

United Nations  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1765th  
MEETING

Thursday, 19 November 1970,  
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 28: Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament ( <i>concluded</i> ) . . . . .	1
Agenda item 94: Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	8

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

AGENDA ITEM 28

Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (*concluded*)\* (A/8059-DC/233, A/8136, A/C.1/L.526, 527 and 533)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

1. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): The first item is the question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons, agenda item 28. On this item, the Committee has before it three draft resolutions, A/C.1/L.526, A/C.1/L.527 and A/C.1/L.533.

2. Mr. PORTER (United Kingdom): I should first like to associate myself with the heartfelt sympathy you expressed on behalf of us all to the Government and people of Pakistan. It now seems that Pakistan has suffered the worst natural disaster of our time. Though perhaps small solace in the face of such devastating tragedy, the British Government has already made immediate assistance available, and this includes the provision of motorized assault boats and rescue craft. I know the people of Britain will also be contributing generously. The Government and people of Pakistan have our deepest sympathy at this terrible time.

3. I should like this morning to say a few words about the three draft resolutions on chemical and biological weapons that are before us today. I do not propose to discuss questions of substance which were dealt with by the leader of my delegation, Lord Lothian, in his general statement of 4 November [1750th meeting].

4. Last year in its discussion on chemical and biological weapons the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament carried out an intensive political and technical examination

of the problems involved. The view was expressed that we might have laid the foundation for agreement in 1971. Certainly that is our hope. It was widely felt that the most useful step would be for the General Assembly to urge the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to continue its work and to redouble its endeavours to find a solution.

5. We had therefore hoped that this year, instead of being faced with several resolutions setting out the differing approaches to the problem of chemical and biological weapons, the Committee would have before it from the start an agreed non-controversial resolution tabled in the name of the principal participants in the negotiations of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. While this did not prove immediately possible my delegation has always believed that by the end of our deliberations we should adopt such a resolution, and it was with this in mind that we submitted our draft [A/C.1/L.526] on 6 November. This contains no controversial elements and is in fact very similar to General Assembly resolution 2603 B (XXIV) adopted last year.

6. It does not prejudice the outcome of the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which has already acquired considerable experience in this field. It raises no point of substance and accords equal treatment to all the proposals made. But it calls on the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to give urgent consideration to reaching agreement on effective measures to deal with the problems of chemical and biological weapons.

7. Since then, however, another and similar draft resolution [A/C.1/L.533] has been tabled by a group of twelve countries. In its preamble and in the essentials of its operative paragraphs this draft resolution contains the same elements as our own.

8. It acknowledges the need for urgency in tackling these problems, and the need to build on the solid foundation of the Geneva Protocol of 1925. It calls for wider adherence to the Protocol, although it does not record its appreciation that a considerable number of important States have, in response to last year's resolution 2603 B (XXIV), taken action in the course of 1970 to become parties to the Geneva Protocol. This is a pity but not, in my view, a serious flaw. The draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.533, like our own draft, also notes in its preambular paragraphs the reports of the Secretary-General and the World Health Organization on chemical and biological weapons. In its operative paragraphs it takes note of the two revised draft conventions, put forward on the one hand by my own country and on the other by the Soviet Union and a number of its allies. It also takes note of the working papers, expert views and suggestions put forward here and

\* Resumed from the 1762nd meeting.

in Geneva, and mentions particularly the joint memorandum submitted in Geneva by the group of twelve States now sponsoring the resolution. All this is common ground between the two draft resolutions, our own and that of the twelve. So, too, is there common ground between us on the three issues singled out for special reference. We agree with the need for urgency, and on the importance of verification. We clearly can have no objection to taking a combination of national and international measures so long as added together, these ensure effective implementation. My delegation, as, I am sure the Committee will recall, said on 19 November last year in this debate [*1694th meeting*] that we were ready to fall in with the wish of the majority if that wish was to make a start on the problem by considering chemical and biological weapons at the same time. This we have done and will continue to do in examining steps towards their prohibition, and indeed the approach set out in our draft convention for the prohibition of biological methods of warfare recognizes clearly that a solution of the biological weapons problem, for which we believe the time is now ripe, can only lead to progress on chemical weapons. It is for this reason that article V of our draft deals with chemical weapons.

9. Finally, the group-of-twelve draft, like ours, requests the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to continue its consideration of the problem and naturally this includes taking into account all the documents put forward this year and in previous years here and in Geneva.

10. Accordingly, I should like to inform the Committee that in the interests of achieving the sort of broadly-supported resolution—which does not prejudice the issues—that I described at the outset of my remarks, I do not propose to press to the vote the draft resolution [*A/C.1/L.526*] originally sponsored by my delegation. My delegation will accordingly vote for the group-of-twelve resolution [*A/C.1/L.533*], and I hope and believe that it will obtain the approval of the great majority of the Assembly.

11. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland): I should like to make some observations with regard to the draft resolutions which have been submitted in this Committee concerning chemical and bacteriological weapons.

12. In the view of the Polish delegation, the draft resolution which is to be adopted should meet the following three requirements.

13. First, it should correspond to the existing international instruments relating to chemical and bacteriological weapons. In the first place this refers to the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, as well as to the basic General Assembly resolutions on this subject, primarily resolutions 2454 A (XXIII) of 20 December 1968 and 2603 B (XXIV) of 16 December 1969.

14. Second, it should take into account the prevailing trend of opinion that has emerged so far in the debate on the question of the elimination of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. Obviously, as the debate in this Committee has proved again, such a prevailing trend of opinion voices the postulate of the establishment of a joint

and total prohibition, as well as destruction of both chemical and bacteriological weapons.

15. Third, such a draft resolution must provide a favourable platform for further disarmament negotiations. The resolution should therefore not only sum up the state of negotiations thus far, but should also embody a set of practical guidelines that would facilitate further negotiations at the next stage of the work of the Geneva Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

16. It is with those basic considerations in mind that the delegations of Hungary, Mongolia and Poland have prepared and submitted to this Committee a draft resolution on chemical and bacteriological weapons [*A/C.1/L.527*]. In their action the three delegations were guided by the realization of the need to take urgent and radical steps in order to establish a complete prohibition and total elimination of chemical and bacteriological weapons. And, indeed, there are very good grounds for following such a course of action. First, as we are all aware, there is the ever present and accelerating process of improvement and sophistication of these weapons, particularly chemical weapons, which, to an ever greater extent, are being perfected into something much more than mere weapons of mass destruction; they are becoming genocidal weapons. Second, there is the underlying principle of the disarmament negotiations whereby top priority has been accorded, by common agreement, to the task of the prohibition and elimination of all kinds of weapons of mass destruction.

17. We submit that the draft resolution put forward by the three socialist States fully takes into account these facts. It places due emphasis on the importance and significance of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 by reaffirming, in its operative part I, General Assembly resolution 2162 B (XXI) of 5 December 1966 and its call for “strict observance by all States of the principles and objectives of the Protocol”. Moreover, it renews the invitation to “all States which have not yet done so to accede to or to ratify the Geneva Protocol”. These two elements of the draft resolution are of substantive importance at present.

18. The draft resolution sponsored by the three socialist States reflects the position and views of an overwhelming majority of States which have taken part in the disarmament debate in our Committee, as well as those participating in the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva. This majority—not at all silent—has declared its support for the concept of the establishment of total and joint prohibition with regard to both chemical and bacteriological weapons. Let me only recall at this juncture the joint memorandum on the question of chemical and bacteriological methods of warfare of the twelve non-aligned States, members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, submitted at Geneva.

19. Such wide support for the idea of the establishment of total prohibition of both chemical and bacteriological weapons is by no means a mere coincidence. It closely corresponds to the practice of the disarmament negotiations thus far when both these weapons have been dealt with together. I might add that such an approach also reflects the situation in the military domain, where chemical and bacteriological weapons constitute an integrated

weapons system. And, last but not least, chemical and bacteriological weapons are weapons of mass destruction whose effects are similar. Therefore, to adopt as a guideline for disarmament negotiations the principle of a separate approach to chemical and bacteriological weapons would certainly delay the solution of the fundamental task of effective and total elimination of these weapons. That, in fact, would be a step backwards from the position which we have already reached in our negotiations.

20. As was succinctly stated by the representative of France in this Committee, it is hard to see how dissociating biological weapons from chemical weapons could facilitate a solution. He then went on to say that the use of chemical weapons "is perhaps more probable, and there may be reason to fear that if they are not dealt with together with biological weapons any solution concerning them will be postponed indefinitely" [*1754th meeting, para. 44*].

21. I submit that this correct view is shared by an overwhelming majority of delegations in this Committee. A separate approach to bacteriological and chemical weapons could also serve as a pretext for attempts at a political or juridical justification for retaining the stockpiles of either of these weapons in military arsenals of States. Without prejudice to the final form of a total prohibition and elimination of chemical and bacteriological weapons, the three sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.527 have included in section II, paragraph 3, a definition of the scope of an agreement on the prohibition and elimination of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons as a "joint and full prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons and the exclusion of these means of warfare from the arsenals of States through their destruction or diversion for peaceful uses".

22. The draft resolution submitted by the socialist States takes note in an impartial way of the draft conventions and other proposals submitted so far, and requests the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament "to give urgent consideration to reaching agreement on a complete prohibition and elimination of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". It further requests the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament "to submit a report on progress on all aspects of the problems of the prohibition and elimination of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons to the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session".

23. These formulations in no way prejudice either the situation or the rights of parties in disarmament negotiations while allowing for a comprehensive debate on the basis of the proposals referred to in the draft resolution.

24. I should like to stress that, in addition, section II, paragraph 5, of the draft resolution contains an appeal to all States to act in good faith in the course of negotiations on a total prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons and to take all necessary steps to facilitate the achievement of such a prohibition at the earliest possible time. What we have in mind here is to create the most favourable conditions for the negotiations ahead, while at the same time preventing any steps, either in the military or political sphere, that would hinder such negotiations and

render them more difficult. This, I believe, is a principle that has gained wide acceptance as one of the rules that determine the conditions of disarmament negotiations in general.

25. Hungary, Mongolia and Poland have submitted their draft resolution with a desire to advance the negotiations on the elimination of chemical and bacteriological weapons. We are convinced that the adoption of the draft resolution would be an important stimulus to the work of the Committee on Disarmament in this field. However, we note with satisfaction that the draft resolution submitted by the twelve non-aligned States [*A/C.1/L.533*] contains a number of ideas and formulations that are identical with or close to our own, and that it is based on the same approach to the question of the elimination of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. It does in fact meet the objective of the draft resolution submitted by Hungary, Mongolia and Poland.

26. This is why the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.527 are prepared, in a constructive spirit, to support the draft resolution of the twelve Powers, and consequently we shall not insist on a vote on our draft. We hope that draft resolution A/C.1/L.533 will thus meet with general support in this Committee.

27. We are convinced that the resolution about to be adopted will facilitate the task of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, and that it will contribute effectively to an early and complete prohibition and total elimination of chemical and bacteriological weapons.

28. Mr. BOZINOVIC (Yugoslavia): Before I address myself to the subject of my intervention, I should like to offer to the delegation of Pakistan my deepest sympathy, and the sympathy of the Yugoslav delegation, for the disaster that has befallen that country. It is with shock and sorrow that we have followed the events in which tens of thousands of lives have already been lost and enormous damage has been caused to that part of Pakistan.

29. Today I have the honour, on behalf of twelve delegations—Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sweden, the United Arab Republic and my own, Yugoslavia—to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/L.533.

30. The sponsors of the draft resolution are those same countries which submitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, on 25 August 1970, the joint memorandum on the question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) methods of warfare. The submission of this draft resolution is, in fact, a continuation of the efforts of those countries to find a way out of the difficulties encountered in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in trying to solve the complex problem of chemical and biological warfare and to accelerate its solution.

31. Under the fifth preambular paragraph of the proposed draft resolution the General Assembly would express its deep conviction "that the prospects for international peace

and security, as well as the achievement of the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, would be enhanced if the development, production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological (biological) agents for purposes of war were to end and if those agents were eliminated from all military arsenals”.

32. It is precisely because of that conviction that the sponsors attach great importance to the speedy solution of this problem and expect that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament will be in a position to accelerate its efforts in this field and to concentrate on the most important aspects of that complex problem.

33. Since the draft resolution appears to be self-explanatory, I do not intend to go into any analysis or explanation of its paragraphs. This actually would be unnecessary, also, after the numerous references that have been made here during our general debate to the joint memorandum, of the twelve countries, and after the wide support given to it. It is my duty, however, to point to the main aspects of the proposed resolution, offering certain brief comments.

34. After having duly taken note of the existing substantive revised drafts in their chronological order, and also of the working papers, expert views and suggestions put forward both in the Committee on Disarmament and in the First Committee, and after having taken note also of the joint memorandum of the twelve countries, the General Assembly, under operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.533, would commend:

“... the following basic approach, contained in the joint memorandum, for reaching an effective solution to the problem of chemical and bacteriological (biological) methods of warfare:

“(a) It is urgent and important to reach agreement on the problem of chemical and bacteriological (biological) methods of warfare;

“(b) Both chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons should continue to be dealt with together in taking steps towards the prohibition of their development, production and stockpiling and their effective elimination from the arsenals of all States;

“(c) The issue of verification is important in the field of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons, and verification should be based on a combination of appropriate national and international measures, which would complement and supplement each other, thereby providing an acceptable system that would ensure effective implementation of the prohibition”.

35. The part of the draft resolution I have just quoted is the basic approach that the General assembly would commend for the solution of the problem of chemical and biological methods of warfare.

36. The draft resolution later on requests the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to continue its consideration of the problem of chemical and biological methods of warfare, with a view to the urgent prohibition of their development, production and stockpiling, and to their elimination from the arsenals of all States.

37. The sponsors of the draft resolution firmly believe that, by adopting it, the General Assembly would provide the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament with an important specific recommendation for its further work in the field of chemical and biological weapons.

38. The sponsors also believe that this draft resolution is a comprehensive and well-balanced one. It has incorporated, so as to make it as widely acceptable as possible, substantial parts of both draft resolutions submitted earlier by the delegation of the United Kingdom [A/C.1/L.526], and by the delegations of Hungary, Mongolia and Poland [A/C.1/L.527]. At the same time, if adopted, this resolution will, we believe, contribute to the efforts aimed at solving the complex problem of chemical and biological weapons.

39. Now, after we have heard the statements by the representatives of the United Kingdom and of Poland, I should like to express our satisfaction and gratitude for their understanding and their contribution to our common effort to end up with one draft resolution.

40. In conclusion, I wish to express the hope of the twelve sponsors that our draft resolution will be adopted unanimously.

41. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): From the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom, whose delegation is the author of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.526, and from the statement made by the representative of Poland on behalf of his own delegation and of those of Hungary and Mongolia which are co-sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.527, it is quite clear that we have only the draft in document A/C.1/L.533 before us.

42. However, before I put that draft resolution—which I repeat is the only one now before the Committee—to the vote, I propose to call on those delegations which wish to explain their vote before the vote is taken.

43. Mr. DE LA GORCE (France) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation would like first of all to join its voice to your own, Mr. Chairman, and to those of delegations whose representatives have spoken before us, in the expression of sympathy to the delegation of Pakistan. France was deeply moved and shocked by the catastrophe that befell Pakistan and, from the bottom of our heart, we share the grief of that country and shall take part in the effort of solidarity to assuage the sufferings of the unfortunate victims of this tragedy.

44. Last year, the French delegation came out in favour of resolution 2603 B (XXIV), which stressed the urgency of the speediest possible elimination of chemical and biological weapons. We stated then that, if there was progress still to be made in the field of those weapons, it had to do not with the prohibition of their use in war—a question which has already been settled on condition that all States adhere to the 1925 Protocol—but rather with their manufacture and stockpiling. We were the first to recommend an initiative in that direction in our answer on 12 August 1968 to the Soviet memorandum on disarmament dated 1 July of that same year.

45. While voting in favour of that resolution, we expressed reservations, however, about its last section which postponed the study of the problem of chemical and bacteriological weapons to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament: we thought that that body was possibly not the most appropriate for the consideration of questions of direct interest to all the signatories of the 1925 Protocol.

46. Experience seems to have borne out the correctness of our reservations, since the debate here on the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in the matter of chemical and bacteriological weapons has shown no substantial progress. Once again the draft resolution submitted to us, which comes at the end of our consideration, invites the General Assembly to send the matter back to the Geneva body. In the circumstances my delegation has some hesitation about encouraging, by its vote, the continuation of a procedure which, until now, has not yielded the results rightly expected of it by world public opinion.

47. Further, the procedure envisaged in the draft resolution does not, with sufficient clarity, provide for the study of what is undoubtedly the main condition for the effective prohibition of the manufacture of bacteriological weapons, namely, the study of methods for controlling such prohibition.

48. It is true that this draft resolution does contain a clause which, quite rightly, stresses the importance of the problem of verification. But is that sufficient? We doubt it. It seems to us that additional progress really could have been achieved this year. A group of experts appointed by the Secretary-General and offering therefore all necessary guarantees of impartiality and competence could have been entrusted with the preparation for the next session of the General Assembly of a report on the whole gamut of questions raised by control over the prohibition of the manufacture of chemical and bacteriological weapons. The complexity of this problem and its importance require, in fact, that it be dealt with with maximum objectivity and without taking into account any specific draft convention.

49. That was the view of the representative of France, who, in this very room on 9 November [1754th meeting], reminded the Committee of the interest with which our delegation had greeted the idea put forward by the representative of Japan, that experts could be consulted on problems relating to the control of chemical and bacteriological weapons. We said then that the French-delegation would be very happy to support a draft which would request the Secretary-General of the United Nations to gather under his high authority, as he has done in the past for other studies relating to disarmament, a group of experts who would study the question of control.

50. That idea is absent from the draft resolution on which we now have to take a decision. This draft adheres to a formula which stresses the importance of the problem of verification. But, although it is good as far as it goes, it is not sufficient. We are indeed in agreement with some of the principles to be found in this draft: we approve of the preamble and operative paragraphs 1 to 5. But, once again, we deplore the absence of a specific proposal relating to the ways and means of studying the various aspects of the

problem of control, and without control what would be the use of agreeing to the elimination of chemical and bacteriological weapons? Neither can we, for the same reasons, agree to the procedure of study recommended in paragraphs 6 and 7.

51. That is why the French delegation, deeply interested in the conclusion of a convention prohibiting the manufacture of chemical and bacteriological weapons, but also wishing to see a convention providing for control and guarantees, will abstain on this draft resolution because, on this last point, this draft does not yet contain all the necessary assurances.

52. Mr. TANAKA (Japan): I should like to make a brief statement to explain the vote of my delegation is about to cast on draft resolution A/C.1/L.533, sponsored by the twelve Powers. My delegation will vote in favour, on the following understanding: this draft resolution, and the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 5 (b) and 6 in particular, shall not be taken as excluding the possibility that not only the questions relating to the prohibition of development, production and stockpiling of chemical and biological weapons, but also the questions relating to the prohibition of their use, should continue to be considered by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, as has been the case so far.

53. We also should like to put on record our understanding that this draft resolution should not in any way prejudice or prejudge legal formulations of any agreement to be reached on the prohibition of chemical and biological weapons.

54. Mr. SHARIF (Indonesia): I should like first, on behalf of my delegation, to extend to the delegation of Pakistan our sympathy and deep sentiments of grief and sorrow at the recent disaster in East Pakistan.

55. The position of my delegation with regard to draft resolutions A/C.1/L.526, 527 and 533 on the question of chemical and bacteriological weapons is obvious. In my statement on 12 November [1759th meeting], I indicated that my delegation was in favour of the joint memorandum on the question of chemical and bacteriological methods of warfare submitted by the twelve non-aligned countries to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, the main principles of which have been included in operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.533. My delegation will, therefore, not find it difficult to give it its full support.

56. While having the floor, I should like further to explain the Indonesian position in connexion with operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.533 regarding the Geneva Protocol of 1925. It is a matter of record that the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands signed the Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare on 17 June 1925 and ratified it on 31 October 1930, not only on its own behalf, but also on behalf of its colonies, the Netherlands East Indies, Surinam and Curaçao. Indonesia declared its independence on 17 August 1945, and the Kingdom of the Netherlands extended its official recognition to the Republic on 27 December 1949. Treaties, conventions and

agreements signed and or ratified by the Netherlands in the past on behalf of the Netherlands East Indies are not automatically accepted by Indonesia. The Indonesian Government considers the Geneva Protocol in 1925 of the utmost importance. We have completed our studies and constitutional procedures, and I am authorized to state here and now that Indonesia reaffirms its acceptance of and adherence to the Geneva Protocol of 17 June 1925 for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed in 1925 and ratified in 1930 on its behalf by the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

57. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): Before explaining my vote, may I also associate the Canadian delegation with the expressions of sympathy and solidarity with Pakistan following the dreadful disaster which brought such cruel suffering to a multitude of its people. In addition to expressing the condolences which have also been conveyed officially to the Government of Pakistan by the Prime Minister of Canada, I should like to say that the Canadian Government is responding to the appeal of the International Red Cross for cyclone relief.

58. The Canadian delegation has noted with satisfaction the success in the negotiations according to which draft resolutions A/C.1/L.526 and 527 will not be pressed to a vote, and that their sponsors now favour draft resolution A/C.1/L.533, on which we are about to vote. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the representative of Yugoslavia in expressing the hope that it will be adopted unanimously. However, I should like to make the following comments with respect to this issue.

59. Canada has participated actively both here at the United Nations and in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in efforts to overcome the difficulties which have been encountered in devising a comprehensive prohibition of chemical and biological methods of warfare. We intend to continue to contribute to these negotiations in the hope that agreement may be reached on a means of eliminating these obnoxious weapons. As an initial contribution to practical progress and to strengthening the existing Protocol signed at Geneva in 1925, I explained the Canadian position on this question in some detail during the last session of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. I shall not repeat that statement here. The essential points of that statement were that Canada does not possess and does not produce either chemical or biological agents of warfare; and that Canada has no intention, under any circumstances, of acquiring or using biological or chemical methods of warfare. However, with respect to chemical weapons, until a verifiable agreement can be concluded and in this connexion I agree with the remarks made by the representative of France in emphasizing the importance of control—we must reserve the right to retaliate if these weapons are used against the civil population or armed forces of Canada or of its allies.

60. The draft resolution now before us appears to be fully consistent with this position of the Canadian Government. We hope, therefore, that it will be adopted unanimously.

61. Mr. SAMMUT (Malta): Before my brief intervention, I should also like on behalf of my delegation to express my

sincere feelings of sympathy to the delegation of Pakistan following the recent disaster which has befallen that country.

62. We cannot vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.533, since we do not agree with the formulation of operative paragraph 5 (c). We do not understand the meaning of the national measures of verification to which reference is made. No concrete and significant national measures of verification are mentioned in the numerous documents considered by the Conference on the Committee on Disarmament. The Yugoslav paper [A/8059-DC/233, annex C, sect. 31] suggests numerous measures of national self-restraint, but these are not verification measures. Thus, the sentence should read: "Verification must be based on effective international measures, supplemented by appropriate national measures of self-restraint, which would complement each other . . .".

63. Besides, the issue of verification in the field of chemical and biological weapons is not only important, as stated in paragraph 5 (c), but is, in our view, essential.

64. For these reasons we shall abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/L.533.

65. Mr. LEONARD (United States of America): The delegation of the United States will support draft resolution A/C.1/L.533 on the question of chemical and bacteriological weapons, sponsored by the twelve non-aligned members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. We consider that it meets the criteria we proposed on 16 November [1762nd meeting], that is, it will stimulate negotiations in Geneva without prejudging in any way the outcome of those negotiations. The draft resolution takes into account the United Kingdom draft convention for the prohibition of biological methods of warfare, the revised draft convention submitted by the socialist countries for a comprehensive agreement banning the production of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons, and also the many valuable suggestions submitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament during the course of this year's deliberations.

66. The fact that these suggestions cover a broad spectrum of issues and problems demonstrates that much work still remains to be done by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in developing the foundations for agreement. Continued careful deliberation on the whole range of complex chemical and bacteriological warfare problems is the approach envisaged in the draft resolution. This draft resolution reflects the joint memorandum of the twelve non-aligned countries on the question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) methods of warfare, and in fact incorporates some of its language. My delegation fully accepts the interpretation of that memorandum expressed in this Committee by the representative of Argentina, Ambassador Ortiz de Rozas, who said in his speech here on 9 November:

"... nothing contained in that memorandum and nothing stated during its presentation to the Committee would justify the supposition that it was supporting, or even favouring, either of the two opposing trends of opinion. We consider that the merit of the document derives from



the fact that it carefully avoids prejudging the issue and therefore makes a process of negotiation possible.  
[1754th meeting, para. 67.]

67. My delegation is pleased to see that operative paragraph 3 (c) of the draft resolution takes note of the expert views put forward in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and in this Committee. In view of the many complex technical problems involved in the development of agreements in the chemical and bacteriological warfare field, we are convinced that the assistance of experts can greatly facilitate our work. We are therefore gratified that the expert views expressed at Geneva have been and will continue to be taken into account.

68. Paragraph 5 of the draft resolution refers to the “basic approach, contained in the joint memorandum, for reaching an effective solution to the problem of chemical and bacteriological (biological) methods of warfare”. The three sub-paragraphs in paragraph 5 are all based on this fundamental premise, that is, the need to reach an effective—I repeat, an effective—solution to the problem posed by chemical and biological methods of warfare. As we have made clear many times, an effective solution to any arms control problem is a reliable and stable solution and thus requires adequate verification. This point has been particularly underlined by several of the speakers who have preceded me this morning. Paragraph 5 (b) of the draft resolution says that both chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons should continue to be dealt with together in taking steps towards their prohibition; not one step, but steps—in the plural. In other words, we are to reach an effective solution to the problem and this solution may be through a series of actions, all of them representing steps toward our goal.

69. It would of course, be consistent with this approach for us to reach an agreement on the banning of biological agents and toxins, along the lines of the United Kingdom draft convention, while continuing our work on other chemical agents. A crucial aspect of the problem for which we must reach an effective solution is stated in paragraph 5 (c), that is, to develop an acceptable system of verification, which would ensure effective implementation of the prohibition. As the representative of the United Kingdom said before this Committee on 4 November: “The ideas for verification of chemical weapons have been ingenious and clever, but, as I have said, they are far from adequate as yet and there is much hard work to be done in this field.” [1750th meeting, para. 54.] The draft resolution will encourage us to continue this work and we hope that it will receive the widest support.

70. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): We too should like to make a statement explaining our vote. We wish to stress that we fully support the position stated by the representative of Poland. At the same time, we wish in particular to stress that the draft resolution on which we are now to vote is based on the memorandum of the 12 non-aligned countries that was submitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. We have repeatedly emphasized both in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and here in the General Assembly that the essential idea of the

memorandum was that the prohibition of chemical weapons and the prohibition of bacteriological (biological) weapons would be considered together. The fundamental point of principle in the memorandum of the non-aligned countries is thus fully reflected in the draft resolution which is about to be put to the vote. We therefore consider that the draft resolution now submitted by the 12 non-aligned countries brings us significantly closer to the proper approach to the decision on the matter before us, i.e. the simultaneous consideration and solution of the problem of prohibiting both chemical and bacteriological weapons.

71. As to the question of control, the draft resolution likewise fully reflects the position which we have often stated and stressed both in the Committee on Disarmament and in the General Assembly, namely that verification must be based—and I wish to stress this point—on a combination of appropriate national and international measures, which would complement and supplement each other, thereby providing an acceptable system that would ensure the effective implementation of the prohibition.

72. For these reasons, which we have developed, explained and stressed time and again in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and in the General Assembly, we welcome the draft resolution of the 12 non-aligned States and we shall vote in favour of it.

73. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): My delegation wishes to support draft resolution A/C.1/L.533, which we feel combines all the requirements of the present case in that it keeps the two items—chemical and bacteriological warfare—together and is a forward-looking resolution. I think we should support it in the interests of eliminating this great danger to humanity.

74. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Morocco on a point of order.

75. Mr. KHATTABI (Morocco) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I would merely like to state on a point of order that the French translation of the word “commends” in paragraph 5 of the original English text of the draft resolution does not seem to correspond to the meaning that the sponsors wished it convey. I consider that the word used in French, “*approuve*”, is not the exact translation of what the sponsors of this draft wanted to express when they used the word “commends”. This, at least, is my delegation’s opinion.

76. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Secretariat will take note of your observation and made the necessary changes in the French text.

77. The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.533.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 94 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

78. With the adoption of this draft resolution, the Committee has now completed its consideration of item 28.

## AGENDA ITEM 94

**Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security (continued)\* (A/7994, A/C.1/L.535)**

## CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

79. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): As members are aware, the Committee has before it only one draft resolution on this item, which is contained in document A/C.1/L.535.

80. The members of the Committee are asked to note that Tunisia has been added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

81. Mr. DIACONESCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): Draft resolution A/C.1/L.535 is sponsored by the delegations of twenty-four countries. This draft is the result of painstaking consultations in which other delegations have also participated and made their contributions. The sponsors have tried in drafting the text to take into consideration as widely as possible the views expressed in the course of our debates as well as the suggestions made by some delegations in this connexion.

82. In the circumstances, it is not our intention to go back over the reasons which led to the inscription on this session's agenda of the item concerning the consequences of the armaments race, because they were set forth in full detail in the course of the debates on that item. In the opinion of the Romanian delegation, the magnitude and the multiple consequences of the armaments race—as has been very clearly brought out in the course of the current session—are the subject of deep and increasing concern on the part of the Members of the United Nations and of all States of the world.

83. Owing to that fact, we consider that it is quite right to search for ideas and solutions with a view to adopting effective measures likely to contribute to halting the armaments race and to making definite progress towards disarmament.

84. This is the context in which the twenty-four-Power draft resolution should be viewed. I should like now to refer briefly to the principal provisions of that document. As can be seen, the preambular part contains a number of considerations which, in our opinion, are designed to bring out the dangers created by the rate and the magnitude of the armaments race and of military expenditure, the burden that this represents for all peoples, the effects of the armaments race in economic, social and security terms, the need to take action designed to put an end to the armaments race and to advance towards the goal of general and complete disarmament. The existing relationship between efforts designed to achieve disarmament and those devoted to the economic and social progress of nations is also underlined in the text.

85. In the operative part of the draft resolution, the General Assembly calls upon all States to take effective

steps for the cessation of the armaments race. In addition, the Assembly requests the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to continue with a sense of urgency to pay due attention to all questions meant to put an end to the armaments race, particularly in the nuclear field.

86. An essential element of the operative part of the draft resolution is the fact that the Secretary-General is being requested "to prepare, with the assistance of qualified consultant experts appointed by him, a report on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race and of military expenditure".

The Governments of Member States, as well as non-governmental and international organizations are also being called upon to make their contribution to the preparation of the report that it is proposed should be transmitted to the General Assembly for consideration at its next session.

As is well known, the idea of preparing such a study was suggested this year by the Secretary-General; our debates have demonstrated that it commands a wide audience.

87. For its part my delegation is convinced that such a study would make it possible, under the aegis of the United Nations, to carry out a needed and useful evaluation of the consequences of the armaments race, which would help us to gain a better understanding and grasp of the effects of this negative phenomenon on the life of nations, on peace and security and to take appropriate measures to eliminate them.

88. In conclusion, may I offer our very sincere thanks to all those delegations which, through their ideas and suggestions, have co-operated with us in the drafting of the text.

89. The Romanian delegation expresses the hope that since the twenty-four-Power draft resolution deals with a question of general interest it will meet with the support of Member States.

90. Mr. LEONARD (United States of America): We shall be pleased to lend the support of the United States delegation to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.535, sponsored by Romania and a number of other delegations, because we believe that a report by the Secretary-General on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and of military expenditures can provide helpful material for our future work. To be useful the report will, of course, have to weigh carefully and objectively the consequences of expenditures on all arms, nuclear and conventional. The value of the report will also be enhanced by the extent to which Governments heed the request for co-operation contained in paragraph 4, and particularly by the extent to which they provide the Secretary-General with relevant data on their military expenditures over the past several years.

91. I should add that the United States Government is deeply concerned, as I presume other Governments present here are too, to ensure that the limited resources of the United Nations are used efficiently. In our view the report called for in this draft resolution can be produced with the assistance of a relatively small group of qualified experts at

\* Resumed from the 1762nd meeting.



a cost of not more than \$150,000. We are, accordingly, voting for the draft resolution, on the understanding, which we have discussed with the Romanian delegation, that every effort will be made to limit the cost of the study to that sum.

92. Mr. BOZINOVIC (Yugoslavia): The draft resolution entitled "Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security" of which the Yugoslav delegation is a sponsor, deals with one of the fundamental problems of contemporary international relations. That is the reason why the initiative of Romania in placing this question on the agenda of the current session of General Assembly and the proposal that the Secretary-General should prepare a report, with the assistance of qualified consultant experts, has been received with great interest and wide support in our Committee.

93. Today, it is generally recognized that unresolved economic and social problems, which continue to affect all countries adversely, especially the developing ones, are at the root of instability in international relations, tensions, crises and conflicts. It is also a widely held view that the pressing economic and social problems are, to a large extent, a direct or indirect consequence of the armaments race, which is assuming ever more frightening proportions.

94. During the twenty-five years the United Nations has been in existence the demand has been constantly reiterated to stop the arms race and to take the road of disarmament before it is too late.

95. The report, as a necessary supplement to the study of 1962 on the economic and social consequences of disarmament, will, we expect, be very useful for the future examination and study of the complex of disarmament questions in our Committee and other forums.

96. We also expect the report to pay due attention to the social consequences of the armaments race, whose importance is often not fully recognized. In this connexion, it would be sufficient to remind the Committee that modern history very convincingly demonstrates that people are no longer willing to reconcile themselves with their difficult social positions and that they are more resolutely demanding to have the possibility of realizing their social emancipation.

97. We believe that the report will, in fact, have even wider significance. With its publication, people throughout the world will gain a greater insight into the economic and social consequences of the armaments race. This, in turn, will serve as an additional impetus to the efforts of peoples and Governments to create as soon as possible conditions in which human and material resources, at present consumed by armaments, will be utilized for a more rapid solution of the urgent problems besetting the international community.

98. For all these reasons, my delegation fully supports this initiative of the Romanian delegation and would like to express its hope that the proposed draft resolution will have the widest possible support in this Committee.

99. Mr. ANAS (Afghanistan): The estimate of the potential destructive power of armaments in units of tons of TNT

*per capita* would make a shocking impact on public opinion. Such an estimate should be included in the report proposed in the draft resolution, in order to convey the existing dangers in a more impressive way and to awaken public attention and concern. It seems to me advisable that, in the report called for in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, a place should be reserved for an accurate estimate, supported by statistics, of the potential destructive power represented by the stockpiling of armaments in the arsenals of the world. The statistics and figures mentioned in this regard in different documents and by different conferences do not support and bear each other out. We would contribute to arousing public opinion against the armaments race, if we were to provide accurate figures indicating the amount of destructive energy stored in units of tons of TNT *per capita*. These statistics, which should be broken down by countries and kinds of armaments and which should be subjected to periodical revision, would convey a clear idea to the peace-loving people of the world of the danger of the futility and the psychosis of the armaments race. This report should create panic all over the world and we should all be panic-stricken at the realization of the magnitude of the danger.

100. To sum up, I suggest, although I am doing so informally, that in the preparation of the report due regard should be given to the compilation of statistics of destructive energy *per capita*, apart from those concerning expenditures. I am sure that the social consequence of those statistics would favour disarmament.

101. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Rwanda) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of Rwanda would like to add its voice to those speakers who have preceded me in expressing heartfelt condolences to the delegation of Pakistan.

102. The draft resolution carries an appeal to all States to renounce the arms race, stresses the dangers of that race and also expresses very deep concern to all the expenditure devoted to armaments by States applied to economic and social assistance which, better than armaments, guarantee the prosperity and happiness of States.

103. The reports which have led to the presentation of this draft resolution are very eloquent, as were the statements made here on this subject telling us that the waste of these resources is an extremely important fact in world affairs, when we know that thousands of millions in currency are spent every year in the world for perfecting weapons, while whole nations, several million of men, live in conditions of poverty and ignorance.

104. It is therefore easy to understand that this draft resolution is a most felicitous initiative which should normally give rise to enthusiasm among all States and delegations and should be adopted unanimously.

105. So far as my country is concerned, aware of its responsibilities as a Member State of the world community, it will fully support such an initiative and this is why we joined twenty-three other States in sponsoring this draft resolution.

106. My delegation would therefore like to call upon all other delegations to support this initiative so that all States

may enjoy a greater guarantee that we will be able to tackle serious problems, which are mainly the result of a lack of collective conscience and deeper solidarity. Mankind is one, and we must defend it more through concrete action than through weapons of destruction.

107. Mr. JAIN (India): The delegation of India has great pleasure in co-sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/L.535. The action called for from the General Assembly in that document is in line with the proposal made by the Secretary-General, a proposal which has received such overwhelming support. A comprehensive, international expert study of the arms race would help in keeping the focus on general and complete disarmament, with the highest priority being given to measures in the field of nuclear disarmament.

108. The Indian delegation reiterates the view it expressed at the meeting on 12 November: "To have maximum value from a study of that kind we must ensure that it adheres to the supremely important question of the nuclear arms race and is not diffused by considerations that may not be so vital." [1758th meeting, para. 30.]

109. It is our earnest hope that the draft resolution will receive the unanimous support of this Committee and of the General Assembly.

110. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I wish to state that my Government has taken a great interest in this subject and has sponsored the draft resolution now before us because it considers it to be of vital importance in helping to achieve what is needed, namely a halt in the arms race. A greater knowledge of the economic and social consequences of the arms race will enhance our awareness of the danger of the arms race for the very survival of mankind. The two convergent purposes are thus very well served by this draft resolution, which is why we have sponsored it. We wish to state how strongly we feel about the draft, which is also sponsored by a number of other delegations.

111. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): There are no more speakers on my list. I regret to have to state that, although I had hoped we could conclude the consideration of this item by a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.535, the Secretariat has informed me that the statement of the financial implications of this draft resolution, which must be submitted to the Committee before it is put to the vote, is not ready yet. As the members of the Committee are aware, the draft resolution

was submitted only yesterday and some time will be needed to effect the necessary consultations. In the light of all these considerations, I should like to suggest that the Committee should postpone a vote on the draft resolution until we resume consideration of the remaining items concerning disarmament, which we hope will be on Tuesday, 24 November. Of course, at that time, those delegations which wish to explain their vote before or after the vote will have an opportunity to do so.

112. Having no other speakers on my list and not being able to proceed to the vote now, I believe we have completed our work for this morning. I should like to remind members of the Committee that the time-limit for the submission of draft resolutions or amendments on the agenda items concerning disarmament which we have not yet completed will expire at 6 p.m. today.

113. I now call on the representative of Pakistan, who wishes to make a statement.

114. Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan): On behalf of the delegation of Pakistan, I wish to convey our sincere thanks to the representatives of the United Kingdom, Poland, Yugoslavia, France, Indonesia, Canada, Malta and Rwanda for their expressions of sympathy in the Committee this morning in connexion with the calamity that has recently befallen my people and my country.

115. These touching expressions of grief and sympathy will be conveyed to the people and Government of Pakistan. The people and Government of Pakistan have been deeply touched by the messages of condolence and the offers of help and assistance we have received from many countries in the four corners of the globe. It is proof indeed, if proof were needed, that all nations and peoples of the world belong to one indivisible human family, and that in times of trial and suffering involving one member of this family, all the members feel deeply concerned and grieved.

116. As an afflicted member of the human family, the peoples of Pakistan feel that their sufferings have been alleviated by the help, assistance and expressions of sympathy that have come from the other members of the family, and we do wish to convey our deep gratitude to all who stand by us in this tragic hour.

*The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.*