

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1749th  
MEETING**

Monday, 2 November 1970,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

Agenda items 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 93 and 94:

Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (*continued*)

Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (*continued*)

Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (*continued*)

Implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*)

Establishment, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency, of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (*continued*)

Status of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2456 B (XXIII) 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*)

Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security (*continued*) . . . . . 1

Statement by the representative of Equatorial Guinea . . . . . 8

**Chairman:** Mr. Andrés AGUILAR M. (Venezuela).

## AGENDA ITEMS 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 93 AND 94

Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/7958, A/7960 and Corr.1, A/7961, A/8059-DC/233, A/C.1/1001 and 1010)

Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/8059-DC/233, A/8136)

Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/7967 and Add.1, Add.2, Add.3 and Corr.1 and 2, Add.4, Add.5 and Corr.1 and 2, A/8059-DC/233)

Implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/8079)

Establishment, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency, of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (*continued*) (A/8080)

Page

Status of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2456 B (XXIII) 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*) (A/7993 and Add.1 and 2, A/8076, A/C.1/L.522)

Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security (*continued*) (A/7994)

## GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): The statements made in the general debate and in the commemorative meetings connected with this anniversary session have underlined the fundamental importance of progress in arms control and disarmament in containing the effects of a run-away technology and in seeking to attain the high purposes of the United Nations Charter, the signing of which we celebrate this year. These statements have also, I believe, offered us the benefit of a fuller perspective as we open our annual discussions on disarmament in the First Committee.

2. Indeed, this first United Nations General Assembly session of the Disarmament Decade, coinciding as it does with the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations and with the completion of almost a decade of activity in the Geneva Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, offers us an occasion for a sober and heart-searching review of past accomplishments, as well as for looking ahead to future possibilities for progress in the arms control field. This process should serve as an incentive during the remainder of the decade to achieve greater and more even progress on effective measures of arms control and disarmament.

3. In reviewing the list of accomplishments in this area in the past 25 years, one is forced to admit that, during the greater part of the quarter-century since the United Nations was established, disarmament negotiations were marked by comparative sterility, with very few productive accomplishments to set against the record of the ever-expanding arms race.

4. However, in the last decade, we have seen more encouraging results with such agreements as the Treaty on the denuclearization of Antarctica<sup>1</sup> in 1959; the partial test-ban Treaty<sup>2</sup> of 1963; the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America<sup>3</sup> and the outer space

<sup>1</sup> Antarctic Treaty (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 402 (1961), No. 5778).

<sup>2</sup> Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (*ibid.*, vol. 480 (1963), No. 6964).

<sup>3</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634 (1968), No. 9068.

Treaty,<sup>4</sup> of 1967; the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] of 1969; and now, as the speakers who have preceded me in this debate have already called to the Committee's attention, a treaty prohibiting the emplacement of nuclear weapons on the sea-bed. While none of these, by itself, has had the effect of halting the spiralling arms race, each has contributed, at least, to an expanding system of international agreement to control the proliferation of new weapons, or of old weapons into new environments, which, I believe, offers some hope for the future. That hope, however, can materialize only if these arms-control measures are followed up with imagination and energy during the Disarmament Decade. In other words, so far, I believe we have had more success with progress in what might be called preventive rather than curative measures in dealing with the continuing arms race.

5. We are encouraged to believe that further progress is possible, in part because the super-Powers have demonstrated, at least to some extent, their intention to enter into what has been called an era of negotiation rather than of confrontation. This development also is consistent with an increasing realization of the futility of the nuclear arms race, risking, as it does, continuing improvement in weaponry that could pose a threat to the long-term stability of the balance of the deterrence on which the peace of the world so uneasily rests. The efforts to bring the spiralling arms race under control by regional as well as global measures also coincide with a widespread recognition of the waste of the resources involved and a desire to channel more of man's resources and capabilities into economic and social development, which more and more nations recognize as the true basis on which a stable peace can be built.

6. As the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [*A/8059-DC/233*] makes clear, the Governments directly involved in arms-control negotiations have continued to assign, as this Assembly has wished them to do, the highest priority to efforts to halt the nuclear arms race; indeed, this was the objective set by this Committee too. The Declaration on the Occasion of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations [*resolution 2627 (XXV)*] also calls on all Governments to move "forward from arms limitation to reduction of armaments and disarmament everywhere, particularly in the nuclear field".

7. During the past year we have witnessed two major steps forward in this regard. The initiation of direct negotiations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the limitation of strategic arms represents the most promising development to date in the struggle to achieve effective arms control, and provides an auspicious beginning for the Disarmament Decade. The concerns of the international community are invested in these crucial negotiations, and we all eagerly hoped that they will permit the nuclear Powers eventually to impose a halt on the nuclear arms race before the point of no return has been passed. In other words, we hope that the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks will lead to a halt in an essential aspect of the current arms race the existence of which is

not disputed by the super-Powers participating in the talks. Theirs, however, I suggest, is the opportunity to do something effective about this vital problem through the talks, which are being resumed in Helsinki today. Nothing could contribute so much to the improvement of the international climate or of the prospects of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament as would the news of positive results through those talks.

8. The other major achievement in this field during the past year was the entry into force on 5 March of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Canada, as is well known, was among the first to sign and ratify that Treaty, the culmination of more than five years of negotiations.

9. The Treaty represents a recognition by its parties of the importance of bringing into being a régime to ensure that no additional Powers develop nuclear weapons capability and thus add greater weight to the nuclear sword of Damocles that already hangs over our world. I should like to make clear at this stage, however, that, important as the entry into force of the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty undoubtedly is, the problem of nuclear proliferation will remain in existence until the Treaty is acceded to by all Powers with the technological capacity to produce nuclear weapons.

10. I think we should agree with Samuel Johnson that "example is more efficacious than precept". No better example could be set by the super-Powers at this time than an increased effort to ban all nuclear testing. For unless the Treaty becomes all-embracing, the objectives which it is designed to meet will remain in part unfulfilled. For this reason, the adherence of China, as well as of France, to the disarmament negotiations generally, and to the nuclear non-proliferation and the partial test ban Treaties in particular, is, in our view, essential in the long run.

11. The two encouraging achievements to which I have just referred are obviously related to the negotiation of a comprehensive test ban and highlight its importance. If any further emphasis were required of the importance of halting testing, it was provided, as Secretary-General U Thant pointed out at the close of the commemorative session [*1883rd plenary meeting*], in the fact that the opening of that commemorative session was marked by major nuclear weapons tests by three of the world's nuclear Powers. The partial test ban of 1963 represented the best possible compromise step at that time towards the total prohibition of testing, but the partial test ban has not served to curtail the nuclear arms race. In this regard the United Nations General Assembly at its last session adopted resolutions 2604 A and B (XXIV), each of which underlined, in its own way, the urgent need for the cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests.

12. We recognize that progress towards a complete ban on testing depends, in the first instance, on an improvement in international relations and in the international atmosphere, more especially among the nuclear Powers. But pending the evolution of a political climate in which a decision can be made to ban further testing, we have urged that the most constructive approach within the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and elsewhere would be to study

<sup>4</sup> Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (resolution 2222 (XXI), annex).

ways to narrow the existing difference of opinion on the means of providing effective assurance that all countries would comply with any comprehensive test ban.

13. As a negotiating body, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has an obligation, when faced with important differences of views on questions such as verification, to seek to render the problem into a negotiable form, taking into account both technical and political aspects of the problems concerned. This is precisely what the Conference has been attempting to do, through discussion, formal statements of position by members, and through informal sessions with experts. In carrying out this task, it was not surprising that the Conference turned its attention to the possibilities offered by an effective international exchange of seismic data, which is directly relevant to the detection and identification of underground nuclear and thermonuclear tests by seismological means.

14. The General Assembly at its last session, recognizing the importance of effecting progress in this clarification process, adopted, by an overwhelming majority, resolution 2604 A (XXIV), in which it asked the Secretary-General to transmit to Governments a questionnaire concerning "the provision of certain information in the context of the creation of a world-wide exchange of seismological data which would facilitate the achievement of a comprehensive test ban".

15. The purpose of that questionnaire, as set out in the annex to the resolution, was to "assist in clarifying what resources would be available for the eventual establishment of an effective world-wide exchange of seismological information", which information will obviously prove invaluable—indeed, essential—in negotiating any comprehensive test ban or, I suggest, any other measures which might be developed to supplement the partial test ban of 1963. The results so far have been most encouraging, in that more than eighty-five countries have replied [*see A/7967/Rev.1*] from all different parts of the world, and mostly in a positive and informative fashion.

16. The results of the first 50 or so replies to the questionnaire have already been analysed by Canadian scientists, and a preliminary assessment of those replies was circulated to members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva. Our scientists are now engaged in bringing this analysis up to date in order to obtain a more complete assessment of the world's present seismological identification capabilities.

17. There appears to be a growing recognition of the potential role of seismological data exchange, on an assured or guaranteed basis, in facilitating the verification of any underground test ban, and thus promoting the long-sought agreement on this question. Alternatively, the international exchange of seismic data on an assured availability basis might contribute to a threshold treaty which would at least impose a limit on the size of the tests carried out, in the event that agreement on this broader basis were to appear to be negotiable to the nuclear Powers directly concerned.

18. In this regard, we hope very shortly to submit in this Committee, in company with other like-minded delegations, a draft resolution which might serve as a useful focus

for support for further progress in clarifying the potential role of a seismic data exchange system in the verification process of a comprehensive ban. In our view, such an exchange system will surely be an essential part of any verification proposal designed to overcome the disagreement between the nuclear Powers on this important issue.

19. Another measure designed to impose controls on nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction is the treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof, a revised draft of which is annexed to the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and was the subject of comment by our two co-Chairmen of the Geneva Disarmament Conference at the 1748th meeting. The treaty, in our view, is, in at least one respect, similar to the outer space Treaty, in that it is designed to preclude the extension of the nuclear arms race into an environment newly opened up by the world's rapidly advancing technology. But in addition to its arms limitation functions, we consider that the treaty is also important for its contribution to opening up vast areas of the sea-bed for peaceful development. We recognize that it constitutes the major achievement of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in the session just concluded.

20. It must, I believe, be recognized as evidence that the expanded Committee on Disarmament in Geneva has proved itself to be a viable and effective forum for the discussion of arms-control issues, as has been demonstrated by the fact that additional changes have been made to the draft sea-bed treaty in negotiation in order to meet concerns expressed in this Committee as well as in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament last year. The draft represents the most successful negotiation to date in which not only the co-Chairmen, but all the other delegations at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, have participated fully while protecting their interests. Indeed, compromises were extracted from all parties, and we believe that the final product is definitely the better for that process.

21. In response to General Assembly resolution 2602 F (XXIV) calling on the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to continue its work on a treaty to prohibit the emplacement of weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed, taking into account the proposals and suggestions made here last year, much of the last session of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament was devoted to that topic. Members will recall that last year the Canadian delegation was among those calling for further modifications to the draft treaty, which had been submitted to the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly.<sup>5</sup> The particular concern of the Canadian delegation was that the treaty should give all parties reasonable assurances of compliance and take into account the rights of coastal States. Therefore, we concentrated our efforts, in co-operation with many other delegations, in attempting to devise verification procedures which would ensure that all States, great or small, technologically developed or developing, would have the right to initiate the verification process and to obtain assistance, either bilaterally or through resort

<sup>5</sup> *Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1969, document DC/232, annex A.*

to an appropriate international mechanism, in carrying out the process of verification. We also sought language in article III that would ensure that the special rights and interests of coastal States as recognized in international law could not in any way be encroached upon as a result of the provisions of this new treaty.

22. In two revised drafts, presented by the co-Chairmen in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on 23 April 1970 [A/8059-DC/233, *annex C, sect. 3*] and 1 September 1970 [*ibid.*, *annex A*], amendments were effected in the treaty which were designed to gain for it the widespread adherence of Governments necessary to make it an internationally effective arms control agreement. Nevertheless, members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament continued to express the opinion that the draft could even be further improved.

23. The draft now before us represents, in the opinion of the Canadian delegation, a real effort to meet not only the views of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament but also those of the members of the General Assembly in regard to the various issues which have been raised. Canada considers the amendments to article III satisfactory and in particular welcomes the revisions in paragraph 5 providing for international assistance in the verification procedure "through appropriate international procedures within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with its Charter". This compromise wording was worked out by nine non-aligned delegations at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and I should again like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to them as well as to the co-Chairmen for their efforts to improve the original Canadian proposals.

24. We recognize, of course, that the text as it now exists represents a carefully balanced and negotiated compromise which involved months of concentrated efforts by all the members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. We hope that this text will prove generally acceptable to other delegations, and our delegation recommends its approval in its present form in order that it may be opened for signature without delay during this year of the Disarmament Decade.

25. On another disarmament issue, during the past year, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has continued its detailed study and discussion on measures to ban the development, production and stockpiling of chemical and biological weapons to supplement and strengthen the Geneva Protocol of 1925.<sup>6</sup> These efforts were directed to the object of clarifying areas of concern or confusion, as well as avenues that might usefully be further explored. As part of this process, the Canadian delegation to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on 24 March of this year provided that body with a declaration of Canadian policy and intentions with respect to chemical and biological warfare [CCD/PV.460]. We did this in the belief, not that this could in any way substitute for a binding international convention, but that such a step would assist in the development of a consensus upon which

further negotiations could be based, and would thus contribute to the cause of arms control and disarmament.

26. The discussions during this period appeared to indicate some measure of agreement that the problem of verification required particular attention. Most delegations in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament appear also to accept the thesis that verification by challenge is the only feasible verification procedure that can logically be considered for biological agents. Clearly, however, chemical weapons pose problems of a different dimension. Moreover, inasmuch as measures additional to verification by challenge may be deemed necessary for chemical weapons, it becomes evident that there would be a requirement for both national and international procedures. It has not yet proved possible, however, to determine precisely what form these measures might take. A further definition of these procedures remains one of the highest priority items for consideration in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

27. In addition to various background documents, such as the report of the Secretary-General entitled *Chemical and Bacteriological (Biological) Weapons and the Effects of Their Possible Use*<sup>7</sup> and the report of the World Health Organization entitled *Health Aspects of Chemical and Biological Weapons*,<sup>8</sup> the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has before it a draft convention, and this Committee has before it a draft convention for the prohibition of biological methods of warfare submitted by the delegation of the United Kingdom [*ibid.*, *annex C, sect. 2*]. This Committee also has before it the revised draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons and the destruction of such weapons [A/8136], submitted by nine socialist States to this session of the United Nations General Assembly.

28. During our debate in Geneva in the past year differing opinions were again expressed on whether the problems of the prohibition of research, development, production and stockpiling of chemical and biological weapons should be considered simultaneously or separately, and whether any eventual treaty should attempt to cover both types of weapons. Our view continues to be that high priority should be given to efforts to prohibit both, but that difficulties in making progress on one should not rule out progress on the other.

29. In the limited time available to us in this Committee this year, our delegation doubts whether, even after a general discussion which we hope will take place on the various issues involved in the negotiations to ban chemical and bacteriological weapons, it would be possible for the General Assembly to take substantive decisions, particularly having regard to the basic differences of opinion that we found have prevented more substantial progress in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

30. We hope, however, that after reviewing the important problems associated with efforts to negotiate an extension of the existing ban on the use of these awesome weapons,

<sup>6</sup> Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous and Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare (League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV (1929), No. 2138).

<sup>7</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No. E.69.I.24.

<sup>8</sup> World Health Organization (Geneva, 1970).

the General Assembly will request the Committee on Disarmament to continue its study of all the issues involved. We believe that our efforts in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should be concentrated on resolving what has proved to be the most intractable problem, that of international verification measures, especially in relation to those chemical elements which have not only a military potential, but are in common use for commercial purposes, taking into account the useful proposal in this respect contained in the memorandum of the Group of Twelve [A/8059-DC/233, annex C, sect. 39].

31. The General Assembly of the United Nations at its twenty-fourth session adopted resolution 2602 E (XXIV), which requested the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament "to work out... a comprehensive programme, dealing with all aspects of the problem of the cessation of the arms race and general and complete disarmament under effective international control, which would provide the Conference with a guideline to chart the course of its further work and its negotiations".

32. Canada supported this resolution and welcomed the designation of the 1970s as a Disarmament Decade, since we considered that these initiatives might serve as additional incentives during the next 10 years to achieve progress on effective measures of arms control and disarmament. As we know, the Committee has, since its inception, accepted as its ultimate goal the attainment of general and complete disarmament, and the renewed emphasis on this as a result of these resolutions has, I believe, produced a climate conducive to progress. The Committee has demonstrated an increasing awareness of the fact that our present concentration on urgent, specific collateral measures should be viewed as part of a pattern of progress towards our long-term objective of general and complete disarmament.

33. The report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament includes a series of working papers appended to it and provides an indication of the attention which the Conference focused on the task assigned to it of developing a comprehensive programme. The complexities involved, the compromises required and the necessity of assigning top priority to specific arms control negotiations before the Committee made it impossible, however, for the last Conference to come to any clear consensus on the programme issue. There was, moreover, a general feeling among delegations that the Conference should not revert to the polemical debates of the early 1960s, nor should it become bogged down in a discussion of priorities or a delineation of "successive phases".

34. The most constructive approach would appear to involve the identification of positive developments in the field of arms control and disarmament to date and the enumeration of specific arms control measures which might be considered ripe for progress. The setting of time-tables and target dates would not, in our view, contribute to the achievement of such a programme. We should be clear as to our aims, but flexible as to methods, having in mind the close interrelationship between arms control and disarmament and the prevailing international climate.

35. On the basis of this approach, the draft comprehensive programme tabled in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on 27 August by the delegations of Mexico,

Sweden and Yugoslavia [*ibid.*, sect. 42] appears generally to place the issues in a logical framework and represents, in our view, a realistic effort to find an acceptable compromise formula. There are some aspects of it which we would wish to see changed, but on the whole, this draft programme offers, we think, a basis for realistic negotiations during this session. It is our understanding, moreover, that the authors of this constructive proposal are willing to discuss their draft with others in an attempt to arrive at a formulation which would elicit widespread support at this Assembly and which could serve as viable, useful guidelines for the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in the future.

36. "Hope", it has been said, "is the poor man's bread". We in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament have learned to realize that in the field of arms control and disarmament, where so much depends on great-Power relationships and the international climate, "better is half a loaf than no bread". In this light, the significance of the progress made last year on the sea-bed arms control treaty as well as in clarifying some of the basic elements involved in verifying a comprehensive test ban through seismic co-operation, and a ban on the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological and chemical weapons should certainly not be underrated.

37. The Canadian delegation will lend its best efforts to consolidate the progress already made in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament during the discussions in this Committee. It is our hope that we can here lay firm foundations, through consensus, for progress at the next session of the Conference, particularly on a comprehensive programme, on agreements to ban nuclear weapon testing and on the development, production and stockpiling of chemical or biological weapons.

38. Mr. YANGO (Philippines): Since it takes part in the debate on all the disarmament items, my delegation wishes to address itself at this early stage to the declaration of the 1970s as a Disarmament Decade under the terms of General Assembly resolutions 2499 A (XXIV) and 2602 E (XXIV).

39. In the words of resolution 2499 A on the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, the General Assembly in paragraph 9:

"Endorses the call of the Secretary-General for the proclamation of a Disarmament Decade, which will coincide with the Second United Nations Development Decade, and, in this respect, entrusts the competent bodies of the Organization with the task of presenting concrete proposals to the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session."

This resolution was adopted on 31 October 1969.

40. On 16 December 1969, the General Assembly, in its resolution 2602 E, reaffirmed resolution 2499 A, and in particular paragraph 9, with a declaration that the decade of the 1970s would be a Disarmament Decade.

41. In operative paragraph 4 of its resolution 2602 E (XXIV), the General Assembly:

"Further requests the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, while continuing intensive negotiations

with a view to reaching the widest possible agreement on collateral measures, to work out at the same time a comprehensive programme, dealing with all aspects of the problem of the cessation of the arms race and general and complete disarmament under effective international control, which would provide the Conference with a guideline to chart the course of its further work and its negotiations, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session.”

In operative paragraph 7 of that resolution, the General Assembly:

“Requests the Secretary-General and Governments to publicize the Disarmament Decade by all appropriate means at their disposal in order to acquaint public opinion with its purposes and objectives and with the negotiations and developments related thereto.”

42. In the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization for 1968-1969,<sup>9</sup> the Secretary-General, as will be recalled, proposed that Members of the United Nations dedicate the decade of the 1970s as a Disarmament Decade. He said that the world stood at a most critical crossroads and that a concerted and concentrated effort during the Disarmament Decade to limit and reduce nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, to reduce conventional weapons and to deal with all the related problems of disarmament and security, could produce concrete, measurable progress towards general and complete disarmament by the end of the decade of the 1970s.

43. In thus pointing out the great importance of the Disarmament Decade, my delegation feels that we should place it in proper perspective relative to other equally important issues facing the United Nations. We call the Committee's attention to the Declaration on peace and disarmament by the Nobel Peace Prize Laureates, published on 21 September 1970 [A/C.1/1001], from which I quote the following paragraphs:

“If civilization is not to suffer a set-back from which it might never recover, if man is to survive on our globe, it is imperative that the Disarmament Decade be made to live up to its name.

“... ”

“Warfare may in the past have been associated with victory; and occasionally with peace. It is clear that it can no longer result in either. Let the Decade of Disarmament therefore bring with it an increasing realization that whatever its costs, whatever presumed advantages have to be ceded, the political settlement of international differences will in the end always prove less costly and less dangerous than any attempted settlement brought about by the force of arms. With this realization, may the nations of the world during the Disarmament Decade finally embark on the reduction and elimination of the dreaded means of their destruction. Nothing less will rescue mankind from international anarchy and war.”

44. Those are wise and inspiring words, propitious and timely as we commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of

<sup>9</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 1A.

our Organization. At the same time they are words of warning as we contemplate the gloomy fact that the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control has eluded us these many years, while the total world expenditure for military purposes has been escalating. The first year of the Disarmament Decade is almost over and in another two months we shall be entering its second year; but what have we to show for it? An encouraging note is provided by the fact that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII), annex] entered into force on 5 March 1970 and that the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof [A/8059-DC/233, annex A] has been negotiated. But in this connexion it would not be remiss to note that the Second United Nations Development Decade has so far had a more auspicious beginning, with the adoption by the General Assembly during the commemorative session just concluded of an International Development Strategy [resolution 2626 (XXV)] that lays down the goals and objectives of the Development Decade. It must be stated with much regret that there is as yet no agreed comprehensive programme for disarmament in the Disarmament Decade.

45. His Excellency Dr. Carlos P. Romulo, Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, speaking before the General Assembly on 17 October 1970 on the Second United Nations Development Decade, emphasized the close link between the Development Decade and the Disarmament Decade:

“The wasteful expenditure of enormous resources in the arms race constitutes a very heavy burden on both the developed and developing countries. The military expenditure of the world community in 1969 reached the staggering amount of approximately \$200,000 million, or roughly \$550 million a day. In the language of both Sir Robert Jackson, author of the Capacity Study, and President McNamara of the World Bank, this emphasis on military spending is a manifestation of man's ‘ultimate folly’.” [1871st plenary meeting, para. 135.]

46. In this context, it is abundantly clear to my delegation that the achievements during the Disarmament Decade will certainly impinge on the strategy of the Development Decade, and there is thus all the more reason for there to be a realistic and comprehensive programme for disarmament.

47. The Secretary-General has himself emphasized the necessity of having such a programme. In the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization for 1969-1970, the following appears:

“The Disarmament Decade would acquire real meaning and significance if a comprehensive programme for disarmament could be worked out. A request to work out such a programme was addressed by the General Assembly to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, emphasizing the need for early and continued action so as to hasten progress and increase the momentum of the achievements in the field of disarmament during the decade of the sixties. This subject has been given full consideration by the Conference of the Com-

mittee on Disarmament. Although the Conference has not been able to reach agreement on the contents of such a programme, it is my hope that the extensive discussion of this matter and the several constructive ideas and suggestions put forward may facilitate the task of the General Assembly in adopting a comprehensive programme. This would be of primary importance in promoting the work of disarmament and would also be extremely opportune in that the programme for the Disarmament Decade would coincide in point of time with the proclamation of the Second United Nations Development Decade, with which it is closely connected in the world-wide struggle for economic and social progress.”<sup>10</sup>

48. At this juncture, my delegation extends its appreciation to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and commends it for the section of its report [A/8059-DC/233] dealing with the question of general and complete disarmament. The report states that many delegations devoted their statements to the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament referred to in General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV), and particular mention is made of statements by the delegations of Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Sweden, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America and Yugoslavia. These statements do indeed show that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament gave full consideration to the subject of a comprehensive programme for disarmament and that some delegations stressed the urgent necessity of coming to an agreement on such a programme in order to comply with its mandate under resolution 2602 E (XXIV). That it failed to accomplish this undertaking in its 1970 sessions is indeed a matter for regret. The representative of Canada, who spoke before me, referred to that failure in his statement. Nevertheless, as stated in the report of the Conference, “the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament intends to continue its discussions of the question of general and complete disarmament in 1971”. [Ibid., para. 64.]

49. My delegation would prefer at this stage not to go into the substance of a comprehensive programme of disarmament in the light of the proposals already submitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and the statements made there. Suffice it to say that my delegation hopes that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, as the negotiating machinery actively engaged on the question of general and complete disarmament and authorized by the General Assembly to prepare a comprehensive programme of disarmament, will immediately address itself to such a programme at the first opportunity. One member of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament suggested that this task should have priority in its agenda for next year. Another member, Canada, described a comprehensive programme as an incentive to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in its negotiations on disarmament. That was reaffirmed here this afternoon. My delegation feels that sufficient ideas and guidelines exist for the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to arrive at an agreed programme. The task should not be made more difficult by hair-splitting analyses of principles and objectives and other factors involved. We

cannot afford delay in this respect, as delay will result in making the declaration of the 1970s as a Disarmament Decade meaningless. The opportunity to forge ahead should not be missed, for it may not present itself again to the United Nations. It would indeed be a welcome development if at this session of the General Assembly the desired comprehensive programme could be evolved.

50. My delegation has taken note of the documents submitted by Italy [*ibid.*, annex C, sect. 38] and by Mexico, Sweden and Yugoslavia [*ibid.*, sect. 42] to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament concerning a comprehensive programme of disarmament. At the very end of the latter document, under the heading “Procedure”, the following proposals are made:

“1. The General Assembly should consider, annually, the progress made in the implementation of the comprehensive programme. Every three years, the General Assembly should review the comprehensive programme and revise it as warranted. This will entail an evaluation of the over-all situation in the field of disarmament and a comparison between the development in regard to armaments and disarmament. The United Nations Disarmament Commission might be reactivated and entrusted with a part of this task.

“2. The practice of requesting the Secretary-General to prepare, with the assistance of expert consultants, authoritative studies on concrete questions relating to the arms race and disarmament should be continued.

“3. There should be more conferences and scientific exchanges among scientists and experts from various countries on the problem of the arms race and disarmament.

“4. Universities and academic institutes should be encouraged to establish continuing courses and seminars to study problems of the arms race, military expenditures and disarmament.

“5. The increased exchanges and publications of relevant information and data should lead to greater openness, to the establishment of greater confidence among States and increased knowledge and interest in these matters among public opinion.

“6. The feasibility of convening in due time, and after appropriate preparatory work, a world disarmament conference of all States should be thoroughly studied.”

51. These proposals regarding procedure constitute an area in which the General Assembly should initiate action at this session.

52. As a negotiating machinery, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament is heavily burdened with the many problems of disarmament in all their complexity and should not be expected to shoulder alone the task of giving meaning and significance to the Disarmament Decade. With this in mind, the Chairman of our delegation, Mr. Romulo, strongly holds the view that the General Assembly might well consider the institution of machinery to assist the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., Twenty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 1A, para. 28.

would have the task generally of exploring and developing the opportunities presented by the Disarmament Decade. In the context of the proposals regarding procedure, such machinery might take the form of a committee of the General Assembly for the Disarmament Decade, which should add substantially to the efforts being made in the disarmament negotiations. For instance, the committee might be assigned the following functions: first, to plan activities appropriate to the Disarmament Decade directed towards increasing public understanding of the need for disarmament and supporting of the important negotiations now being held on disarmament and arms limitation; secondly, to initiate, in co-operation with the Secretariat, a periodic newsletter on the Disarmament Decade, detailing activities by Member States, by the United Nations and its agencies, and by non-governmental organizations in support of the Disarmament Decade, and to develop other appropriate publications; thirdly, to give consideration to the holding of a special session of the General Assembly, a meeting or meetings of the Disarmament Commission, or to the planning of a world conference on disarmament to be held as early as possible in the Disarmament Decade; fourthly, to consider the holding of regional seminars on regional arms control problems; fifthly, to keep under review the programme of the negotiations on disarmament; and sixthly, to review the interrelationship of progress on disarmament with the requirements for progress in further development of other primary functions of the United Nations, including the capacity of the United Nations for effective peace-keeping and peaceful settlement of disputes.

53. Bearing in mind the above-mentioned proposals regarding procedure, this list of suggestions for the activities of the committee must not be considered definitive or final. Other tasks and activities may be authorized which would deepen the significance of the Disarmament Decade.

54. One important task of the proposed committee, which in our view stands out, is the mobilization of public opinion towards greater understanding of the whole problem of disarmament. The convening of a world disarmament conference of all States, after appropriate studies and preparatory work, should be another important task. In this connexion it should be recalled that at the twenty-fourth session the First Committee decided that the terms of operative paragraph 9 of resolution 2605 A (XXIV), on the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States, would cover the inclusion in the provisional agenda of the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly the question of convening a session of the Disarmament Commission early in 1971 [see 1722nd meeting]. The idea of a world disarmament conference is but one step in advance of the suggested session of the Disarmament Commission.

55. The proposed committee could also review and evaluate the progress made in disarmament negotiations during the Disarmament Decade and make appropriate recommendations to the General Assembly. Although it is suggested in the above-mentioned proposals regarding procedure that the review and evaluation should be made by the General Assembly itself, entrusting the task to a smaller body, which would report to the General Assembly, would

in our view be more effective and productive of results, since such a body would be continuously working while the General Assembly was not in session.

56. My delegation is of the view that there is much to be commended in the idea of creating a committee of the General Assembly for the Disarmament Decade. It is our view that this matter deserves the utmost consideration and attention of the First Committee. We are prepared to consult with delegations on a draft resolution which could command wide support.

57. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have no further speakers on my list for this afternoon, and what is worse I have no speakers on the list for the meetings tomorrow. According to the programme of work, two meetings were scheduled for tomorrow, one at 10.30 a.m. and another at 3 p.m., but so far no delegation has indicated a positive and definite desire to participate in the debate tomorrow. Therefore, we shall find ourselves in the position of having to cancel both meetings, or at least one of them, if no delegation is ready to speak in the general debate tomorrow.

58. I would venture once again to appeal to any delegations that are able to do so to advance the date of their interventions, for example to tomorrow afternoon, so that we can make the best use of the very limited time available to us.

59. I should be grateful if those delegations which are in a position to decide accordingly would inform the Secretariat of their decision immediately so that we may know whether we can hold the meetings that had been scheduled.

#### *Statement by the representative of Equatorial Guinea*

60. Mr. ONDO (Equatorial Guinea) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. Chairman, my delegation, which is taking the floor for the first time in this Committee, is gratified to see you in this high post, for under your able guidance and with the co-operation of the other officers of the Committee as well, our work will certainly progress rapidly.

61. On another point, I apologize for having to refer to a question on which this Committee has completed its consideration, namely the invitation aspects of the item relating to the question of Korea. We had to abstain from voting when the vote was taken on 30 October last [1747th meeting] on draft resolution A/C.1/L.520, for the reasons given. In our communication dated 2 November of this year, we stated the view which we want to place on record now—namely that we would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.520 had the vote been taken “in the present circumstances”.

62. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): The statement of the representative of Equatorial Guinea will be placed on record. I would also like to thank you for your kind words to the officers of the Committee.

*The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.*