



CONTENTS

Agenda item 94: Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security (<i>concluded</i>)	1
Agenda item 30: Implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: report of the Secretary-General (<i>concluded</i>)	3
Agenda item 31: 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 (<i>concluded</i>)	3
Agenda item 27: Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (<i>continued</i>)	7

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

AGENDA ITEM 94

Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security (*concluded*)* (A/7994, A/C.1/L.535/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.541)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS
(*concluded*)

1. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): As members of the Committee will recall, at the 1765th meeting the Committee decided to postpone voting on the draft resolution submitted on item 94 of our agenda, in order to allow the Secretariat to present a document covering the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution. As I pointed out to the Committee at our meeting yesterday afternoon, the Committee now has that document, circulated as document A/C.1/L.541, on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution. I would also draw your attention to the fact that the revised text of draft resolution A/C.1/L.535 has now been circulated. Therefore, on this item of our agenda we now have before us the two documents I have mentioned: A/C.1/L.535/Rev.1; and A/C.1/L.541, the latter on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution.

* Resumed from the 1765th meeting.

- Page
2. Mr. DIACONESCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): I wish briefly to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.535/Rev.1.
3. In submitting the revised version of the draft resolution, the sponsors have borne in mind the suggestions made by a number of delegations, which, generally speaking, were intended to clarify the ideas contained in the text proposed by twenty-four countries.
4. At the outset I must make it clear that most of the changes are linguistic in nature and are intended to make clearer the various paragraphs of the draft. In the preamble, the following changes have been made.
5. In the first preambular paragraph the words "in the ever more devastating nature" have been deleted and the end of the paragraph now reads "... and impending new qualitative advances in, nuclear armaments".
6. In the third preambular paragraph the words "the highest" have been added before "priority to nuclear disarmament...".
7. In the fifth preambular paragraph, the words "on the arms race" have been inserted after the word "talent", so that the first part of that paragraph reads as follows: "Deeply convinced that the elimination of the enormous waste of wealth and talent on the arms race, which is detrimental to the economic and social life of all States, would have a positive impact...". The rest of the paragraph remains unchanged. I should mention that the changes were introduced to make the sentence more clear and precise.
8. In the next paragraph two changes have been made. The expression "a reduction of military expenditures" has been inserted after the words "a halt in the arms race". The paragraph now begins as follows: "Convinced that a halt in the arms race, a reduction of military expenditures and concrete progress toward disarmament would greatly facilitate...". In the same paragraph the word "urgent" has been deleted.
9. In the eighth preambular paragraph the words "and thus to help ensure human survival and human welfare" have been deleted.
10. In the final preambular paragraph the words "at all levels" have been deleted.
11. At the end of operative paragraph 1 the words "in the disarmament negotiations" have been replaced by "in the field of disarmament".

12. In operative paragraph 2, the words “a sense of urgency to pay due attention to” have been replaced by a much simpler formula: “to pay urgent attention to”.

13. Operative paragraph 5 has been reworded for reasons of clarity. The text now reads as follows:

“Calls upon non-governmental organizations and international institutions and organizations to co-operate with the Secretary-General in the preparation of the report”.

14. Finally, in the English text of operative paragraph 6, for stylistic reasons, the words “the Assembly’s” have been replaced by the word “its”, so that the text now reads “to permit its consideration at the twenty-sixth session”.

15. As can be seen, in the English version of the text in all cases, the words “armaments race” have been replaced by “arms race”, which is more usual in English.

16. It is evident that the changes introduced in no way change the substance of the draft resolution. In submitting the revised text, the sponsors have, as I said at the beginning of this statement, been moved by the desire to take into account the suggestions made by a number of delegations and the concern to make the wording as clear as possible.

17. May I take this opportunity to repeat our conviction that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.535/Rev.1 will be supported by all delegations.

18. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have no further speakers listed to speak on this subject. I take it that the Committee is ready to vote on this draft resolution.

19. I shall now call on those delegations which wish to explain their votes before the vote.

20. Mr. LEONARD (United States): We are pleased to support draft resolution A/C.1/L.535/Rev.1, which we think will result in a useful study of the economic and social consequences of military expenditures.

21. We are very grateful to the Secretariat for accepting our suggestion that the cost of the study be kept at a reasonable figure, thus assisting the United Nations in making efficient use of resources. We note from document A/C.1/L.541 that the Secretariat has estimated the total cost of the study at very close to \$150,000, which was the figure we had in mind.

22. The study will, of course, concern economic and social questions to a large extent. The Secretariat of the United Nations has built up over the years great expertise in this general area. We would urge that the experts in this field within the Secretariat be utilized to the maximum degree possible. In our judgement, not only will that help to produce a very good study but it might also assist in keeping down the expenses of the study.

23. Mr. FONSECA TRUQUE (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The debates in the First Committee on the strengthening of international security, as also those on the

disarmament question, have shown that there exists a general feeling of frustration in the United Nations on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Organization. We note the inexplicable unwillingness of the nuclear Powers to accept and establish a solid tie between the Disarmament Decade and the Second United Nations Development Decade, which is borne out by the discouraging and unclear terms of the final document adopted on 24 October 1970 [*resolution 2626 (XXV)*].

24. Colombia welcomed the idea of the delegation of Romania on the need to assess the economic and social consequences of the arms race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security, and particularly with regard to the developing countries.

25. My country is happy to sponsor draft resolution A/C.1/L.535/Rev.1. Generally speaking, this document is intended to encourage the creation of a wide range of disarmament measures in order to achieve United Nations development plans for the 1970s. To this end . . .

26. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I realize now that the representative of Colombia is one of the sponsors of this draft resolution. I must apologize to him for this.

27. Mr. FONSECA TRUQUE (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): But I understand that since there is no counterproposal to this one . . .

28. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am sorry, but the rules of procedure do not make such distinction.

29. Mr. FONSECA TRUQUE (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I commend this draft resolution to the Committee for I consider it indispensable and of great importance.

30. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to ask the representative of Colombia to refrain from making his statement now, for the reasons that I have already adduced, namely that the rules of procedure are very clear on this point. I am sorry, since I would have been very happy to call upon him before calling upon speakers in explanation of vote. Since we have already started that process, however, I cannot allow him to continue.

31. Since there are no further speakers to explain their votes before the vote, may I ask whether the Committee is ready to adopt this draft resolution unanimously? If there is no objection, I shall take it that draft resolution A/C.1/L.535/Rev.1 is adopted unanimously.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

32. Does any representative wish to explain his vote after the vote? Since no delegation has asked to do so, the Committee has thus concluded its consideration of item 94.

33. With regard to the other three items on disarmament, may I suggest that the Committee take them up in the following order: first, item 30; second, item 31 and finally item 27.

34. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to this order of priority.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 30

Implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)* (A/8079 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.538)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

35. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): In connexion with item 30, we have one draft resolution, in document A/C.1/L.538. I shall now call on those speakers who wish to speak on the draft resolution.

36. Mr. ESCHAUZIER (Netherlands): The First Committee has before it two documents, A/8079 and A/8079/Add.1. Both are reports of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States.

37. The reports are thorough and compact and have already been studied by the members of this Committee. I therefore will not tax their patience by enumerating and commenting on the achievements listed therein. The reports show that the four organizations most directly concerned with the implementation of the results of the Conference are the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

38. I wish to remind the members of this Committee that the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Food and Agriculture Organization already have a Joint Division of Atomic Energy in Food and Agriculture. The Agency is strengthening its relationship and exchange of information with the World Bank and is intensifying its efforts to execute more UNDP-supported projects.

39. Draft resolution A/C.1/L.538, which I have the honour to introduce on behalf of Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Denmark, Finland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Pakistan and my own country offers a simplified procedure, which is most suitable under the present circumstances, in particular with a view to avoiding duplication in the future. It takes note of the reports of the Secretary-General and recognizes the International Atomic Energy Agency's special and increasing responsibilities. Noting also the recent steps the Agency has taken, the draft resolution calls on the Agency to continue, in co-operation with other organizations and bodies concerned, its work on implementation of the recommendations of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States. By requesting the Director-General to include the relevant information in his annual reports, the results of the Agency's work in this respect will be readily available to all for further consideration during the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly. On behalf of the sponsors I commend the draft resolution for the unanimous approval of the Committee.

* Resumed from the 1762nd meeting.

40. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): As there are no further speakers on item 30, I understand that we can go on to vote on this draft resolution. If there is no objection, can we consider that the Committee adopts this draft resolution unanimously, or is a vote called for?

41. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. Chairman, I would request that you take a vote on this draft resolution, so that our delegation can express its attitude on the question in the course of the vote itself. This attitude has been well-known ever since the time when the question of convening a Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States was raised and the results of that Conference were examined. I would request you, Mr. Chairman, to put draft resolution A/C.1/L.538 to the vote.

42. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before voting, may I ask if any delegation wishes to explain its vote? We shall now proceed to the vote. Inasmuch as no delegation has asked for a roll-call vote, we shall now vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.538 in the usual way.

The draft resolution was adopted by 70 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

43. Since no delegation has asked to explain its vote after the vote, we have thus concluded our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/L.538, and since no other draft resolution has been submitted, we have also concluded our consideration of agenda item 30.

AGENDA ITEM 31

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 (concluded)* (A/8080, A/C.1/L.540)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

44. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): Under agenda item 31, the Committee has before it draft resolution A/C.1/L.540.

45. I shall first call on those delegations that wish to make statements on this draft resolution.

46. Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/L.540, which was submitted last week. As is indicated in the document, the draft resolution is sponsored by the delegations of Austria, Canada, Denmark, Japan, Mexico and the Netherlands.

47. The background of the discussion of item 31 during our general debate and at this stage of our deliberations is the encouraging and informative report of the International Atomic Energy Agency, which was submitted in accordance with a request of the General Assembly in its resolution

* *Idem.*

2605 B (XXIV). The report is contained in document A/8080.

48. Delegations will recall that the General Assembly in its resolution 2456 C (XXIII) requested the Secretary-General to prepare, in consultation with Member States and with the co-operation of the International Atomic Energy Agency, a report on the establishment within the framework of the Agency of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control. This report of the Secretary-General,¹ which also contained a supplementary report by the Agency on the role it might play in the field of peaceful nuclear explosions, was submitted to the General Assembly at last year's session. On the basis of extensive discussion on the information thus conveyed to it, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2605 B (XXIV).

49. In that resolution, recognizing that the International Atomic Energy Agency has certain programmes under way, such as the convening of expert groups, designed to assure a wider appreciation of the status of this technology, and that certain nuclear-weapon States have furnished the Agency with useful information on the status of their experimental programmes in this field, the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session suggested that it should continue to give particular attention over the next year to the convening of further technical meetings to discuss the scientific and technical aspects of this technology. Furthermore, the General Assembly suggested at that session that the Agency initiate studies on the character of the international observation that it might perform in the field of peaceful nuclear explosions.

50. In response to these suggestions and to a specific invitation, which was also embodied in resolution 2605 B (XXIV), IAEA submitted early in October 1970 the progress report to which I referred in the beginning of my statement. That report highlights the Agency's further studies and activities in connexion with nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

51. In examining the report, my delegation is happy to note that the Agency has responded to the invitation of the General Assembly with its customary dispatch and is carrying out the studies requested of it with its usual thoroughness and care.

52. We learn from the information submitted by the Agency that a first panel meeting on a review of the technology of peaceful nuclear explosions was successfully concluded earlier this year and that other panels are being prepared for the future. The next of these panels is expected to take up the practical aspects of contained nuclear explosions for industrial purposes.

53. In addition to organizing panel meetings and other technical meetings, the Agency also gave considerable attention to the evaluation of the results of these gatherings, in particular to the evaluation of the information and data submitted by participating Member States. In keeping with its excellent record of disseminating technical and scientific information, the Agency will no doubt make the results of these studies available in appropriate form.

54. In the field of exchange of information, the Agency during the last year published several papers as well as a bibliography on peaceful nuclear explosions up to 1969. Furthermore, it has adjusted its international nuclear information system so as to ensure also an adequate exchange of information in this specific realm of nuclear technology.

55. Finally, I should like to mention that the Agency has also initiated studies on the character of the international observation of peaceful nuclear explosions. In fact, a group of experts which has the task of preparing a preliminary study on that matter is meeting at present at Vienna.

56. I hope that these few remarks have helped to set out the background against which draft resolution A/C.1/L.540 has been prepared. The draft itself contains four operative paragraphs, in which it expresses our appreciation for the studies recently performed and invites the Agency to continue and intensify its programmes in the field of peaceful nuclear explosions. Lastly, the draft requests the Secretary-General to include the present item in the agenda of the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, thus providing for a continuation of a discussion of these important and far-reaching problems.

57. In concluding, let me express the hope that this draft resolution will command the broad support of our Committee.

58. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): My delegation has studied with much interest the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency on the establishment, within its framework, of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control [A/8080], submitted in response to General Assembly resolution 2605 B (XXIV). The Panel on Peaceful Nuclear Explosions, held in Vienna last March, has made some very useful and practical recommendations. In particular, my delegation endorses the one relating to the role of the agency in the exchange of information and in the fields of education, training and scientific research.

59. Most of the countries of the world have only a rudimentary knowledge of the constructive potential of the technology of nuclear explosions. Those countries which do know the secrets—namely, the nuclear-weapon Powers—guard them jealously. We, therefore, share the view that an introductory review of the technology of peaceful nuclear explosions must be made for the purpose of general dissemination. We also endorse the recommendation of the Panel that the Agency should consider arranging for the engagement of travelling lecturers to speak on the subject of peaceful nuclear explosions, the setting up of academic programmes and the encouragement of scientific research in related fields. The assignment of scientists from Member States to projects in countries with peaceful nuclear energy programmes also needs to be facilitated. It is, of course, understood that such assignments would be made with the purpose of disseminating the knowledge of the benefits of nuclear technology and not the knowledge of the technology of nuclear explosions.

60. We look forward to even more positive results from the Panel meeting which will be held in January next year,

¹ Documents A/7678 and Add.1-4.

and we favour periodic meetings of the Panel and the enlargement of its membership, and also of the scope of its work.

61. My delegation appreciates the idea behind the Agency's international nuclear information system (INS) and its originality. The system denotes a practical method of disseminating information on nuclear subjects and, in particular, on the benefits of peaceful nuclear explosions. As this system is put into operation, a milestone may be reached. One day, nuclear explosive technology will be fully harnessed to make the earth yield its riches to man. It will create harbours, dig canals and literally move mountains. For its bountiful possibilities to be realized, it is imperative that its benefits should also be available to all non-nuclear nations. The best, the least risky and, indeed, the only way to achieve this object is by establishing, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency, an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control. We firmly share the view that such a service needs to be established as soon as practicable.

62. The fact is incontestable that technologically there is no difference between nuclear weapons and nuclear explosive devices manufactured for peaceful purposes. The recognition of this fact is implicit in articles I and II of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII), annex], which prohibits nuclear weapons or "other nuclear explosive devices"—I repeat, "other nuclear explosive devices". Article II of the Treaty, which defines the main obligations of the non-nuclear-weapon States signatory to the Treaty, reads as follows:

"Each non-nuclear-weapon State Party to the Treaty undertakes not to receive the transfer from any transferor whatsoever of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or of control over such weapons or explosive devices directly, or indirectly; not to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices; and not to seek or receive any assistance in the manufacture of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices."

63. During the debate on the non-proliferation Treaty in this Committee, at the resumed twenty-second session of the Assembly, many speakers and, in particular, the representatives of the three nuclear-weapon Powers party to the Treaty—namely, the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom—made it absolutely clear that there was no difference in the technology for making nuclear weapons or nuclear explosive devices for peaceful purposes. Justice Goldberg, speaking in this Committee on 26 April 1968, on behalf of the United States Government, said:

"Finally, all that articles I and II forbid as regards nuclear weapons, they likewise forbid as regards other nuclear explosive devices. This provision is necessary and essential because every nuclear explosive device contains the same nuclear components as a nuclear weapon." [1556th meeting, para. 39.]

64. The representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Kuznetsov, speaking at the same meeting, said:

"... from the technological point of view, there is no difference between the nuclear explosive devices used in nuclear weapons and similar devices used for peaceful purposes. That means that States which carry out nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes are at the same time States possessing nuclear weapons." [Ibid., para. 121.]

65. Mr. Mulley, the representative of the United Kingdom, speaking in this Committee on 28 May 1968 said:

"The technology involved [in nuclear explosive devices for peaceful purposes] is indistinguishable in the final stages from the manufacture of nuclear weapons. The same device which might move millions of tons of earth could also be used to kill hundreds of thousands of people." [1575th meeting, para. 74.]

66. My delegation does recognize that the point we have made is not at all controversial and does not therefore need to be laboured. Nevertheless, it has to be kept in the forefront of our minds for the proper appreciation of the urgent need for the establishment of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency. It is not pessimism to believe that, unless such a service is established without loss of time, nuclear devices will be manufactured by non-nuclear-weapon States which are not party to the non-proliferation Treaty and the world will be reduced to a state which will be virtually a nuclear free-for-all.

67. Since some of the States will not be bound by the provisions of the non-proliferation Treaty, its objectives will be frustrated. Such a development would certainly create a qualitatively new situation, endangering not only regional security but also, ultimately, the security of the world. Seen in this light, draft resolution A/C.1/L.540 has an importance and a purpose which should not be underestimated. The Pakistan delegation endorses the provisions of that draft resolution, expressing the Assembly's appreciation of the studies recently carried out, commending the International Atomic Energy Agency for its efforts to compile and evaluate information on the present status of this technology, and for making this information available to the Member States, and also recommending that the Agency continue and intensify its programme in this field.

68. It is our hope and expectation that the report of the Agency, which will be submitted to the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session, will contain positive indications of the early establishment of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control. This would mean not only the closing of an ostensibly peaceful route towards the acquisition of nuclear weapons, but it would also be a signal that nuclear energy can be tamed and its powers geared for the well-being, not the destruction, of man.

69. Mr. LEONARD (United States of America): The question has been raised of the relationship between the development for peaceful purposes of a nuclear explosive device by a non-nuclear-weapon State and the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The position of the United States has been stated repeatedly by United States representatives.

For example, on 8 June 1967, Mr. William Foster, then Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the United States representative to the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, stated at the Conference:

“A nuclear explosive device capable of moving vast quantities of earth in an uninhabited area is also a nuclear explosive capable of destroying a city and its inhabitants. No amount of argumentation can obscure this fact or its implications.

“... ”

“So we must return to that one indisputable fact. A nuclear explosive device for peaceful purposes could be used as a nuclear weapon. Both have one significant, relevant characteristic as far as a non-proliferation treaty is concerned. Both can be used to threaten, to attack, to destroy.”²

70. On 25 January 1968, Mr. Adrian Fisher, then Deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, stated at the Conference:

“... the acquisition of the technology of nuclear explosions would be contrary to the very concept of non-proliferation.

“... it is an indisputable technological fact that the development and manufacture of nuclear explosive devices intended for peaceful uses is indistinguishable from the development and manufacture of nuclear weapons”.³

71. Similar statements were also made by Ambassador Goldberg in the First Committee on 26 April 1968 [*1556th meeting*], and they have just been quoted by the representative of Pakistan.

72. My Government remains convinced that the technology involved in producing nuclear explosive devices for peaceful purposes is indistinguishable from that involved in producing nuclear weapons, and therefore that the production of any such explosive device by a non-nuclear-weapon State would be equivalent to the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

73. With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/L.540, my delegation considers that it treats in a satisfactory manner the subject of preparations for the establishment of an international service for peaceful nuclear explosions, and we will support it.

74. Mr. JAIN (India): The question of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes can only be considered in the larger context of the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The Government of India has been of the firm and consistent view that the development and benefits of the technology of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes should be available to all States without any discrimination.

75. All States should be free to acquire the knowledge to extract all possible benefits from the development of

nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. They should be able to do so by themselves and have the freedom to use such knowledge. Nuclear technology is the technology of the future and is likely to become a most crucial and potent instrument of economic development and social progress, particularly in the case of the developing countries. It would be invidious for a great part of the world to become dependent on a few nuclear-weapon States for the knowledge and application of this technology. India is opposed to any effort to create discrimination in the peaceful nuclear field among States according to whether or not they possess nuclear weapons, since any such effort could only widen the economic and technical gap that already exists, which the developing countries are striving very hard to close. It is not the knowledge of nuclear technology or its use for peaceful purposes, but only its misuse through diversion to the production and deployment of nuclear weapons that constitutes a threat to peace.

76. What is needed, therefore, is action in the following two directions: first, urgent and concrete steps towards nuclear disarmament; and, secondly, the application of safeguards to prevent the misuse of nuclear technology. For safeguards to be effective, they should be based on objective, scientific and non-discriminatory criteria, and should be applicable to all States without exception.

77. The delegation of India, in its statement before this Committee on 12 November, outlined the approach that should be adopted for seeking a solution to the question of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. The delegation of India stated:

“India is convinced that a correct and equitable solution of the question of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes can only be found in the context of a comprehensive nuclear test ban, and that meanwhile the discipline of the partial test-ban Treaty should be observed by all States. An international régime for peaceful nuclear explosions should be established and the benefits of technology made available to all States on a basis of equality. We agree with the proposal that, while the technical aspects of the question of peaceful nuclear explosions, including the establishment of an international service, should continue to be dealt with by the International Atomic Energy Agency, the principles governing the creation of an international régime should be discussed at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.” [*1758th meeting, para. 40.*]

78. I should now like to make a few comments on behalf of the delegation of India on draft resolution A/C.1/L.540.

79. As regards the establishment of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control, the International Atomic Energy Agency is fully competent to undertake this responsibility, and the Agency should, in conformity with its Statute, provide these services on a non-discriminatory basis and upon request by Member States. This represents our understanding of the draft resolution, which the Indian delegation supports and will vote for. The draft resolution would have the General Assembly express its appreciation for the studies already carried out by the International Atomic Energy Agency and commend the Agency for its

² ENDC/PV.303, paras. 5 and 9.

³ ENDC/PV.359, paras. 36 and 37.

efforts to compile and evaluate information on the present status of the technology of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes and make such information available on an international scale.

80. The delegation of India cannot agree to any interpretation of the draft resolution which goes beyond any of its provisions.

81. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet delegation would like to make a few comments in connexion with the forthcoming vote on the draft resolution on the question of the establishment, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control [A/C.1/L.540].

82. The position of the USSR on the question of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes has already been stated on more than one occasion both in this Committee and in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. This position is based on the provisions of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*]. Article II of that Treaty, which has already been referred to here by the representative of Pakistan, provides that non-nuclear-weapons States undertake not to receive the transfer from any transferor whatsoever of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or of control over such weapons or explosive devices directly, or indirectly; not to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices; and not to seek or receive any assistance in the manufacture of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. This formulation of article II of the Treaty on Non-Proliferation is based on the objective fact, already stressed here by previous speakers, that any nuclear explosive device can be used as a weapon. The Treaty on Non-Proliferation is intended to avert such a possibility.

83. Article V of the Treaty provides for the establishment of a system of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear explosions and stipulates specifically that there shall be no discrimination within the framework of such co-operation. It also provides that the charge for the explosive devices used will be as low as possible and exclude any charge for research and development of nuclear explosion technology.

84. The USSR considers that the systematic implementation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons should provide non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty with every opportunity to receive the potential benefits of the peaceful uses of nuclear explosions. The USSR has already stated its attitude on the question of the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency in connexion with the peaceful uses of nuclear explosions under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

85. The USSR supported the resolution of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency, on this subject, which states that the Agency may effectively fulfil the role of an international organ through which the benefits of the peaceful uses of nuclear explosions will be

accessible to States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

86. In determining its position, the USSR proceeds from the premise that IAEA is an international organization specially established for the purposes of co-operation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. During the course of its existence, the Agency has accumulated considerable experience in the organization of international co-operation in this field. The Agency's special role in connexion with problems relating to atomic energy is laid down in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which gives the Agency the function of ensuring that nuclear material is not transferred for the purpose of producing nuclear weapons. It may be noted with satisfaction that the Agency has already proceeded in a practical manner to carry out tasks in connexion with peaceful nuclear explosions under the aforementioned Treaty.

87. In view of these considerations, the Soviet delegation will support draft resolution A/C.1/L.540 and will vote in favour of it.

88. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): There are no further speakers in the debate on this item. If no delegation wishes to explain its vote before the vote, we shall now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.540.

The draft resolution was adopted by 89 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

89. That was the only draft resolution on this subject before the Committee. If no delegation wishes to explain its vote after the vote, we may take it that the Committee has concluded its consideration of item 31.

AGENDA ITEM 27

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, A/C.1/L.532, A/C.1/L.534/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.537)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (*continued*)

90. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): In connexion with item 27 we have before us draft resolutions A/C.1/L.532, A/C.1/L.534/Rev.1 and A/C.1/L.537. I think that the best procedure would be to consider each draft resolution separately, beginning with A/C.1/L.532.

91. Mr. EDELSTAM (Sweden): Last year the General Assembly, in its resolution 2602 A (XXIV) of 16 December, appealed to the Governments of the Soviet Union and the United States to agree on a moratorium on further testing and deployment of new offensive and defensive strategic nuclear-weapon systems as an urgent preliminary measure in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT). However, no action has yet been taken in that direction by the major Powers.

* Resumed from the 1767th meeting.

92. During our recent general debate in this Committee, a number of delegations have very eloquently demonstrated why the nuclear arms race must be brought to an immediate halt. In line with that opinion, which is shared by the general public all over the world, the delegations of twelve Member States have put forward a draft resolution on the subject [A/C.1/L.532]. On behalf of the sponsors—the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, the United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia and Sweden—I express the hope that all the members of this Committee will vote in favour of this appeal, an appeal addressed to the Governments of the nuclear-weapon Powers to bring the arms race to an immediate halt and to cease all testing and deployment of nuclear weapon systems, both offensive and defensive. There should be no reason to repeat here the urgent reasons for such action.

93. May I finally request that the vote on this draft resolution be taken by roll-call.

94. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have no further speakers on this subject.

95. I have been informed that some negotiations are taking place on the draft resolutions relating to agenda item 27 and that some delegations would like consideration of all three documents referring to item 27 to be delayed until some future meeting of the Committee, specifically on Monday.

96. I should like to consult the Committee on whether it would agree to our postponing a decision on these three drafts or whether the Committee would deem it appropriate and desirable, in order to clarify matters and also facilitate negotiations, if we were to hear all those who might wish to comment on these three draft resolutions, today, and that we postpone the vote on the draft resolutions until some future meeting. I should like to hear the comments of the delegations on this question.

97. Mr. JAIN (India): Mr. Chairman, do I understand correctly that we can make statements on all or any of the three draft resolutions but that the vote will be taken later?

98. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I understand that what some delegations are asking for is further time to hold consultations that might make it easier for the Committee to decide upon these draft resolutions, and that there would be no objection to our hearing statements on the drafts, which might contribute to making those conversations and negotiations easier. So if there are no objections, we might hear all the delegations that wish to speak on these draft resolutions in the time still available to us at this meeting and then take a vote at some future meeting, for example next Monday.

99. I ask the Committee whether it would be in agreement with that procedure? Since there are no objections, I shall take it that the Committee adopts that procedure.

It was so decided.

100. In accordance with that procedure I shall call on the delegations wishing to make comments on draft resolution A/C.1/L.534/Rev.1.

101. Mr. PARDO (Malta): Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank you for permitting me to introduce the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.534/Rev.1. I shall be extremely brief.

102. In the first place, let me explain that the draft resolution submitted by my delegation is not intended in any way to question the inalienable right of any State to develop research or the production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes or to develop new technologies in the field of peaceful nuclear activities. Those rights are specifically guaranteed in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and we have incorporated the substance of the text of article IV, paragraph 1, of the non-proliferation Treaty in the first paragraph of the preamble of the revised draft resolution to make our position perfectly clear.

103. We also recognize, willingly and without reservation, that new methods of uranium enrichment have been developed primarily as a contribution to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, as a delegation observed in Geneva last February. That concept has been incorporated in the third paragraph of the preamble. The reason for the submission of our original and of our revised draft resolution does not reside in the fact that we have any doubt of the entirely peaceful intentions of the countries concerned, but rather in the wide implications of the technological developments that have taken place.

104. There are two sources of nuclear weapons: enriched uranium and plutonium. In the consideration by the United Nations of the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, it was assumed that the major danger of proliferation would derive from the large increase in plutonium production to be expected in the near future as a result of the great expansion in nuclear reactor activities.

105. It was also assumed that the production of enriched uranium would not be a serious problem, because the gaseous diffusion method of uranium enrichment had been mastered only by the nuclear-weapon States, because a major research and industrial effort would be required to produce enriched uranium by this method and because, even if this method of uranium enrichment were mastered, a very heavy capital investment would be needed to construct the plants necessary to accomplish the enrichment.

106. The development of new methods of uranium enrichment has produced a radical change in the situation. It is relevant in this connexion to observe that while the gas diffusion method of uranium enrichment was a monopoly of the nuclear-weapon States, approximately a dozen countries are developing new methods of uranium enrichment. Thus the wide dissemination of new technologies involved cannot be effectively limited. Accordingly, we share the concern expressed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament last February [*see CCD/PV.450*].

107. The development by several countries of new techniques of uranium enrichment gives rise to a certain number of problems. Malta has ratified the non-proliferation Treaty and my Government has contacted the International

Atomic Energy Agency for the purpose of negotiating an agreement under article III, paragraph 4, of the Treaty. Thus, when consultation with more experienced delegations indicated that consideration by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament of the implications of new technologies for uranium enrichment might be inopportune at the present time, we had no difficulty in revising our draft resolution. In the revision, we suggest consideration only of problems that are within the competence of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Consideration of those problems in the context of the safeguards system to be established under the non-proliferation Treaty cannot be avoided if the long-term viability of the Treaty is to be assured.

108. To make it perfectly clear, however, that we would not wish the International Atomic Energy Agency to ignore previously known techniques when establishing the safeguards system under the non-proliferation Treaty, I would, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, enter a slight revision in operative paragraph 1, namely, to insert the word “also” after the words “to pay attention” and to delete the word “particular”. Operative paragraph 1 would thus read:

“Requests the International Atomic Energy Agency to pay attention also to the safeguards required with respect to new techniques for uranium enrichment”.

109. Furthermore, I would propose a very slight change in the fourth preambular paragraph, in order to make it clearer and more precise. I would suggest inserting after the word “that” the words “material produced by” and substituting the word “diverted” for the word “utilized”. The revised preambular paragraph would read:

“Considering also that material produced by these new techniques may be diverted for weapons purposes unless subjected to effective safeguards”.

We believe that the insertion of these words will make this preambular paragraph more precise.

110. We attach particular importance to the last paragraph of our draft resolution. We strongly believe that the General Assembly, which discussed the non-proliferation Treaty over a period of years and subsequently commended the Treaty to Member States, is at least entitled to be informed of the manner in which it is proposed to adapt to the advance of technology the safeguards system to be established under the non-proliferation Treaty. This is a fundamental right of the General Assembly, which I hope will not be contested.

111. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before calling on the next speaker, may I make it clear that we are not at the moment closing the general debate on these three draft resolutions under agenda item 27, nor does the decision arrived at by the Committee a few moments ago imply that all statements have to be made specifically at this meeting. When we take these matters up again on Monday, any delegation that wishes to speak in the general debate or wishes to explain its vote before or after the vote will be perfectly entitled to do so. I want this procedure to be clearly understood because it will answer some of the questions that have been asked of me. What we

are doing at the moment is to progress as far as possible in consideration of these draft resolutions and to take note as far as possible of any amendments or changes that may be submitted to the drafts.

112. With regard to the revision of his draft just made by the representative of Malta, by Monday—if not sooner—the new revised text will be available to all members of the Committee.

113. Does anyone else wish to speak on this same draft resolution? Since there are none, are there any speakers on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.537?

114. Mr. CARACCILO (Italy): My delegation takes a particular interest in the problem dealt with in draft resolution A/C.1/L.537, introduced in this Committee last Friday [1767th meeting] by Ambassador García Robles, whose statement I regret I did not have the privilege of hearing. The draft resolution refers to 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, according to the directives set forth in General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV).

115. I wish to state that my delegation has been second to none in believing that some initiative ought to be taken in order to provide the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament with some sort of programme charting the course of its future work in achieving progress towards the ultimate goal of an agreement on general and complete disarmament.

116. We had, in fact, already realized some time ago that, after the discussions in Geneva on the two plans submitted respectively by the Soviet Union and United States in March and April 1962, were stalemated and after the consequent cessation of further endeavours on any other disarmament plan, a crisis of confidence was likely to creep into the disarmament Conference, where negotiations had meanwhile centred on specific collateral measures for the prevention and limitation of armaments. However useful the latter approach might have been, we were convinced of its insufficiency and of the need to supplement it with the adoption of a more general programme that would confirm the ultimate objective of our negotiations and put the right emphasis on arms reduction. We were also convinced that by doing so we would give the proper means to the work of the Conference, reaffirm the political will of the Governments concerned, reassure public opinion as to the real purpose of our negotiations, and restore confidence in our work.

117. These considerations had prompted the Italian initiative at Geneva in March 1969, aimed at the adoption of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.⁴ We pursued that initiative subsequently, both at Geneva and in New York, in co-operation with those delegations that shared the same views and concern.

118. As representatives will recall, the delegations of Ireland, Italy and Japan submitted a draft resolution to this

⁴ See ENDC/PV.397.

Committee last year, which was approved in the General Assembly by an overwhelming majority and became resolution 2602 E (XXIV). In the two following sessions of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in 1970, the Italian delegation tried to contribute to the work of implementing the directives set forth in paragraph 4 of the above-mentioned resolution, believing that a joint effort had to be promoted in order to achieve some concrete results. The Italian delegation therefore contacted other delegations at Geneva that were particularly interested in the question of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, and tried to bring out through informal meetings some common views that could help to lay the foundation for a wider consensus on the subject.

119. The informal meetings of this group of delegations, also attended by the three delegations that later drafted the comprehensive programme of disarmament now before the Committee in document A/C.1/L.537, were held at Geneva over a considerable period of time in the course of the first session of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament this year, and the results of these joint efforts were duly reported to the Conference at the beginning of its second session.

120. For its part, the Italian delegation assumed that, given the complexity of the problem and the necessity of reaching a wide consensus, and in order to ensure valid and fruitful results, the work already initiated in a smaller group had to be developed in the full Committee as steadily as possible but without undue haste. Accordingly, the working paper submitted by the Italian delegation on 19 August, the text of which is annexed to the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [A/8059-DC/233, annex C, sect. 38], far from being a draft for a comprehensive programme, contained only some elements and suggestions for a future draft. Our paper was, therefore, similar in nature and scope to the useful document previously submitted in Geneva by the delegation of the Netherlands [*ibid.*, sect. 5]. This proves, I think, that both delegations believed at that time that some work of clarification was still needed before discussion began on an actual draft for a comprehensive programme that could reflect the views of the majority of delegations. Following this path, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament could have submitted a progress report on the drafting of a programme to the General Assembly at its present session, could have elicited views on the various aspects of the programme, and would have received here the necessary guidance and support for the drafting, in due time, of a more complete and articulated programme.

121. The delegations of Mexico, Sweden and Yugoslavia chose instead to take a short cut by submitting a full-fledged draft comprehensive programme of disarmament [*ibid.*, sect. 42] to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva on 29 August, a few days before its recess. Although that document contains many of the ideas raised at Geneva within the informal group of delegations I referred to earlier, it is an indisputable fact that the Conference had neither the opportunity nor the possibility of discussing the draft before adjourning.

122. Having briefly recalled the course of our proceedings in Geneva, I wish to pay tribute to the delegations of

Mexico, Sweden and Yugoslavia for the work they have done. It has been a courageous endeavour and one that deserves to be commended, even if one thinks that, given a little more time and additional effort, the document could have gone further in reconciling the views of more delegations in the interest of the future work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. For our part, while sharing the aims and agreeing to many of the provisions of the draft programme, we would find it difficult to subscribe to its entire contents. The document before us does not reflect some of the important elements that were raised during the discussions of the informal group in Geneva, nor certain ideas contained in the working papers submitted by the delegations of the Netherlands and Italy, ideas that were supposed to be further developed only at a later stage.

123. For these reasons, the draft resolution explained to us last Friday by the representative of Mexico places us in a slightly embarrassing situation, which is probably shared by some other delegations. For while we supported from the beginning the idea of a comprehensive programme, while we have given our contribution to the promotion of this initiative, while we agree with most parts of the document we are examining, we are now faced with a draft resolution which recommends the adoption of a programme that has not been discussed thoroughly either here or in Geneva and which, in its present form, can command only limited approval on our part.

124. We therefore believe that in order to gain wider support, especially on the part of those Powers whose active participation in the fulfilment of the programme is indispensable to the achievement of our common aim, some modifications of this draft resolution would be advisable.

125. Without prejudice to other proposals that may be put forward in the course of this debate, I shall, therefore, limit myself at this stage to suggesting that the draft resolution should duly take into account the fact that other elements have already been submitted by other delegations and have not yet been fully developed, and also that specific new ideas may arise in the future. To that end, and more precisely, we should like to suggest that operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.537 be amended to read as follows:

“Recommends to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to take the programme into account in its deliberations, together with other disarmament programme suggestions presented or to be further presented in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, and invites all States to avail themselves of the elements therein contained in developing guidelines for their disarmament activities.”

126. I hope that this suggested amendment will meet with the approval of the authors of the draft resolution. I am encouraged in this hope by the words of Ambassador García Robles in his statement last Friday, when he said that the disarmament programme annexed to the draft resolution “obviously leaves open the door to considering any other suggestions concerning disarmament that might be forthcoming in the Conference”. [1767th meeting, para. 4.]

127. My delegation would also like to focus the attention of the Committee on operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution we are discussing. That paragraph aims at including the item dealing with the comprehensive programme of disarmament only at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, which is due to take place two years from now.

128. Since the programme of disarmament is strictly related to the problem of general and complete disarmament that constitutes the main task entrusted to the Geneva Conference, it seems to us, to follow, as a logical consequence, that we should be more than interested in keeping such an important item on our agenda every year. Accordingly, in our view, this paragraph should be amended by substituting for the words "twenty-seventh session" the words "twenty-sixth session".

129. However, if the Committee is inclined to leave more latitude to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament as to the choice of the most suitable moment for informing the General Assembly of the progress made on the programme of disarmament, I would at least ask for the deletion of the whole of paragraph 3 in its present form.

130. Mr. JAIN (India): The delegation of India cannot support draft resolution A/C.1/L.537, since it does not correctly reflect either the work that has so far been done in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament or the situation in regard to the question of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. Moreover, through the device of an annex and a particular form of wording, the draft resolution seeks to obtain some kind of an endorsement for a paper that has not even been discussed in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, since it was presented just a week before the Conference adjourned.

131. It is necessary to analyse carefully what has happened since the General Assembly adopted resolution 2602 E (XXIV) at the last session, calling upon the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to work out a comprehensive programme of disarmament for itself and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its current session. The *raison d'être* of a comprehensive programme of disarmament was to give the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament a clear sense of direction and purpose. The international community had become increasingly alarmed by the ever-spiralling arms race in nuclear weapons; no real progress was taking place in the field of disarmament because of a tendency to concentrate on partial non-armament measures of marginal importance and to avoid discussion of measures of actual disarmament. The General Assembly had, by its historic resolution 1378 (XIV), established the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. That was done because there was a clear realization that with the advent of nuclear weapons there was no question of palliatives and half-hearted measures in the field of disarmament—concepts like "a balanced limitation and reduction of armaments", which had failed in the past, could not even be considered in the new situation created by nuclear weapons. Disarmament would have to be general; that is, it must include all States. It would have to be complete; that is, it would have to cover all weapons and weapons systems. It would also need

to be carried out under effective international control in order to inspire confidence among all States.

132. As a result of intensive discussions, a further consensus emerged in the international community—that the highest priority should be given to nuclear disarmament.

133. We started slipping back from the goal. The Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament set up in 1962 with the main task of reaching agreement on general and complete disarmament even stopped discussing that problem in 1964. The goal of general and complete disarmament was characterized by some people as the philosopher's dream and the Holy Grail. It is only as a result of concerted efforts by several States that the question of general and complete disarmament has now been put back on the map in disarmament discussions.

134. General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV), by which the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament was called upon to work out a comprehensive programme of disarmament, was a reminder to the Committee to cease to stray from the principal task for which it had been established. Partial or collateral measures, however important and necessary they may be, are only a step towards the goal of general and complete disarmament.

135. During the two sessions of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament held this year, several Governments represented on the Committee submitted their views and suggestions on how such a programme could be developed. India also submitted its views, to which we made reference in our statement before this Committee on 12 November [1758th meeting]. But the discussions remained inconclusive and no consensus emerged in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. In fact, the serious divergencies of views that exist in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on this question can be seen from a study of its records.

136. The present situation is as follows. There are three attitudes for dealing with the question of a programme of disarmament. One attitude is that any further discussions on a programme of disarmament are sterile and a waste of time and that it would be best to get this question out of the way as early as possible. Another is that all that is needed is to prepare some kind of inventory that can be passed off as a programme of disarmament, and to avoid difficult issues such as a general order of priorities among the various measures in the field of disarmament. The third approach is to take the question of a programme of disarmament seriously and to ask the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to continue its work, taking into account all the views and suggestions that have been put forward during discussions in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and in the General Assembly.

137. It is the view of the delegation of India that we should not accept either the first or the second approach. The question of a programme of disarmament is far too important a matter to be disposed of in that manner. The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should be asked to continue its work and report to the General Assembly next year, taking into account all the views and suggestions which have been put forward.

138. The Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which was held at Lusaka in September, adopted a declaration on disarmament which contain the views of that large assembly of nations on the general order of priorities which should be followed in drawing up a comprehensive programme of disarmament. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to quote the relevant portion of that document:

“The Conference welcomes the designation of the 1970s as the ‘Disarmament Decade’. The participating countries are determined to spare no efforts to ensure the success of the Disarmament Decade. They will co-operate closely among themselves and with other like-minded countries to help in the drawing-up of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. The Conference is of the opinion that the following general order of priorities should be followed in drawing up such a programme: (i) measures in the field of nuclear disarmament, such as a cut-off in the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes and the transfer of resources from the production of such materials to peaceful uses; a stoppage of the production of nuclear weapons; a comprehensive test ban; and a reduction and destruction of the stockpiles of nuclear weapons; (ii) other measures of priority in the disarmament field: an agreement prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of chemical and biological (bacteriological) weapons and their elimination from the arsenals of all nations, etc.; (iii) non-armament or confidence-building measures, such as a convention on the non-use of nuclear weapons, demilitarization of the sea-bed and the ocean floor beyond an agreed limit, the establishment of nuclear free zones, etc.”.

139. The views of the non-aligned States on the subject merit the serious attention of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in its further work.

140. Mr. PARDO (Malta): It is with great reluctance that I must clarify the position of my delegation on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.537 submitted by six delegations. We whole-heartedly support the drafting by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. We also find much that is valuable and commendable in the specific programme attached to draft resolution A/C.1/L.537. Nevertheless, this programme, in our opinion, does have serious deficiencies. We mentioned two fundamental points in our statement on 12 November [*ibid.*]: first, total disregard of the implications of scientific and technological advance, and secondly, insufficient demonstration of awareness of the impact of political and ideological conflicts outside the United Nations on disarmament negotiations.

141. The comprehensive programme before us also seems to be rather confused on a number of other points. For instance, the convening of regional disarmament conferences appears under the heading “Other measures of disarmament”. A disarmament conference, whether regional or global, is not, in our view, a measure of disarmament, it is rather a forum which can lead to the adoption of measures of disarmament but which can also lead, as has often happened in the past, to a more acute armaments race. Nor can we agree that restrictions on the

creation of foreign military bases is a measure of disarmament even within the very loose definition contained in the introduction of the comprehensive programme. This matter is essentially a political measure which may or may not be relevant to disarmament.

142. The term “conventional armaments” is used repeatedly in the draft comprehensive programme, but it is not defined. Does it mean all types of armaments that are not nuclear weapons, including new concepts of weapon systems? If this should be the case, section III. B, paragraph 2, of the comprehensive programme should be modified.

143. In his statement before this Committee [*1756th meeting*] the representative of New Zealand also pointed out that it is not sufficient to say that the principle of balanced disarmament should be kept in mind. This is a basic principle and it must be stressed.

144. Furthermore, the objective of the comprehensive programme is stated to be “to achieve tangible progress”. Is this truly all that we have in mind? There are also several sentences that are unclear. For instance, section II, paragraph 9, reads: “In disarmament agreements every effort should be made not to prejudice or prejudice juridical or other unresolved issues in any outside field.” What does this mean?

145. Notwithstanding these and many other deficiencies, we would vote in favour of the draft resolution if we were certain that the comprehensive programme before us had received thorough consideration and could not be improved. We have, however, too much respect for and confidence in the delegations that are authors of the programme to believe that this can be the case. Nor do we believe that consultations on this subject have been as exhaustive as perhaps might be desirable. Consequently, we would appeal to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.537 to accept a few modest amendments. Firstly, the deletion of the word “adequately” in operative paragraph 1, and the replacement of the word “all” by “some of the”. In other words, the sentence would read, “. . . is a broad and flexible document dealing with some of the principal aspects . . .”.

146. Secondly, we would suggest the reformulation of operative paragraph 2 to read as follows: “*Recommends* to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament that it further refine the comprehensive programme, taking into account relevant views and suggestions”.

147. Should these amendments be acceptable to the sponsors my delegation will support the draft resolution.

148. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): During my statement in this Committee on 2 November [*1749th meeting*] I outlined the Canadian position with respect to the draft comprehensive programme submitted by Mexico, Sweden and Yugoslavia [*A/8059-DC/233, annex C, sect. 42*]. I noted at the time that the draft programme appeared generally to place the issue in a logical framework and represented, in our view, a realistic effort to find an acceptable compromise formula.

149. In view of the comments made this morning I should like, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, to make a few

additional remarks. It should first of all be recalled that, in spite of the intensive and commendable efforts of some delegations, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, as the representative of Italy and others have reminded us today, was unable to come up with a programme for the Disarmament Decade in accordance with resolution 2602 E (XXIV), which was adopted last year. It is because this was not accomplished that the Assembly is now confronted with the formidable task of trying to reach agreement in the limited time available to us.

150. We continue to believe there is value in attempting to outline, for General Assembly endorsement, objectives and principles which might guide our collective efforts in this Disarmament Decade.

151. We note that the annex to draft resolution A/C.1/L.537 containing the outline of a programme for the Disarmament Decade, based on the working document submitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament by Mexico, Sweden and Yugoslavia, has, as a result of negotiations here, already been somewhat amended. Several of these amendments represent improvements in the programme from our standpoint; others, however, are less attractive to us. Some other examples have been cited by preceding speakers—points which do not meet entirely with their approval.

152. But let us be realistic. Experience has shown that neither here at the General Assembly nor at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has it been possible to arrive at a consensus on a programme that will please all, except in terms of general aims and principles. We believe that because of the comprehensive nature of such a programme it is bound to contain some parts that are unacceptable to some delegations, giving rise to the necessity of producing an outline acceptable to all.

153. Turning to the covering resolution itself, we are glad to note the specific reference in the preamble to all three valuable working papers on this subject presented to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament during its last session. I refer, of course, particularly to the papers presented by the representatives of Italy and the Netherlands [*ibid.*, sect. 38 and 5], as well as by the delegations of Mexico, Sweden and Yugoslavia. In one way or another all these documents have, it is quite true, contributed to the outline contained in the annex to the draft resolution before us.

154. With respect to operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.537, we consider that its recommendation to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament “to take the programme into account in its deliberations” is a realistic proposal which the First Committee is justified in making in its discussion of the Disarmament Decade, since it is impossible in our view to freeze any programme on disarmament at the very outset of the Decade. What we would hope this draft resolution will do is to provide the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament with more horse and perhaps more spur, and a little less harness.

155. The second part of this paragraph, which invites States to avail themselves of the programme as a guideline,

could be improved, I think, by changing it to read: “in developing guidelines for their disarmament activities”. I was very happy that this language was among the very helpful suggestions put forward by the representative of Italy. Some of the suggestions put forward by the representative of Malta regarding the preambular part might also help bring the resolution into accord with the inescapable reality that Governments themselves are ultimately responsible for developing guidelines and instructions in connexion with disarmament activities that will develop in the Disarmament Decade. These national guidelines would, however, at the same time, reflect such areas of agreement as may be forthcoming here or in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. But it has to be a developing concept, not a static one, as the representatives of Italy and Malta have pointed out.

156. During the next few days, Mr. Chairman, as you have suggested, we would hope that the sponsors of this draft resolution, in consultation with other delegations and particularly with the delegations of the co-Chairmen of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, who have a special responsibility in regard to the programme of that body, might try to arrive at suitable language which would make the draft resolution more generally and broadly acceptable.

157. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): My delegation would also like to offer some general comments on draft resolution A/C.1/L.537. Looking at the draft resolution as it stands, my delegation supports—shall I say? —the motivation behind it.

158. We feel that it could be useful for the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and for States to have at their disposal a set of priorities which would function as general guidelines and objectives along the path of negotiations. The programme annexed to this draft resolution has merit from such a point of view, and it is in this spirit that we can give general support to its purposes and aims.

159. It is also true, however, that despite the potential usefulness of developing such general guidelines most States will not normally be disposed to judge measures of disarmament in accordance with one standard and possibly selective list of criteria. They are going to judge them primarily from the point of view of their own circumstances and with their own security in mind.

160. Thus my delegation would not like to be understood as favouring the acceptance of the draft disarmament programme annexed to the draft resolution as the only guideline for disarmament negotiations or even as a full and complete guideline in itself. The fact is that, in the short time available, my Government has been unable to develop a considered attitude towards the important recommendations in the draft programme. We realize, too, in this regard that there are other such programmes before the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, and we feel that these also have merits of their own. And there may well be further developments in the future, as the representative of Italy has said. In fact, we would echo the emphasis that the representative of India has put on the need for the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to be

requested to continue its work, taking account of all suggestions and all developments that have been made and will be made in the future.

161. As it stands, the draft resolution, in its operative paragraph 1, declares that the annexed programme of disarmament deals adequately with all principal aspects of the arms race. We would not interpret the word “deals” in this context as meaning that it resolves those problems or that it sets out an adequate means for their solution. The only way of resolving problems of disarmament is through the negotiation and widespread acceptance of effective international agreements. In connexion with this paragraph we would favour the amendments submitted by the representative of Malta.

162. As regards the second part of operative paragraph 2, which has already been referred to by representatives, and which would invite States to avail themselves of the programme as a guideline for their own disarmament activities, we too would prefer something less specific. We

also were very happy to hear the suggested amendment put forward by the representative of Italy.

163. As for operative paragraph 3, this would include in the agenda of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly an item entitled: “Consideration of the progress attained with regard to the comprehensive programme of disarmament”. We would not interpret this as excluding the consideration of other developments in the field of disarmament that, as I said, may take place in the future. It would seem unlikely to my delegation that we have as yet reached a situation where we should in any way restrict our studies to the programme attached to this draft resolution.

164. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): When we resume our consideration of item 27 on Monday, 30 November, representatives will be free to refer to the draft resolutions or to any revised versions of them and to make known their views in statements either in the debate or in explanations of vote before or after the vote.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.