenditure on arms as a percentage of their national income. Ultimately, long-term reductions of military expenditure, under conditions of undiminished security, should then be achievable on the basis of standard internationally-accepted definitions. Targets for reductions in arms expenditure could then be expressed in terms of a percentage of national income over a given period of years.

(Mr. Keating, Ireland)

A country could, in other words, set its own targets for the foreseeable future. In any event, our desire would be to see this process being undertaken voluntarily, with the aim of a gradual reduction of arms expenditure. It would, of course, be our intention that the funds thus released should be devoted to development, especially the development of the developing countries.

Since the special session devoted so much attention to the reversal of the arms race, it is surely worth the effort to devote more time and attention to the manner by which progress in this field can be measured. And progress will only be possible when the dimensions of the problem have been universally acknowledged, defined and accepted. This applies in the case of militarily significant States as it does in that of other States: States members of military alliances and countries, like my own, which are not parties to any such arrangements.

The special session gave us a unique and challenging opportunity to pause, to reflect on our efforts to date and to chart our future progress. But the relative success of the session must not become a cause for complacency or an excuse for inaction. The words of the Final Document will remain simply so much empty rhetoric unless they are translated into deeds. We all bear the awesome responsibility of demonstrating the political will to forge ahead with the concrete implementation of disarmament measures.

Mankind demands no less of us.

Mr. MADADHA (Jordan): When one reads all the reports in front of us in this Committee, one cannot but express dissatisfaction at what has been achieved in regard to the ultimate goal of our negotiations and deliberations, namely, general and complete disarmament.

First, the two most important series of negotiations taking place in the world today, namely for the achievement of a second strategic arms limitation agreement (SALT II) and a comprehensive test-ban treaty, have not as yet reached a successful conclusion. In spite of a lapse of 10 years since the signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), there are still about 50 States which have not yet acceded to it. Also, in spite of the passage of 15 years since the signing of the partial nuclear test-ban Treaty, and in spite of all the General Assembly resolutions and negotiations within the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) and elsewhere, no comprehensive test-ban treaty has yet

(Mr. Madadha, Jordan)

been reached and nuclear tests are still going on. We have therefore sponsored the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/33/L.2, L.9 and L.11. We shall also vote for the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/33/L.3 and L.7, hoping that they will provide partial remedies for the aforementioned problems of disarmament programmes.

Another negative aspect of disarmament programmes is the disagreement between the nuclear Powers over the negative guarantees of security for non-nuclear States.

In our view, a convention would strengthen the unilateral declarations and would be a more legally binding instrument. We shall thus vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.6 and L.15, because they tend towards the same objective, namely, the drafting of a convention by the Committee on Disarmament which would secure the consensus of its members and would offer the non-nuclear States some partial guarantees of security.

Another negative aspect of disarmament programmes is the disagreement both inside and outside the negotiating body of the United Nations, over a draft convention to ban chemical weapons and weapons of mass destruction such as radiological and excessively injurious weapons, in spite of the numerous calls and resolutions of the General Assembly.

Yet another negative aspect is the disagreement between the major Powers concerning the holding of a world disarmament conference and the reduction of military budgets. In this respect, the delegation of Jordan attaches great importance to the study to be carried out by Government experts on the relationship between disarmament and development. For this reason, we have sponsored the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.12 concerning the proposal to establish an international disarmament fund for development.

Yet one more very important field of disarmament in which there has been very limited success is that of regional disarmament. In the Middle East and in Africa, Israel and the régime of South Africa are blocking and defying the unanimous will of this international Organization, as manifested in its numerous resolutions. The Governments of those two countries are collaborating in their nuclear activities, and they are the only countries in the Middle East

(Mr. Madadha, Jordan)

and Africa which have refused to comply with the United Nations resolution concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. The Jordanian delegation is therefore one of the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.1. We also call on all peace-loving nations to vote in its favour.

In South Asia and the Indian Ocean, the results so far are also disappointing. In spite of General Assembly resolutions, no agreement has been reached on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. The two major Powers have also halted their negotiations concerning the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. That Declaration has not yet been implemented, despite the lapse of seven years since its adoption.

These are the gloomy facts of our current disarmament programmes. I have pointed out the negative results, because the choice before the world has become a choice between life and death, in the light of the existing race for huge and destructive armaments. A better future can only be achieved through good and constructive political will, especially on the part of the mighty major Powers.

Mr. STRAUB (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Chile is glad to be here, participating in the general debate on items relating to disarmament because, like most delegations to the United Nations, we are concerned about and very aware of the need to adopt as soon as possible resolutions which would lead us to the drafting of legal instruments which would in fact enable us to halt and reverse the arms race, with adequate guarantees for the security of all States. This would enable peoples to develop in peace.

We have often said that the greatest danger to peace is nuclear proliferation, both vertical and horizontal. That is why we should like to express our appreciation for and welcome the initiatives which have been taken to strengthen guarantees for the security of non-nuclear-weapon States, including our own, provided, of course, that the inalienable right to use

(Mr. Straub, Chile)

nuclear energy for peaceful purposes is respected, that the safeguards established by the International Atomic Energy Agency are observed and that there is no discrimination in this respect.

Accordingly, we are willing to co-operate as best we can in all initiatives to encourage the non-proliferation of weapons. This implies the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, the destruction of arsenals of nuclear weapons and also of arsenals of chemical weapons and all kinds of weapons with injurious and indiscriminate effects. We also support the reduction of military budgets and other measures. All this is designed to enable us to reach our goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

(Mr. Straub, Chile)

The nuclear arms race has now become a qualitative one, which makes it even more dangerous to world stability, given the greater destructive power of the new weapons.

It seems likely that negotiations on the limitation of the nuclear danger will continue. However, we should stress that this should be accompanied by an agreement that would prevent nuclear-weapon tests. In our opinion we can no longer postpone dealing specifically with a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests while we are still looking for ways to halt and reverse the nuclear race.

We are rather concerned lest, in the process of acquiring arms, which unfortunately continues unabated, use might be made of outer space for military purposes. We have already expressed our views on this matter and we agree with the representatives of Austria and Kuwait that there has been very little debate in our Organization on this serious issue. We trust that this important issue will be duly studied and that provisions will be adopted to avoid greater problems in the near future.

We fully agree with what has been said by representatives who have spoken earlier in this debate to the effect that we should abandon, as soon and as completely as possible, this tedious method of dealing with matters rhetorically and should instead take specific action to prevent political tension among the major Powers from involving the world in a conflict that would mean the destruction of all mankind.

Chile is a profoundly peace-loving country which in its foreign policy fully respects the treaties and principles relating to peaceful coexistence. Accordingly we believe that disputes of every kind should be dealt with in accordance with the principle of the peaceful settlement of differences.

Our region has agreed to prevent nuclear proliferation by signing the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which has often been cited here as a model and which has the support of the nuclear Powers which have signed its Additional Protocols preserving the region from the use of nuclear weapons. The Latin American region is also seeking ways and means of limiting conventional weapons with a view to turning over to development the economic resources that are required by our young peoples, which are filled with faith in their future and their ability.

(Mr. Straub, Chile)

Our country agrees with those that hold the view that disarmament is something that we have to move towards gradually, and as a result of our experience we believe that regional denuclearization agreements can lead us more readily to our goal. States in every region should freely and on the basis of mutual confidence and interests agree on the various clauses to be included in their agreements, and the Powers - in particular the nuclear Powers and those of great military importance - should support those regional initiatives and efforts in the deliberative and negotiating bodies within the United Nations to guarantee the security of the regions, leaving aside the technical considerations which are subjective in nature and do not provide the desired clarity.

We also believe that the best guarantee of the security of non-nuclear countries would be nuclear disarmament. Our country accepted the priorities referred to in paragraph 45 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, in which top priority is given to such disarmament.

We believe that we should as soon as possible finalize a general and complete treaty prohibiting the production and eliminating the arsenals of chemical, biological and bacteriological weapons, through negotiations, in good faith, in which, before it becomes possible to produce weapons that could annihilate the human species, people will agree not to use them. The fact that there already exists a considerable quantity of those weapons is a major destabilizing factor for world peace.

We welcome the initiatives taken by some developed countries which are seeking to divert resources from armaments to the social and economic development needs of peoples that are endeavouring with great dignity and effort to emerge from their condition of underdevelopment. Accordingly, we must move on to a programme of action on disarmament which will enable us to attain those laudable goals, and here the industrialized countries have a major role to play.

The Disarmament Decade is now drawing to a close, and it seems clear that its goals will not be attained before the Decade ends. We support those goals and it is our view that we should prepare for a second disarmament decade, bearing in mind the important proposals and resolutions on this issue that were adopted by consensus at the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament.

(Mr. Straub, Chile)

We would stress also our concern at the proliferation of conventional weapons, which are becoming increasingly sophisticated and whose existence causes problems of tension in international relations. This proliferation is seen in the increasing production and transfer of these weapons and there is also the secret arms trade. Such proliferation is draining the economies of the developing countries, which are made to feel a lack of security and compelled to buy arms. Moreover, this proliferation causes them to neglect the vital needs of their peoples. Our Organization should ensure that the elements of confidence and security are adequate, so that the developing countries can resolve their economic problems in a more appropriate manner and more quickly, instead of preparing for warlike endeavours.

(Mr. Straub, Chile)

These preparations for war would never be adequate in any case. We have to ensure that development and technological progress are applied as intensively as possible, and by the greatest number, in order to meet the vital requirements of the peoples. We should not continue with the present system whereby most of the resources and technological capacity of countries are being used for arms. We must begin as soon as possible - immediately, in fact - to study this subject, and also to take measures to ensure that the available resources are used for proper purposes. In this way we would show real determination to achieve disarmament.

So far as a world disarmament conference is concerned, Chile is a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on that conference. We are glad that the idea of holding the conference has been broadly supported by Member States of the United Nations. Different approaches may be taken, and there may be certain divergences of opinion on matters relating to the time of its convening, but the main point is that all States would participate in the conference, in accordance with paragraph 122 of the Final Document adopted at the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, during which the preparations for the conference were also considered. Accordingly, we feel that our Organization should fix the date for the conference, bearing in mind in addition the extension of the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee so that it can make full preparations for the conference.

The delegation of Chile would like to reaffirm its willingness to co-operate as best it can in working towards general and complete disarmament. We are willing to participate in collective efforts to strengthen and consolidate international peace and security by eliminating the threat of war, particularly nuclear war. We are also willing to support the application of practical measures intended to halt and, indeed, reverse the arms race. We support measures to strengthen procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes, to reduce military budgets, and to use the resources that may be made available as a result to ensure great prosperity for all peoples of the world and to improve the economic conditions in the developing countries.

Mr. YANGO (Philippines): The special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the current debate in the First Committee on the 15 disarmament items have shown a rekindling of significant interest in the subject of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Paragraph 33 of Part II of the Final Document of the special session - the Declaration - reads as follows:

"The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of agreements or arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the zone concerned, and the full compliance with those agreements or arrangements, thus ensuring that the zones are genuinely free from nuclear weapons, and respect for such zones by nuclear weapon States constitutes an important disarmament measure." (resolution S-10/2, para. 33)

This principle finds its counterparts in paragraphs 60 to 63 of Part III of the Final Document, the Programme of Action, of which paragraph 61 reads as follows:

"The process of establishing such zones in different parts of the world should be encouraged with the ultimate objective of achieving a world entirely free of nuclear weapons. In the process of establishing such zones, the characteristics of each region should be taken into account. The States participating in such zones should undertake to comply fully with all the objectives, purposes and principles of the agreements or arrangements establishing the zones, thus ensuring that they are genuinely free from nuclear weapons." (ibid., para. 61)

In our current debate on disarmament, the subject of nuclear-weapon-free zones has been touched upon by an array of speakers among whom were the representatives of the Sudan, Zaire, Yugoslavia, Romania, Fiji, Czechoslovakia, Brazil, Ecuador, Qatar, Ethiopia, Uganda, Poland, Venezuela, Bahrain, Syria, Colombia, Papua New Guinea and Finland. As members of a group with more than a passing interest in disarmament, we are all aware that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America by formal treaty among the countries in the zone has been and still remains an item in our yearly deliberations since 1967. This is both a proof and a reminder of the importance of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone to the peoples of Latin America, and the need for a firm determination to accomplish their objective.

(Mr. Yango, Philippines)

Before the signing of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the General Assembly was familiar with plans or proposals to make central Europe and the Balkans free from nuclear weapons. Then came the idea of the denuclearization of Africa. This led to a rising consciousness of the significance of nuclear-weapon-free zones, and eventually proposals were introduced into our yearly debates for the establishment of such zones in such diverse areas as the Middle East, South Asia and the South Pacific. For that matter, as early as 1963, Scandinavia had also contemplated the idea of denuclearization.

The concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones can also be considered as integrally linked to the parallel concept of the establishment of zones of peace under broader security arrangements, such as those proposed for the Indian Ocean, South-East Asia and the Mediterranean. Since all these proposals for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace encompass geographical areas constituting a very sizable portion of our globe, a new and positive element has been introduced in international political relations which should be recognized and respected. It may be recalled also that in 1975 a study of the subject was published in a document entitled "Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects: report of the Ad Hoc Group of Qualified Governmental Experts under the auspices of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament."

All these developments pinpoint the validity of the principle that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is an important disarmament measure, inasmuch as in our view it results in the following corollaries:

(Mr. Yango, Philippines)

First, a nuclear-weapon-free zone which is truly such a zone prevents or avoids the spread or proliferation of nuclear weapons; secondly, the nuclear-weapon-free zone as such promotes the stability and security of the countries in the zone; and thirdly, the zone contributes to the strengthening of international peace and security, as we believe it lessens great-Power rivalry.

Indeed, it was to uphold these principles and corollaries that at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament a proposal was made for an in-depth study with a view to declaring certain countries and parts of the world non-nuclear zones.

It has been established and accepted that nuclear disarmament is the priority problem of general and complete disarmament. To this end we fully endorse the idea that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is one of the measures that will help in achieving nuclear disarmament. As long as nuclear weapons exist, the spectre of a nuclear holocaust will remain with us. However, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones will ease the fear of a nuclear war in the countries within those zones.

Once nuclear-weapon-free zones become widespread, it is conceivable that eventually nuclear weapons will exist in only limited areas of the world. In effect, nuclear weapons will be quarantined in those limited areas so that they will then be considered as a kind of disease or contagion that should be avoided and prevented from spreading to other areas. In other words, the creation of many nuclear-weapon-free zones is the intermediate stage, preparatory, we hope, to making the whole world a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

The Philippines has signed and ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty because we firmly believe in the concept that nuclear weapons should be prevented from spreading. It follows without question that we equally and firmly believe that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is one way of stopping the horizontal and eventually the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons.

My delegation therefore fully endorses a movement to encourage the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world with the ultimate objective of achieving a world entirely free of nuclear weapons. It has become apparent in our deliberations in this Committee that

(Mr. Yango, Philippines)

the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the various parts of the world already mentioned is confronted with many problems and difficulties. These problems are not insurmountable provided the countries concerned and others affected have the necessary political will and persistence in their objective to overcome all the stumbling-blocks.

First and foremost, there should be complete agreement and co-operation among the countries involved in the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Of equal importance is the agreement and acceptance of responsibility by nuclear-weapon States to respect the status of nuclear-weapon-free zones. And, last but not least, it is during this difficult formative period that the international community should give support and assistance where and when needed for the successful establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Now is the time to take a serious second look at the study I have referred to on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. It is also time to update or supplement it. Too much delay may be disastrous owing to the rapid advance of technology in nuclear-weapon systems.. It is also imperative at this time that the members of the international community give the necessary assistance and encouragement to those countries desirous of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in their regions, so as to comply with the obligations we have imposed on ourselves to implement disarmament measures approved at the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

The second review conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty is scheduled to take place in 1980. Undoubtedly the goal of the review conference is to strengthen the non-proliferation régime embodied in the Treaty. My delegation is committed to that objective in spite of the many problems and issues that arose during the First Review Conference in 1975, which we hope can somehow be solved at the coming review conference.

Introspectively, we find that there is a definite connexion between the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime. The link appears when the responsibility and the undertaking of nuclear-weapon States to recognize and respect the status of nuclear-weapon-free zones become a reality. This is yet another way for nuclear-weapon States to give added security guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States, which as everyone knows, is one of the burning issues in the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime.

(Mr. Yango, Philippines)

With the encouragement of nuclear weapon States in the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, the issue of security guarantees becomes less acute. Hence, my delegation believes that this aspect should be given due consideration at the second review conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

In making this statement today my delegation reaffirms its strong conviction that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is a very significant aspect of the non-proliferation régime, which we strongly desire to continue to prevail and exist.

Mr. DIARRA (Mali) (interpretation from French): At the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly and in other appropriate circumstances my delegation has forcefully stressed the dangers to mankind of the perfecting and stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction. We have also proposed concrete measures for general and complete disarmament, which our Organization has been sought for the past three decades. Like many other members of the international community, we have asked that the resources freed by disarmament be allocated to development, in the hope that the process of disarmament would lead to an era of peace and justice that would bring real security to everyone.

At this stage of our debate I should like, on behalf of my delegation, to make a few comments on some of the points before the Committee.

The Disarmament Decade proclaimed in 1969 will come to an end in one year. One need only glance at the road travelled to see that talks on disarmament have come to a standstill. We are very far from general and complete disarmament, for arms have increased in quantity and in quality as progress has been made in science and technology during the Disarmament Decade.

The tenth special session of the General Assembly alerted world public opinion to the insecurity caused by the stockpiling of weapons capable of destroying the world many times over. It is time that we went beyond the stage of limited agreements pertaining to peripheral disarmament issues. Current negotiations must lead to concrete agreements, and soon. But if that is to happen, political will must replace declarations of intention.

(Mr. Diarra, Mali)

All delegations that have participated in the debate have quite rightly said that nuclear disarmament is a matter of urgent priority. But before such disarmament can be achieved, firm guarantees must be given to the non-nuclear States in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In this connexion, my delegation would point out that several nuclear Powers are still in a state of confusion regarding their commitments to the non-nuclear States.

(Mr. Diarra, Mali)

I am referring to the non-use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against those countries. Those States must encourage the development of denuclearized zones and zones of peace. The countries of the third world have taken a decisive step in this direction.

In July 1964 the African Heads of State or Government proclaimed the denuclearization of Africa. That historic decision has been confirmed by a number of resolutions of our Organization and it is an important contribution to the consolidation of international security and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Unfortunately it is being confronted by the absurd policy of the racist régime of South Africa. The efforts of that régime to acquire nuclear capability constitute a threat to peace and security in Africa. That is why the international community must continue to condemn all forms of military and scientific co-operation that would make it easier for South Africa to acquire nuclear capability.

Efforts similar to those being made in Africa are being made in the Middle East in order to make that area a nuclear-weapon-free zone. In that part of the world, which is already in a state of turmoil, action must be taken to translate the will of the countries concerned into facts, because Israel, spurning the resolutions of our Organization, stubbornly pursues its nuclear arms programme.

The intention of the States of South Asia to make their part of the world a nuclear-weapon-free zone should be encouraged and sustained. We hope that the parties concerned will soon reach agreement on the basis of the relevant United Nations resolutions.

Finally, in Latin America the conclusion of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, aimed at the prohibition of nuclear weapons, is in line with the legitimate aspirations of mankind to live in peace and security. The recent signing of Additional Protocol I to that Treaty by Powers outside the region is very encouraging. We think that that example should be followed by all the nuclear Powers in order to strengthen the desire for peace of the peoples of Latin America, which would thus be respected.

The priority that has been given to nuclear disarmament should not cause us to lose sight of the importance of banning the production and stockpiling

(Mr. Diarra, Mali)

of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. Competition among the military Powers serves only to encourage the stockpiling of new kinds of weapons.

Notwithstanding resolutions of the General Assembly and the efforts of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, draft international conventions on this important question have met with a lack of political will on the part of military Powers. Urgent solutions are required in this field. The United States and the Soviet Union must speed up the talks announced in their joint statement of 22 August 1978 and new momentum must be given to the disarmament process. Furthermore, we note with regret that the progress which has been made in the field of fundamental sciences and technology, instead of serving man's well-being, has been diverted to military purposes. Progress in that field has been used to perfect and develop new kinds and systems of weapons of mass destruction.

It is urgently necessary that we reach international agreements of a preventive nature in order to stop the emergence of those weapons.

In current negotiations there are two conflicting theories: that we should negotiate in advance to prohibit the creation of any new weapons; or that we should await the identification of those weapons before negotiating on their prohibition. We believe that the difficulties encountered in disarmament negotiations lie as much in defining the methods of approach as in the preparation of credible measures to reduce and eventually eliminate arsenals throughout the world.

My delegation believes that if we wait until new kinds of weapons emerge before banning them that will only encourage vertical proliferation, which is the opposite of disarmament. The crusade for disarmament and the fight to meet the major challenges of the world today requires above all a minimum of political will by all States and a climate of confidence, which will require: improvements in international relations in a spirit of collective responsibility; scrupulous respect for the sovereignty of States, including their options and their right to choose their allies; non-interference in the internal affairs of States; renunciation of the theories of strategic borders and advanced defence, and the dismantling of foreign bases; settlement of disputes among States by peaceful means and renunciation of the use or threat of force in international relations.

Mr. AL-HAMZAH (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation would like to deal with some of the topics which are before the First Committee in its deliberations on the agenda items relating to disarmament. We have noted with satisfaction the great interest shown by the various contributions made here regarding items 35 to 49 of the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly. The opinions in general reflect the anxiety of mankind concerning the dangers of the arms race and the negative effects of that arms race in the various fields of activity.

On a previous occasion, in the discussion on agenda item 125 on the review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session, my delegation had an opportunity to express its views regarding disarmament items. However, we would point out now that the recommendations and resolutions included in the Final Document, which was adopted by consensus at the end of the special session devoted to disarmament, show that nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind at the present time. Those recommendations define the stages of the action that should be taken in order to achieve the aspirations of mankind to nuclear disarmament.

It is fitting to reaffirm that the inclusion in the Programme of Action of the Final Document of an appeal for the speedy cessation of all nuclear tests is important and should be answered speedily in order to arrive at a treaty on the banning of nuclear tests and a protocol relating to nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. The results of the tenth special session should strengthen the efforts to reach agreements, and the agreements and bilateral and multilateral treaties in this context which have already been signed, as well as those that will be worked out and signed in the future.

Paragraph 16 of the Final Document gives a clear picture of the sufferings of mankind as a result of the poverty and deprivation suffered by two thirds of the world's population because of excessive expenditure on the arms race. Sufficient justification certainly exists for the interest shown in and the great contribution made to the deliberations on disarmament items by all delegations here. Progress in limiting the arms race and taking the steps necessary to lead to the reduction of military budgets and the diversion of such expenditure to strengthen and develop the economies of the developing

(Mr. Al-Hamzah, Democratic Yemen)

countries, in particular, will undoubtedly improve the pace of economic and social development throughout the world. Progress in this field will also strengthen the basis of international co-operation, peaceful coexistence and mutual respect among peoples and encourage the rejection of the use or threat of force in international relations.

(Mr. Al-Hamzah, Democratic Yemen)

My delegation feels great satisfaction with regard to the two initiatives presented by the Soviet Union during this session. The Committee on Disarmament in Geneva has a great responsibility in the study of the text of the convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States. We also support the proposal for pledges not to station nuclear weapons on the territory of countries which do not at present have such weapons on their territory.

The proclamation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world will certainly contribute to the achievement of total and complete nuclear disarmament. On various occasions we have supported the proclamations of Africa, Latin America, South Asia and the Middle East as nuclear-weapon-free zones. We would like to affirm once again this attitude that my country has adopted. Such proclamations will undoubtedly generate greater activity and be more effective if the necessary measures are freely agreed on and adopted by the countries concerned, while taking into consideration the special situation which characterizes certain areas such as the Middle East.

The delegation of Democratic Yemen would like to affirm here that the acquisition of nuclear weapons by the racist régimes in Palestine and South Africa constitutes a serious violation of the declaration of Africa and the Middle East as nuclear-weapon-free zones.

The reactivation of the deliberative body, the Disarmament Commission, in addition to the new composition of the negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, will strengthen and effectively consolidate the current negotiations. The contribution by all countries together and the expression of their interest will be a guarantee for the acceleration of work on new treaties. In addition, the contribution of the nuclear-weapon States in such negotiations and deliberations is a primary requirement and depends in the first analysis on the political will of those countries.

There are positive indications which require serious action to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, as well as other weapons of mass destruction, and we hope that the conferences to be held in 1980 for a review of the treaties and conventions concerned will achieve their goals.

(Mr. Al-Hamzah, Democratic Yemen)

We believe that the success of the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed To Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects will also be a step in the right direction in this field.

My delegation attaches great importance to the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, and it strongly concurs in the expressions of anxiety regarding the preparations made for the production of the neutron bomb, for this will undoubtedly hamper all the efforts which are being exerted in order to prevent the proliferation and development of weapons of all types. Conventional weapons also present a serious danger, and the frightening race by many countries of the world to acquire such weapons is to be regretted. If such tremendous expenditure is spared and diverted to purposes of development it will undoubtedly improve the standard of living of the peoples of such countries.

Amongst the important topics to which my delegation gives particular attention is item 46 of the agenda concerning the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. Current negotiations, since the Declaration, have added new factors which have contributed extensively to the strengthening of that Declaration. Among these new elements we would like to point in particular to the recommendations and statements of the non-aligned countries.

There are many reasons for the recommendation presented by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean regarding the preparatory meeting of littoral and hinterland States in the middle of the next year. My country, which participates in the work of that Committee, considers that it has a prominent role to play, and that its success will permit the convening in the near future of an international conference regarding the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

The negotiations that are taking place between the Soviet Union and the United States have been very instrumental and represent an important event in this context. While affirming the importance of the continuation of these negotiations, we consider that those countries should participate in the next preparatory conference in view of the importance of their participation.

(Mr. Al-Hamzah, Democratic Yemen)

We have explained on various occasions that the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace should basically be linked to the liquidation of all military bases and hostile alliances in the area. These alliances and bases infringe on the independence of peoples and their right to self-determination and the full exercise of their national sovereignty over their territories and their wealth and resources.

We have also affirmed the need to work towards the declaration of the Red Sea, which is closely linked with the Indian Ocean, as a zone of peace and security for all the littoral States, so that the peoples of those countries may all together be able to save themselves from the danger of tension and wars which the imperialist circles try to stir up in this area.

In conclusion: preparation, as of now, for the holding of the international conference on disarmament will be very useful, and a decision to that effect should be taken at this session. A decision should also be taken to set up machinery for the necessary preparations that will allow this important conference to succeed and to reach decisive results that would be satisfactory to all countries.

Finally, we feel sure that we can achieve greater progress in the field of disarmament and create circumstances that will enable mankind to live in peace and security in a world free of weapons and in which prosperity will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN: I have some new sponsors to announce. Ireland has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.18; the Central African Empire has become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.12, A/C.1/33/L.13 and A/C.1/33/L.14; Japan has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.4, and Sierra Leone has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.5.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.