

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION
*Official Records**



COPY:
DO NOT REMOVE
FROM ROOM
L-201 (W/RR)

FIRST COMMITTEE
10th meeting
held on
Monday, 25 October 1982
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 10TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GBEHO (Ghana)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 39 to 57, 133, 136, 138 and 139 (continued)

General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Vraalsen (Norway)
Mr. Nagy (Hungary)
Mr. La Rocca (Italy)
Mr. Chaderton Matos (Venezuela)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/37/PV.10
28 October 1982

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 39 to 57, 133, 136, 138 and 139 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway): Mr. Chairman, at the outset I should like to join you and preceding delegations and express the warmest congratulations of the Norwegian delegation on the occasion of the awarding of the 1982 Nobel Peace Prize by the Norwegian Nobel Committee to Mrs. Alva Myrdal and Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles. As Ambassador Garcia Robles is once again representing his country during this General Assembly and since he is with us here today, I should like to quote a statement issued by the Norwegian Foreign Minister, Mr. Sverre Stray, on 13 October, where he said:

"Ambassador Garcia Robles has played a central role in international efforts for disarmament, both within and outside the United Nations framework. His name is closely linked to the efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to countries and regions where such weapons have not yet been deployed, through his arduous work for the Treaty of Tlatelolco on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America. The awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize to Mrs. Alva Myrdal and Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles is therefore another reminder to us all of the present serious challenge represented by nuclear weapons and of the importance that ongoing negotiations on reductions of nuclear weapons should lead to concrete results."

As I said, my delegation would like to take this opportunity to extend its warmest congratulations to Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles.

Although we have seen no concrete breakthroughs this year, arms control and disarmament have nevertheless figured high on the international agenda of 1982. The deliberative process in the United Nations has been intensified through the convening of another special session on disarmament; important multilateral negotiating efforts have been undertaken in the Committee on Disarmament; new initiatives have been taken in the field of arms control and disarmament concerning conventional forces in Europe, intermediate-range nuclear forces and finally, concerning the crucial talks on limitation and reduction of strategic nuclear arms.

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

Norway has welcomed the resumption of the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms. The Norwegian Government supports the stated objective as outlined by President Reagan that those negotiations should lead to a substantial reduction of the strategic nuclear weapons of the two countries while ensuring strategic stability. At the same time we attach great importance to the fact that both parties must refrain from actions that might undercut existing strategic arms agreements.

The mere fact that those strategic arms negotiations have been resumed should have a positive influence on disarmament efforts in other forums as well, in particular on the talks between the United States and the Soviet Union on intermediate-range nuclear forces, the so-called INF talks. As regards the INF negotiations, Norway fully supports, as a first step, the proposal for elimination of all longer-range land-based United States and Soviet INF missiles.

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

The security situation in Europe is, of course, of particular concern to Norway. In our view balance and stability in Europe can be achieved only through negotiations resulting in binding and verifiable agreements. Given the imbalance in Europe today both in the nuclear and the conventional fields we need in Europe, as elsewhere, a total commitment to respect existing obligations not to use force in any form, except when attacked. This is indeed one of the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter.

In the search for greater stability and security in Europe, Norway puts great emphasis on the Vienna talks on mutual and balanced force reductions in Central Europe, the MBFR talks. We hope that the new Western comprehensive proposal which was submitted on 8 July of this year will create a new momentum in the negotiations. This could lead to an improved conventional balance at a lower force level in Europe and thus contribute to raising the nuclear threshold.

The follow-up meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) in Madrid, due to reconvene in November of this year, is another cornerstone in the efforts to strengthen security in Europe. Norway actively supports negotiating efforts to seek agreement on a clear and precise mandate for a conference on disarmament in Europe as part of an over-all balanced outcome of the meeting. Such a conference would pave the way for the further development of confidence and security-building measures in the military field on the territory of all of Europe.

The limited substantive results achieved at the second special session on disarmament have led many people to question the credibility of our disarmament efforts within the United Nations system. Whereas such reactions are understandable - indeed, progress in arms control and disarmament has been too slow - it must be clearly understood that there is no acceptable alternative to continued and intensified negotiating efforts among nations to seek undiminished security at lower levels of armaments. In this process the United Nations must play an active part. It is in this perspective that we should assess the significance of the second special session. Like its predecessor, it provided another unique opportunity for United Nations Members to address themselves to the issues involved, to carry out a review of

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

developments in the field of disarmament and, finally, to present new proposals regarding future courses of action.

For our part, we attach particular importance to the fact that the second special session on disarmament, despite its inability to draw up new and comprehensive documents on disarmament, did reaffirm the validity of the Final Document of the first special session. We also welcome the adoption by consensus of the guidelines for a World Disarmament Campaign (WDC). We hope that the present session of the General Assembly will unanimously support the implementation of the World Disarmament Campaign, in accordance with the guidelines which have been adopted.

The unleashing of the forces of the atom has presented the greatest challenge to mankind yet in terms of arms control and disarmament. A comprehensive test ban must remain a cardinal measure in our efforts to meet this challenge, thus halting the nuclear arms build-up. A comprehensive test ban would make a significant contribution to the objective of terminating the qualitative development of nuclear weapons and the introduction of new types of such weapons. It would further constitute a non-discriminatory instrument of direct relevance to the promotion of non-proliferation.

A comprehensive test ban should, in our opinion, prohibit all nuclear-test explosions in all environments on a permanent basis. The ban should also include an efficient verification system. Norway has participated in the Committee on Disarmament's Working Group on a nuclear-test ban since its establishment. We have welcomed the agreement reached on the mandate for that Group which has focused on questions relating to verification and compliance. The discussions in the Committee on Disarmament have underlined the importance of a global seismological network. Norway is committed to contributing further to the development of such a network in order to remove remaining obstacles to efficient seismic verification systems. In doing so we shall base ourselves on our own seismological expertise.

In order to make further headway in this field it is necessary that the Committee on Disarmament agree on a work programme for the 1983 session, with a view to enabling the Committee to engage in an in-depth discussion of the various verification methods.

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

Halting further proliferation of nuclear weapons is, in the view of the Norwegian Government, a matter of urgency. Both the vertical and the horizontal non-proliferation of such weapons must assume equal importance.

Under article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) the nuclear-weapon States have undertaken important obligations regarding vertical proliferation. Concrete results in this respect would provide an important impetus in terms of halting horizontal proliferation as well. In our view we must not relax our efforts to obtain even broader adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Furthermore, we maintain that full-scope safeguards must remain a precondition for all exports of relevant nuclear material, equipment and technology. By the same token, all non-nuclear-weapon States should accept full-scope International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards on all their nuclear activities.

A ban on the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on the destruction of existing stocks represents one of the most urgent measures of disarmament at the present time. Such a ban should include all existing and possible new types of chemical weapons.

Progress has been made in the Committee on Disarmament on some of the controversial questions in regard to a chemical weapons convention, and every effort should be made with a view to reaching the phase of formulating the text of a convention. The negotiations seem to indicate that a broader understanding of the complex questions of verification is emerging and we welcome statements made both at the second special session on disarmament and in the Committee on Disarmament in this respect.

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

This understanding should in our view result in elaboration of efficient verification mechanisms, including on-site inspection. The convention should also contain a comprehensive complaints procedure. With this in mind, Norway has been undertaking research of relevance to the development of such procedures within the framework of a chemical-weapon convention.

The Norwegian Government, having made the decision not to allow the stationing or storage of chemical weapons on Norwegian territory, would therefore call for intensified multilateral efforts in this field. Recent reports on possible use of such weapons in various regions cannot be dismissed lightly and should result in increased international efforts at a convention banning such weapons.

In the meantime, we should give careful consideration to ways and means to monitor compliance with existing agreements. We believe that multilateral procedures should be developed for this purpose.

Nowhere are technological advances making the control of armaments more complex than in outer space.

Outer space has immense value to all States in a variety of areas. For this reason the danger of increased militarization of outer space must be considered seriously. For its part, Norway last year co-sponsored resolution 36/97 C, which requested the Committee on Disarmament to consider as a matter of priority the question of negotiating an effective and verifiable agreement to prohibit anti-satellite systems. Norway continues to view these matters as a priority question. Outer space undoubtedly poses new challenges in terms of arms control. Nevertheless these challenges must, in our view, be tackled at the negotiating table before developments take place that may endanger strategic stability among the major space Powers and therefore pose new and major threats to the community of nations as a whole.

Our opportunities to release resources, through disarmament, to social and economic development have been highlighted in the comprehensive United Nations report on the relationship between disarmament and development that was completed last year. As a participant in the expert group, Norway considers it important that decisions be taken during this session with regard to the implementation of recommendations made in that study. Together with the other Nordic countries, Norway introduced a proposal at the second special session on disarmament in

(Mr. Vrealsen, Norway)

this regard. That proposal was contained in document A/S-12/AC.1/49. Based on that document, a draft resolution is now being prepared. In particular there is a need to develop methods for identifying and analysing the benefits that would be derived from the reallocation of military resources following disarmament to meet the needs of social and economic development, in particular in the developing countries. This would require more information from Member States on military use of resources and on arms transfers. Among other tasks which should be undertaken is an investigation of the administrative and technical modalities of an international disarmament fund for development.

Conventional armaments continue to represent the largest share of military expenditures. We note with satisfaction, therefore, that the United Nations Disarmament Commission reached agreement on the guidelines for a United Nations study on conventional disarmament at its 1982 session and that the ad hoc expert group has already held its first meeting and adopted an agreed outline for the study.

We view this study also as a multilateral effort to establish greater openness in the field of conventional armaments. Similarly we should like to see greater openness about military expenditures also in the conventional field as a means to increase confidence building. Recently, added attention has been given to military expenditures, including a call for a conference on military expenditures. As a country which has actively supported United Nations efforts relating to more open information on military budgets, Norway welcomes the renewed attention given to these matters and hopes that this will provide a new impetus to our work along these lines.

Before concluding I should like to make some observations regarding institutional arrangements in the field of disarmament.

Norway attaches great importance to the work of the Committee on Disarmament as the single multilateral negotiating forum. The outcome of the second special session on disarmament has further emphasized the role of the Geneva-based Committee in promoting effective disarmament measures.

Norway for its part favours a limited expansion of the present membership and believes that such expansion would increase the representative nature of the Committee without hampering its negotiating character.

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

Against this background we were happy to note that suggestions made during the second special session to expand the membership of the Committee received wide support and we were pleased to see the General Assembly adopt at its second special session our proposal to include in paragraph 62 of its Concluding Document (A/S-12/32) a provision that the Committee on Disarmament should report to this session of the General Assembly on its consideration of an expansion.

While regretting that the consultations in the Committee on Disarmament have not yet resulted in any agreement among the members to expand its membership, we understand that it was not possible to conclude those consultations owing to the brevity of the second part of the 1982 session. We have, however, noted that the Committee's report states that no objection in principle has been raised to a limited expansion of its membership.

On the basis of its proposal in document A/S-12/AC.1/32, Norway intends to introduce a draft resolution on expanding membership in the Committee on Disarmament with a view to enabling the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly to take note of a decision on a limited expansion on further consideration by the Committee on Disarmament.

Since its establishment in October 1980, the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) in Geneva has performed a useful function. It has indeed represented a strengthening of the research activities of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. As pointed out in the Norwegian proposal to the second special session, Norway is of the opinion that the time has now come to make UNIDIR an autonomous institution. UNIDIR should however work in close co-operation with the United Nations Centre for Disarmament which, on the other hand, would need to be strengthened to cope with the increasing responsibilities it has in the field of arms control and disarmament. During this session, Norway will introduce a draft resolution on UNIDIR's future status.

Finally, we should like to continue consultations on our proposal, put forward during the second special session, in regard to the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies, whose mandate should be more precisely defined. In particular, we believe that the Advisory Board should serve as Board of Trustees of UNIDIR.

Mr. NAGY (Hungary): Those of us who were present are still under the enchanting spell of yesterday's concert. And today the realities of life compel us to discuss problems related to the future of mankind - namely, weapons of mass destruction. I sincerely hope that the optimism conveyed to us through that beautiful music will give further strength to all those who spare no effort to make our world a better and safer place to live in.

The second special session on disarmament rightly emphasized that the prevention of a nuclear disaster:

"remains the most acute and urgent task of the present day".

(A/S-12/32, para. 62)

It is encouraging that the Committee can deal now with these questions, having before it new important Soviet initiatives on the "immediate cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests" and on the "intensification of efforts to remove the threat of nuclear war and ensure the safe development of nuclear energy".

Recent years have witnessed a very dangerous turn in the field of nuclear armaments. My Government's views on the reasons behind this negative trend are well-known, as expressed a few weeks ago by the Foreign Minister of the Hungarian People's Republic in his speech during the general debate of the Assembly.

Latest developments, such as the NATO decision on the deployment of new American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe, the United States decision on the development and production of neutron weapons, the non-ratification of the SALT-II Agreement, the unilateral suspension of the United States-United Kingdom-Union of Soviet Socialist Republics trilateral negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-test ban, the newly-emerging theories and doctrines on limited, protracted and winnable nuclear war, are valid reasons for growing concern and anxiety on the part of the whole of mankind. These steps are bound to increase the nuclear arms race and the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear catastrophe. One should not forget that the sense of vulnerability is relatively fresh, first being felt hardly 20 years ago. And this sense - fortunately - is not based on direct observations but on the theoretical knowledge of the nature of up-to-date nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Nagy, Hungary)

My delegation, therefore, like many others, considers that the elimination of the danger of a nuclear war - the prevention of a nuclear holocaust - is the most urgent task of our days. It was against this background that during the second special session on disarmament Hungary welcomed and supported the solemn commitment of the Soviet Union concerning the non-first-use of nuclear weapons. In the opinion of my delegation our Committee should appeal to those nuclear Powers which have not yet assumed such an obligation to take reciprocal steps. It is obvious that such steps, if taken by all States concerned, would practically lead to an overall ban on the use of nuclear weapons. We hope Governments and leading political circles all over the world will never give credit to doctrines which say that the introduction of new weapon systems and military options would make a nuclear war winnable. Responsible statesmen today and in the future too must start from the conviction that the launching of a single nuclear weapon would mean entry into a vast field of the unknown where destruction beyond human imagination and experience would be waiting for the attacker and the attacked alike. The first user of nuclear weapons can no longer have the hope of going unpunished. This very high probability cannot be lowered to the level of acceptable risk. That is why well-known politicians and public figures all over the world more and more often voice their conviction that the United States and other nuclear Powers should reciprocate the step taken by the Soviet Union and commit themselves to the non-first-use of nuclear weapons. Let me cite just one example.

The Pontifical Academy of Sciences convened in Rome a month ago an assembly of presidents of scientific academies and other scientists from all over the world. The renowned scientists, in their declaration on prevention of nuclear war, emphasized that mankind is confronted today with a threat unprecedented in history and that science can offer the world no real defense against the consequences of nuclear war. There is no prospect of making defences sufficiently effective to protect cities and the masses of population. The devastation of the cultural, economic and industrial base of society would not be prevented. In the light of this the participants unanimously declared that nuclear weapons are fundamentally different from conventional weapons; they must not be regarded as acceptable instruments of warfare. That is why the world-famous scientists

(Mr. Nagy, Hungary)

present came to the same conclusion as the General Assembly - namely, that nuclear warfare would be a crime against humanity. They strongly emphasized that all disputes that we are concerned with today, including political, economic and ideological or religious ones, are small, compared to the hazards of nuclear war.

My delegation is ready to support other proposals, too, aimed at promoting measures for the prevention of a nuclear war. In this spirit it lent support to the Indian proposal for a draft convention on the non-use of nuclear weapons and to the Indian initiative in the Committee on Disarmament for establishing a working group for that purpose. Unfortunately, the opposition of some members prevented the Committee from taking appropriate steps.

Turning to the question of nuclear disarmament and the cessation of the nuclear arms race, my delegation has to state with deep regret and concern that the Committee on Disarmament during its four years of existence has been unable to establish an appropriate organizational framework for starting substantive negotiations on this highly important issue. Therefore it is imperative that next year the Geneva Committee should set up a working group to start negotiations in an organized manner. The working group, with an appropriate mandate, should prepare, on the basis of paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, the stages of the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. In this connection the Hungarian delegation fully supports the proposal for such a programme contained in the memorandum submitted by the Soviet Union to the second special session on disarmament.

In the general context of nuclear disarmament the Hungarian delegation continues to attach special importance to the prohibition of nuclear neutron weapons, since the introduction of these weapons and their deployment in Western Europe and other parts of the world are likely to lower the nuclear threshold, thus increasing the danger of a nuclear war.

(Mr. Nagy, Hungary)

No one should be misled by the arguments about the "cleanliness" of such weapons. A neutron bomb, while emitting a much higher quantity of neutrons than other nuclear weapons, also kills by blast, heat and radiation. That is why in the Geneva Committee the Hungarian delegation, together with the delegations of other Socialist countries, proposed the prohibition of neutron weapons and submitted a draft convention for that purpose as early as 1979. In the Committee on Disarmament we have repeatedly proposed the establishment of an appropriate working group which would create the necessary organizational framework for the elaboration of such a convention. Unfortunately, the opposition of Western countries made this impossible. The Hungarian delegation considers that a declaration by the non-nuclear-weapon States on not permitting the deployment of nuclear neutron weapons on their territories would be an important step contributing to the efforts aimed at prohibiting that particular new type of nuclear weapon. Hungary would be ready to join in such a declaration without delay should other countries concerned do the same.

In the field of nuclear disarmament, the Hungarian delegation attaches special importance to the question of the general and complete banning of nuclear-weapon tests, and considers this an extremely urgent task. My delegation firmly rejects the idea that this can only be a long-term goal.

As early as 1972, the Secretary-General stated the following in connection with a nuclear test-ban treaty, more precisely with the verification of such a treaty:

"I believe that all the technical and scientific aspects of the problem have been so fully explored that only a political decision is now necessary in order to achieve final agreement...."

Ten years had to elapse before the Committee on Disarmament could establish a working group in order to deal with the question of a comprehensive nuclear test ban in a suitable framework. But I have to add with deep regret and concern that this working group has only a very limited mandate, concentrating on compliance and verification issues. The activity of the working group during the last summer session of the Committee on Disarmament clearly showed the insufficiency of its mandate for the elaboration of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty. Another sad fact is that two nuclear-weapon States, China and France, did not

(Mr. Nagy, Hungary)

participate in the working group. This situation calls for a reconsideration by the United States of its position, for the earliest possible resumption of the trilateral talks, for the participation of all nuclear-weapon States in the working group, and for an appropriate mandate for the working group.

It is against this background that the Hungarian delegation welcomes the fact that the Soviet Union proposed the inclusion on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly of a new item entitled "Immediate cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests" including the basic provisions of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and the related draft resolution. My delegation considers that the complete cessation of nuclear weapon tests would constitute a major step in reducing the nuclear threat, checking the nuclear arms race and blocking the development of new types and systems of nuclear weapons. Finally, it would also contribute to strengthening the Non-Proliferation Treaty régime. To create more favourable conditions for the elaboration of such a treaty, immediate action is needed, namely, the declaration of a moratorium on all nuclear explosions for the duration of the negotiations.

Other important steps for removing the threat of nuclear war would be to outlaw the destruction of peaceful nuclear installations even by means of conventional weapons, such destruction having the same consequences as an attack with nuclear weapons and to agree on a simultaneous suspension of the production and development of nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles as well as of the production of fissionable materials for the purpose of manufacturing various types of nuclear weapons. My delegation therefore supports the proposal made by the Soviet Union on the intensification of efforts to remove the threat of nuclear war and ensure the safe development of nuclear energy.

The Hungarian Government continues to support all proposals and efforts likely to contribute to the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. In this connection I should like to deal briefly with two questions: first, the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present; secondly, effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Nagy, Hungary)

The elaboration and adoption of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present would be a step of great importance in preventing the further geographical spread of nuclear weapons. During the last session it was the Hungarian delegation that, on behalf of like-minded delegations, submitted a draft resolution on this issue. General Assembly resolution 36/97 E, which was adopted by a large majority, called for the Committee on Disarmament to proceed without delay to talks with a view to elaborating an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. The Hungarian delegation, together with the delegation of the German Democratic Republic, submitted in the Committee on Disarmament a working paper aimed at assisting the work of that Committee in this respect. Unfortunately, the position taken by some countries prevented the Committee on Disarmament from making any progress in this field. My delegation feels duty-bound to continue and increase its efforts on this issue, and intends to elaborate and submit to the Committee an appropriate draft resolution.

The Hungarian delegation considers it necessary for the Committee on Disarmament's working group on negative security assurances to renew its activities in 1983.

The creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world is still considered to be an important means of increasing the security of non-nuclear-weapon States and of strengthening the non-proliferation régime. Consequently, the Hungarian delegation supports any proposal of this kind, provided that it is based on the joint will of all States of the region in question. As a European State it endorses the idea of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in northern Europe, in the Balkans and in the Mediterranean, and favours ultimately making Europe totally free of nuclear weapons.

Hungary continues to attach great importance to the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime, which has been exposed to constant trials and growing dangers for many years. It considers that everything should be done to make it universal by means of the accession of States which are at present outside the framework of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

(Mr. Nagy, Hungary)

The member States of the Warsaw Pact recognize the right of all sides concerned to security, but are of the opinion that mutual security should be maintained at the lowest possible level of armaments. True, there are differences of opinion as to the analysis of military parity. It is regrettable that the debate, as far as the leading circles of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are concerned, is dominated by unjustified allegations. It seems that catchwords and slogans have pushed aside the objective analysis of parity, and that distorted evaluations serve the purpose of new military programmes only. The Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT I and SALT II) negotiations are good examples of how an objective analysis and comparison are possible if all parties concerned are politically prepared to come to a fair agreement. The communiqué issued concerning the recent meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Pact countries is proof that the political readiness and determination of those countries - including Hungary - to achieve progress in the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons remains unchanged.

Mr. LA ROCCA (Italy): Mr. Chairman, at the outset permit me to congratulate you on your election to the important position of Chairman of this Committee and to express my conviction that under your able and skilful guidance our work will be successful. I should also like to congratulate the other officers of the Committee on their election.

I wish to take this opportunity also to congratulate the representative of , Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles, on the Nobel Peace Prize that was jointly awarded to him and Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden. This is a great honour, bestowed upon them and their countries for their untiring efforts in the cause of disarmament.

On 21 October the representative of Denmark delivered a statement on behalf of the member States of the European Community. I should like first of all to associate myself fully with that statement.

The First Committee has before it an important session and a particularly substantive agenda. In the forthcoming weeks we will have to debate and make recommendations on questions which lie at the core of international peace and security and which should be faced with seriousness and a sense of responsibility. My delegation is ready to make every effort and to give its full contribution in order to promote progress towards the achievement of effective, realistic and verifiable measures of disarmament. It is indeed becoming more and more urgent to deal effectively with the continuing accumulation of armaments, often beyond any reasonable or legitimate needs of national security.

It was in this spirit, and with a view to the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under strict international control, that Italy took an active part in the proceedings at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Taking into consideration the international situation and the continuing tensions in international relations, it is no wonder that the special session could not entirely fulfil the high expectations that Governments and peoples alike had of it. However, we should not take an entirely negative view of that session.

(Mr. La Rocca, Italy)

The realistic approach which prevailed during the special session - and the abstention, in most cases, from attempts to radicalize the debate - prevented a dramatic confrontation. The efforts that were undoubtedly made last June should now be continued and intensified. This task rests primarily with us here in the First Committee. In our deliberations we will continue to be guided by the Final Document of the first special session, the validity of which was solemnly reaffirmed at the second special session on disarmament and in the Concluding Document of that session. Indeed, the indications and suggestions contained in this last document - especially those in the chapter headed "Conclusions" - deserve our closest attention. In this regard I have in mind particularly the acknowledgement of the continuing paramount importance of the rule of consensus and the recognition of the role that freely expressed public opinion can play in the field of disarmament, as well as the reference to the strengthening of the Committee on Disarmament as the single multilateral negotiating body.

My delegation trusts that our efforts will be characterized by a sense of common purpose, for, although there is no alternative to disarmament, no disarmament is possible without the full and unequivocal commitment of all the parties. When deliberating on this vital subject we should always bear in mind that we are dealing with the fundamental security interests of all States. This implies that at least undiminished security should be ensured at all stages of the disarmament process and that in this most sensitive area we should always strive to achieve common decisions.

I should now like to offer a few considerations on an issue that is appropriately central to our deliberations: the question of the prevention of war, in particular nuclear war. The word "preventing" means blocking the occurrence or possible occurrence of an event. In international relations it implies, in the first place, that disputes should be settled by peaceful means without exception, which would help to remove that sense of insecurity that "cast its shadow over the second special session of the General Assembly" of the United Nations, to use the words of the Secretary-General. And indeed there is insecurity. During recent years there have been more and more incidences of flagrant violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter: the use

(Mr. La Rocca, Italy)

of force as a means of settling international disputes; brutal aggression; imperial interference in the internal affairs of other States; blatant violations of sovereignty and territorial integrity, as well as of the right to self-determination of nations.

The invasion and continuing occupation of Kampuchea and Afghanistan, the Iran-Iraq conflict, the dramatic events in Poland, South African military actions in Angola and the invasion of Lebanon are unfortunately only some examples, however prominent, of actions which have contributed much to worsen the international climate and seriously erode the very basis of international confidence, which is obviously a necessary and indeed essential condition for successful negotiations on disarmament.

The reconstruction of a sufficient degree of confidence between States is therefore most urgently needed in order effectively to prevent the risks of war. In this connection it is most important to be aware that each time we remove a factor of international tension, each time we observe and maintain the fundamental principles and rules of the Charter, we are making an essential contribution to the cause of international confidence, stability and security, thereby fostering the disarmament process and helping to prevent war, in particular nuclear war.

Indeed, the objective of disarmament cannot and should not be divorced from security. This corresponds to the demand of all nations, which are entitled to be secure in a stable world. Moreover, paragraph 83 of the Final Document (A/S-10/2) emphasizes that agreements and other measures on disarmament should fully respect "the need of States to protect their security" and "the need to ensure balance and undiminished security of all States".

Nuclear disarmament cannot but constitute one of the main topics of our discussion. If we will only consider the destructive potential accumulated in the thermonuclear arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States, as well as its continuing growth in a perverse and so far endless qualitative and quantitative spiral, it is clear to all that progress towards nuclear disarmament should not be delayed any longer.

(Mr. La Rocca, Italy)

At the same time we should consider the realities as they are and evaluate objectively not only the effects but also the root causes of the nuclear arms race. In the East-West context it is undeniable that in recent years the development of massive programmes of both conventional and nuclear armaments, including the deployment of hundreds of new SS-20 missiles poised against Europe as well as large areas of Asia, the Middle East and Africa, has threatened to upset the maintenance of the precarious balance of forces which remains an essential condition for world peace. The legitimate and indeed restrained response from the West was intended only to restore the balance through appropriate measures while formulating, in the same context, a set of far-reaching proposals for dramatic reductions. A positive response to these proposals was unfortunately long delayed, so that last year, at the inception of the deliberations of the General Assembly, we could not be sure whether negotiations on nuclear weapons were about to commence in Geneva.

There is no doubt whatsoever that the proposals put forward by the West in Geneva concerning intermediate and strategic nuclear forces represent the boldest attempt so far to make effective progress towards nuclear disarmament through radical and concrete measures rather than through declarations of intent, however well-meant. The Government and people of Italy have high hopes, and indeed expectations, of a positive development in these negotiations and attach central importance to a successful and early outcome. In particular, the beginning of the negotiations on intermediate nuclear forces in November 1981 was welcomed with great satisfaction in my country which, within the framework of the relevant Atlantic consultations, is actively associated with the development of the negotiations. In this respect, I should like to repeat that the solution of the problems under discussion should be sought in the direction of a rapprochement of views aimed at the most desirable outcome, namely, reducing to zero level both Soviet and United States intermediate-range nuclear missiles.

(Mr. La Rocca, Italy)

With the same sense of satisfaction the Italian Government welcomed in June 1982 the opening in Geneva of the negotiations on strategic nuclear forces. In this connection we fully support and share the approach aimed at dramatic reductions rather than limitations on such nuclear systems. It goes without saying that the Italian Government will continue to do its utmost to contribute also to the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) negotiations, both in the framework of the relevant Atlantic consultations and through suitable bilateral channels.

Moreover, it is the task and the duty of all Member States to make every possible effort aimed at positive developments and substantive results in all current negotiations dealing with specific aspects of nuclear disarmament. In this connection, while recognizing the difficulties in arriving in the near future at a verifiable treaty on a comprehensive nuclear test ban, I should like to reaffirm the vital importance that my delegation attaches to this objective.

In view of the catastrophic and yet unforeseeable consequences that an atomic conflict would have for the very survival of humanity on this planet, we share - as I have said already - the deep concern which has been repeatedly expressed on the need for nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war. But it must also be realized that if we really aim at achieving progress towards nuclear disarmament and preventing a nuclear holocaust, we shall have to face resolutely the question of conventional disarmament. We do not mean to impose a kind of artificial relationship between the two categories of armaments. The fact is that they are closely interrelated. Both kinds of weapons are part of an overall balance of forces and interact with each other. Conventional imbalance, for instance, can be an important contributing factor to the further refinement and expansion of nuclear arsenals and hence a serious impediment to efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament. That is why Italy has repeatedly drawn the attention of the General Assembly to the great importance of the adoption of concrete and verifiable measures of conventional disarmament.

(Mr. La Rocca, Italy)

While we deeply regret that so little has yet been achieved on a global scale, we note with satisfaction that new and far-reaching proposals have recently been introduced by Western countries in the negotiations on mutual and balanced reductions of forces in central Europe. We trust that on the basis of these proposals, to the preparation of which Italy has contributed, rapid progress will be made towards a mutually advantageous and effectively verifiable agreement which will enhance stability and security throughout the entire continent of Europe. We have no doubt that a result so sought after would in turn reflect positively on international stability and security throughout the world.

Another positive indication, though limited by its very nature, is the progress being made in the work of the study on conventional disarmament. We hope that constructive conclusions and recommendations from the experts will provide the elements to enable the General Assembly to set the course of future multilateral negotiations on conventional disarmament. In this context we hope that action will also be taken with regard to the control and limitation of international arms transfers, with full respect for the sovereignty and security of all parties. In this area Italy introduced specific and practical proposals at the second special session on disarmament and is looking forward to substantive discussion of those proposals in this Committee and in the Committee on Disarmament.

There is no doubt that agreed and verifiable reductions in military budgets would constitute a serious incentive for the adoption of concrete measures of disarmament, especially in connection with conventional disarmament, while permitting the reallocation of resources for other purposes - in particular for the benefit of developing countries. Italy is determined to continue to support the work originally initiated by Sweden aimed at finding solutions to the problems of comparability and verification of military expenditures with a view to their possible reduction. Italy is convinced that the systematic and standardized reporting of military expenditures should be continued and further refined in order to contribute to greater openness and transparency, which are the basis for any serious endeavours to make progress in this field. In this connection Italy urges all those States which have not yet done so to join in this important enterprise.

(Mr. La Rocca, Italy)

The Italian delegation has consistently urged constant efforts to achieve effective agreements banning all existing weapons of mass destruction.

In that spirit Italy acceded without reservation to the treaty banning bacteriological (biological) weapons, although recently serious shortcomings have emerged in the treaty provisions concerning verification and compliance.

With regard to chemical weapons, the negotiations conducted in Geneva for a convention on

"... the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their destruction"

have shown that decisive progress is indeed possible and that further sustained efforts could bring about in a relatively short time those results the international community has so long awaited. We must not lose this opportunity. The conclusion of a comprehensive convention in this field, which should obviously include effective international measures of verification, would not only make humanity safe from weapons whose destructive potential is second to none, but would also provide a decisive impetus to other disarmament negotiations and measures. We therefore appeal to all Member States, and in particular to members of the Committee on Disarmament, to maintain the momentum and to exert the maximum effort in order to reach a solution on the outstanding problems.

(Mr. La Rocca, Italy)

I wish to touch briefly on a subject that has for years been high on the list of priorities of the Italian delegation: arms control in outer space. Given the urgency and importance that this subject has acquired - as witnessed by the general debate in the First Committee - my delegation will address it specifically in the course of our deliberations.

I wish first of all to express our satisfaction at the fact that the Committee on Disarmament, following the recommendations of the General Assembly, in particular resolution 36/97 C, introduced by Italy and other like-minded countries, has begun substantive discussions on this highly complex issue. We hope that such discussions will be continued next year, with a view to clarifying the issues and identifying an approach which is broadly acceptable to all sides. We stress once again the importance of establishing priorities with regard to such a complex and vitally important field. In this context, the threat posed by the development of anti-satellites systems in our opinion deserves the most urgent attention.

We do not think that the development of anti-satellites systems is the only problem to tackle. We are convinced that it is the problem that should be tackled first, in the context of measures aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space. We do not lay the emphasis on anti-satellites systems for tactical reasons, or to curtail activities where one side may have an edge. We are truly convinced that at present the development of such systems is the main avenue through which the reactive cycle which characterizes an arms race could be set in motion.

Satellites serve a number of important and indeed vital purposes, to the benefit of humanity. In connection with disarmament they contribute, as national technical means of verification, to ensuring a measure of transparency of military activities, which is an essential prerequisite of any arms control and disarmament agreement. All such existing agreements, and indeed all proposals made for agreements by any party, give a considerable and irreplaceable role to national technical means of verification. It is therefore essential to ensure adequate protection for these systems through effective and verifiable measures. That is why Italy has advocated the urgent need to concentrate as soon as possible on actual discussions on a convention banning anti-satellite systems. If effective action is not taken on this issue and if anti-satellite systems are not banned now, tomorrow it may well be too late, as I have already said, to stop the development of an arms race in this field.

(Mr. La Rocca, Italy)

In concluding may I dwell briefly on the question of international verification of disarmament agreements and the role which the United Nations would play in this regard. As delegations will recall, this was the subject of an Italian proposal presented for consideration by the special session devoted to disarmament and included in the list which was referred to by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

There is a general consensus on the need to include in disarmament and arms control agreements provisions specifically designed to monitor the implementation of and compliance with such agreements. It is also generally recognized that verification is aimed at and fulfils two basic functions: it serves to deter possible violations of obligations and it helps to generate the climate of international trust which is indispensable for further progress in the disarmament field.

My delegation is convinced that the United Nations has an important role to play in this field and that all avenues should be explored to assess the feasibility of the possible establishment, within the framework of the United Nations, of international procedures for the verification of disarmament agreements. An appropriate participation of all countries in the verification process, through the United Nations, would give the best guarantee that obligations deriving from disarmament agreements were actually being fulfilled by the parties concerned.

I have set forth Italy's views on some points which we believe are particularly significant for our work. My delegation reserves its right to intervene again on those issues as well as on other points of the agenda.

Mr. CHADERTON MATOS (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish):

Mr. Chairman, the delegation of Venezuela is pleased to see you presiding over the First Committee at this session, since you are the representative of a country with which we have had cordial relations for many years and one which has made important contributions to the international community. The fact that you represent a continent which has been the victim of arms races guarantees success for the efforts which you will undertake for the cause of disarmament while holding your important post. You may be assured of our co-operation in carrying out the task entrusted to you by the General Assembly.

We wish to extend our good wishes to the other officers of the Committee and to Ambassador Ignac Golob of Yugoslavia for his positive contribution to the work of this Committee during the last session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Chaderton Matos, Venezuela)

Venezuela, a proudly Latin American country, wishes to take this opportunity to congratulate Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles most particularly on the distinction with which he has just been honoured by the Nobel Committee. Those congratulations are also extended to Mrs. Alva Myrdal. It should be food for thought that the Nobel Peace Prize is shared this time by two personalities who for a long time and with great devotion have been linked to the cause of disarmament and who, as pointed out by the Nobel Committee:

"have helped to open the eyes of the world to the threat faced by mankind, in view of the continuous nuclear arms build-up."

The task of participating in the general debate in the First Committee on all the disarmament items has particular features this year which make it more difficult to face. At this time not only do we have to refer to the discouraging results of the disarmament negotiations; we must also point to the failure of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, although such high hopes had been set on the results expected of it.

Since the international situation and disarmament negotiations cannot be separated the climate of growing tension and the increasing number of conflicts was not auspicious for the work of the recent special session. My country is in a region which has recently witnessed a serious conflict stemming from the colonial situations which still persist in Latin America.

The Declaration of Ayacucho, signed in 1974 by several South American Heads of State, condemned and rejected such situations. In this case, unfortunately, the vestiges of colonialism ceased to be merely a threat and led to a conflict affecting peace in Latin America, in which one of the countries of the region, the sister Republic of Argentina, was the victim of a military aggression by a Power from another continent, which possesses nuclear weapons and very advanced technologies of destruction, supplemented by the support of others, which contributed to the military results we know.

(Mr. Chaderton Matos, Venezuela)

This act of armed aggression, which contravenes the Security Council resolutions on the question, was not only an aggression against the Argentine Republic but an aggression against the Latin American continent, which has always endeavoured to struggle against colonialism and its aftermath.

Latin America has been a pioneer not only in the ideals of freedom that led to our early process of decolonization. Its will to attain objectives of general interest for mankind brought about the establishment of the only inhabited area of the world protected by a status of denuclearization.

The Treaty of Tlatelolco, which established the denuclearized zone, was possible thanks to the combined efforts of the States of the region in which Ambassador Garcia Robles, today the worthy recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize, played a major role deserving recognition and gratitude.

The Secretary-General in his annual report clearly illustrates, by means of a pyramid, the present international situation as:

"...a chilling and unprecedented phenomenon. At the peak of world power there exist enough nuclear weapons to destroy life on our planet...

"In the middle level of world power there exist vast quantities of sophisticated, so-called conventional weapons...

"At yet another level we have the poverty of a vast proportion of the world's population - a deprivation inexplicable in terms either of available resources or of the money and ingenuity spent on armaments and war."

(A/37/1, pp. 2 and 3)

The threat of nuclear war is undoubtedly the greatest risk of destruction facing the world today. I need not dwell at length on the consequences of the use of nuclear weapons; suffice it to look at the study made by the Pontifical Academy of Sciences at the request of His Holiness John Paul II, which was published in the Committee on Disarmament as document CD/238 at Venezuela's request, in which internationally renowned scientists mention the inability to cope with such a situation with the means available and at the same time the impossibility of predicting its scope and proportions.

If we recognize that the greatest challenge is to halt the arms race, we also must recognize, given the results, that disarmament negotiations require a new approach.

The past year's results should not be cause for a defeatist attitude; on the contrary, they should act as a stimulus to renew efforts and to become aware of the

need for a change of heart. It is obvious that the efforts made so far have not been sufficient and that there must be renewed confidence in the cause of disarmament. In this process the good faith and the political will of States are fundamental elements.

While it is true that the special session on disarmament did not take place in an international climate conducive to favourable results and that it was unrealistic to expect too much of it, it is also true that at the level of world public opinion great hopes were placed in that session, hopes that were unfortunately frustrated since the comprehensive programme of disarmament, which was its main objective, was not adopted. Nevertheless, the special session of the Assembly was able to agree on two texts to which we attach great importance: the Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament and the World Disarmament Campaign.

Venezuela is among the group of developing countries that gave important support to Nigeria's happy initiative at the first special session, leading to the establishment of the Programme of Fellowships. Since then a considerable number of fellows have benefited from the Programme.

To the extent that there is a better knowledge and a greater awareness of the dangers and drawbacks of the arms race and its many implications, we may hope for a better understanding of the need to halt and reduce it. My delegation hopes that the General Assembly will make available the necessary funds to enable the Programme to continue its good work.

All States, particularly the great Powers, should realize that the United Nations is the proper forum for genuine disarmament efforts. The deterioration of the international situation has made it even more difficult for the Organization to serve as a centre for constructive negotiations. The results of the special session of the Assembly point to the fact that we have not really known how to take advantage of the full capacity of the Organization and its ad hoc bodies, in particular those which are used for disarmament negotiations and discussions.

In this regard, the Committee on Disarmament is called upon to fulfil the important function which, as the only multilateral forum for disarmament negotiations called on to promote the achievement of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, is assigned to it by the Final Document of the tenth special session, a function that became even more

important at the special session, since it highlighted even further the need for the Committee to be able to negotiate and conclude texts on the agenda items allocated to it by the General Assembly.

We wish now to reiterate the importance that Venezuela attaches, together with the other members of the Group of 21 of the Committee on Disarmament, to ad hoc working groups as being the best means for conducting concrete negotiations on disarmament, as shown from the very first substantive session of the Committee in 1979.

The Committee on Disarmament has on its agenda extremely important items in relation to which it has not yet been possible to initiate concrete negotiations. In particular this is true of the item on "The cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament", which is regarded as being of the highest priority.

In connection with chemical weapons, we wish to refer to the work being done by the ad hoc working group entrusted with preparing a convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, manufacture and stockpiling of chemical weapons and their destruction, taking into account all existing proposals and future initiatives with a view to the Committee reaching agreement as soon as possible. This is an item which, given the continual complaints about the use of chemical weapons in various regions of the world, is increasingly important as an urgent disarmament measure.

Faced with the continuous threat of nuclear weapons and the existence of large arsenals, the cessation of nuclear testing, as mentioned in the Final Document:

"... would make a significant contribution to ... ending the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and the development of new types of such weapons and of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons".

(resolution S-10/2, para. 51)

My delegation trusts that the Committee on Disarmament will at its next session be able to pay due attention to all relevant aspects of a prohibition of nuclear testing and is confident of the positive contribution of all Member States of the Committee, in particular the nuclear-weapon Powers, which bear a special responsibility in the matter.

(Mr. Chaderton Matos, Venezuela)

One of the greatest threats facing mankind today is the growing militarization of outer space. The delegation of Venezuela wishes to reiterate its adherence to the Declaration adopted by the Group of 77 at the second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, which took place last August. There the Group expressed its grave concern over the expansion of the arms race into outer space and mentioned a series of recommendations.

(Mr. Chaderton Matos, Venezuela)

The military uses of outer space are not only a grave danger for the survival of mankind but they are also a serious obstacle to international co-operation and its use for peaceful purposes. Venezuela remains firmly convinced that more concrete steps should be taken in the Committee on Disarmament to have it consider, as a matter of high priority, everything relating to the negotiation of the necessary agreement or agreements, as the case may be, to prevent the arms race in outer space. It therefore supports the establishment of an ad hoc working group to deal with that question in the Committee on Disarmament and to have it begin its work at the next session.

The arms race, nuclear as well as conventional, constitutes a continuous threat to peace and is a determining factor in the overall climate of insecurity in which we live. Every year the First Committee of the General Assembly sees an increase in what is already a long list of agenda items, without their consideration resulting in the adoption of measures of benefit to the cause of disarmament. This year the Committee has before it a series of initiatives which deserve serious consideration. Venezuela, aware of the function which the United Nations can have in the process of disarmament, supports every initiative aimed at strengthening its role in this field.

Another truly important matter on which the special session of the General Assembly was unable to adopt appropriate measures was the study of the relationship between disarmament and development. On various occasions we have mentioned the significance of that study, which once again highlights the tremendous human and material resources that are used in military activities world-wide to the detriment of the economic and social progress of all peoples, particularly developing countries.

My delegation has referred to the items on our agenda on which it is increasingly imperative that we adopt the concrete and effective disarmament measures demanded by mankind whose future we must preserve and in no case keep under a constant and unjust threat. The science, art and industry of weaponry, especially nuclear weapons, will not lead us to a better world.

(Mr. Chaderton Matos, Venezuela)

In conclusion and reverting to an item very dear to Latin America, I wish very clearly to state that, despite the arms build-up and despite armed occupation, the Malvinas are Argentine.

The CHAIRMAN: The list of speakers in the debate for this afternoon has been exhausted. I shall therefore call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to exercise the right of reply. Before I call on them I should like to draw the Committee's attention to the following decision of the General Assembly, taken at its thirty-fourth session:

"Delegations should exercise their right of reply at the end of the day whenever two meetings have been scheduled for that day and whenever such meetings are devoted to the consideration of the same item.

"The number of interventions in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation at a given meeting should be limited to two per item.

"The first intervention in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation on any item at a given meeting should be limited to 10 minutes and the second intervention should be limited to five minutes." (General Assembly decision 34/401, paras. 8-10)

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I should like to reply very briefly to the comments made by the previous speaker about the United Kingdom in connection with recent events in the South Atlantic; in particular, I should like to rebut his suggestion that the United Kingdom committed armed aggression against Argentina and disregarded the resolutions of the Security Council.

I would like to remind the Committee, as I am sure most representatives will remember, that the armed attack in this case was mounted by Argentine forces against the Falkland Islands and that Argentina disregarded the provisions of Security Council resolution 502 (1982) calling on it to withdraw its forces from the Falkland Islands.

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

I should also like to comment briefly on the references to the Treaty of Tlatelolco. The United Kingdom has warmly supported the Treaty of Tlatelolco from the outset, as I pointed out in a statement two or three days ago. The United Kingdom has ratified the two Additional Protocols and has fully observed their provisions ever since. We regret that the Treaty has not yet come into force throughout its intended area of operation because of the failure of some countries in the area to undertake its obligations - in particular Argentina.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina)(interpretation from Spanish): I am compelled to speak owing to the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom with reference my country. It is not my wish to bring up again the question of the Malvinas Islands, but I have no alternative other than once again to mention the fact that the Malvinas Islands were taken by force from the territorial heritage of the Argentine Republic and were kept by force. The Argentine Republic merely wished to recover what had always belonged to it in a bloodless manner - and I emphasize the word "bloodless". All the actions which ensued stemmed from the disproportionate measures adopted by the United Kingdom.

Security Council resolution 502 (1982) included several parts, and the Government of Argentina has always expressed the wish to comply with that resolution, but in all its parts, not merely some of them.

(Mr. Carasales, Argentina)

Moreover, the Security Council did not entrust to the United Kingdom the task of being the direct executor of any of its resolutions and it may not be idle to recall that the Security Council voted, by a sufficient majority, for a draft resolution which was vetoed by the United Kingdom, calling for an immediate cease-fire.

Concerning the Treaty of Tlatelolco, I simply wish to recall what I had stated at last Thursday's meeting. The Argentine Republic is a signatory to that Treaty; it has repeatedly expressed its full agreement with its purposes; it is negotiating with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) on the safeguards system that would be applicable were the Treaty to enter into force with respect to us and, furthermore, it has subjected all its nuclear installations to the IAEA's safeguards system.

I simply wish to draw the attention of this Committee to the difference between a State which, although it has not ratified the Treaty of Tlatelolco, respects all its provisions, and a State which, although it has ratified the Protocols annexed to the Treaty, has in practice violated them by introducing nuclear weapons into the region, not in transit but rather as part of the weaponry of an expedition sent to wage war.

The CHAIRMAN: This morning I drew the attention of representatives to the fact that there will be a special meeting here tomorrow morning to mark the beginning of Disarmament Week. I am informed that the President of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General have graciously agreed to attend the meeting and to make statements, and their statements will be followed by the statements of representatives of the regional groups.

I therefore intend to start the meeting promptly at 10.30 since the distinguished persons who will be with us have other engagements to fulfil. The quorum principle will be very flexibly applied tomorrow morning. I intend to start at 10.30 on the dot.

The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.