

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records *



FIRST COMMITTEE
32nd meeting
held on
Tuesday, 15 November 1977
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 32nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOATEN (Ghana)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 34: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 3473 (XXX) CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL I OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TLAHELCO): REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 38: INCENDIARY AND OTHER SPECIFIC CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WHICH MAY BE THE SUBJECT OF PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS OF USE FOR HUMANITARIAN REASONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 40: URGENT NEED FOR CESSATION OF NUCLEAR AND THERMONUCLEAR TESTS AND CONCLUSION OF A TREATY DESIGNED TO ACHIEVE A COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 41: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 31/67 CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL II OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TLAHELCO) (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 42: EFFECTIVE MEASURES TO IMPLEMENT THE PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DISARMAMENT DECADE (continued):

(a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 43: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE DENUCLEARIZATION OF AFRICA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 44: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN THE REGION OF THE MIDDLE EAST (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 45: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN SOUTH ASIA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 46: PROHIBITION OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND MANUFACTURE OF NEW TYPES OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION AND NEW SYSTEMS OF SUCH WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 47: REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

/...

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/32/PV.32
16 November 1977

ENGLISH

AGENDA ITEM 48: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE INDIAN OCEAN AS A ZONE OF PEACE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 49: CONCLUSION OF A TREATY ON THE COMPLETE AND GENERAL PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR-WEAPON TESTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 51: GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT (continued):

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

AGENDA ITEM 52: SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT: REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 53: WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 34, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46,
47, 48, 49, 51, 52 and 53 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: After hearing the speakers inscribed on my list for this morning, the Committee will take decisions on the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/32/L.4, A/C.1/32/L.5, A/C.1/32/L.10/Rev.1 and A/C.1/32/L.16.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I have the honour formally to place before the Committee the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.17, which refers to item 34 of the agenda of the thirty-second regular session of the General Assembly, entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3473 (XXX) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)". This draft resolution has been sponsored by the following 22 delegations: Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Dominican Republic, Surinam, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela and Mexico.

The first preambular paragraph recalls the three resolutions which the General Assembly has adopted on this subject, and the second preambular paragraph stresses the fact that the non-sovereign political entities located in regions covered by the Treaty of Tlatelolco may derive the benefits flowing from the Treaty by ratifying and approving Additional Protocol I, and particularly from those States which, de jure or de facto, are internationally responsible for those territories. In the last of the three preambular paragraphs we note with satisfaction that two of the countries to which Additional Protocol I is open for signature, namely, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, did in fact become parties to that Protocol in 1969 and 1971 respectively.

In resolution 3473 (XXX), the General Assembly appealed to the other two States that, according to the Treaty, could become parties to Additional Protocol I to sign it and ratify it as soon as possible. The draft resolution which I am formally submitting today takes note with satisfaction of the fact

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

that on 26 May of this year the President of the United States of America signed Additional Protocol I at a solemn ceremony held in Washington, to which the President of Mexico sent the present Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs as his personal representative.

On that occasion, which the President of the United States termed "a historic event", he said that the commitment entered into by the United States was of "world-wide significance" and he added:

"As I said in my inaugural speech, our last hope is that we shall be able totally to eliminate from this world any dependence on nuclear weapons, and I believe it to be significant and typical of our Latin American neighbours and of the countries of the Caribbean that, 10 years before this date, they themselves have already assumed this valuable commitment which stands as an example to the world."

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.17 deplore the fact that France, the only Latin country among the four to which the Additional Protocol I is open, is also the only country that has as yet not taken any step to become party to that Protocol.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

On the other hand, we have welcomed with interest the declaration of the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. de Guiringaud, when he addressed the plenary meeting of the General Assembly and stated that his Government wished to make a positive contribution to the General Assembly's preparation of a special session on disarmament and, during that session, to discuss in detail the general principles of disarmament which he himself had outlined in his statement.

I hope that one of the first acts confirming France's positive stand as announced by the Foreign Minister will be to heed the appeal in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution submitted by the Latin American States, to which I have been referring in this statement. That will allow us next year, when once again we discuss this same subject, to express feelings of gratification similar to those that at this time we have addressed to the United States on its signing of Additional Protocol I.

I also hope that in the very near future effect will be given to the paragraph in General Assembly resolution 2286 (XXII) in which the General Assembly recommended that:

"States which are or may become signatories of the Treaty (of Tlatelolco, Mexico) ... strive to take all the measures within their power to ensure that the Treaty speedily obtains the widest possible application ..."

What I have just outlined is all the more desirable today since the number of such States does not even represent one fifth of the number required for the Latin American instrument to come fully into force.

Mr. FARTASH (Iran): I am going to introduce the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.27. The world is poised today on the threshold of a new age, an age in which countries are moving more than ever before from the use of the diminishing and scarce traditional sources of energy to that of nuclear energy. With the knowledge of nuclear technology and considerable amounts of fissionable materials becoming more and more available, nuclear-weapon-free zones provide the best means by which non-nuclear-weapon States can, by their own initiatives and efforts, ensure the absence of nuclear weapons from their territories, and thus enhance their security.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

The proposal to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East has been advanced in that spirit. It seeks to ensure a complete absence of nuclear weapons in that sensitive area of the world and to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, the growing interest in the regional approach for containing the spread of nuclear weapons is, in a way, a reflection of the apprehension over the possible diversion of the nuclear material intended for peaceful uses to military uses. That, in a more positive sense, is a concrete response to the twin objectives of harnessing nuclear energy in the service of mankind and, at the same time, forestalling its misuse.

Several factors add additional weight and significance to that proposal in the political setting of the Middle East. In a region gripped by a legacy of rancour and adversity, the prospects of nuclear proliferation are of tremendous importance. Thus, given the political setting of the region, what is at stake is much more than a mere involvement of adversaries in a senseless nuclear-arms race. Moreover, as we review the recent events in the Middle East, we witness a growing awareness by the international community of the complexity of the issues involved.

There is at the same time a marked universal desire to avoid further complication of the existing issues and problems while moving towards a gradual easing of tensions in the region. A slow yet laudable drive is underway to move the area from a state of confrontation towards an era of coexistence.

While tremendous efforts are being made and the implements of diplomacy are at work to disentangle an already complex situation, the area can ill afford any additional complication in the form of the introduction of nuclear weapons. Given the prevailing atmosphere of mutual suspicion, the unfortunate development of such a situation would amount to a serious blow to the chances for peace. It would not only endanger the prospects of any perceived, just and durable settlement of disputes, but would also jeopardize the already shaky structure of a non-proliferation régime in the entire world.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

Three years after the proposal was officially launched in 1974, we are not any closer to our goal of sparing the area of the Middle East a possible nuclear-arms race. While we continue to be concerned about the basic causes underlying our original proposal, we can ill afford to lose sight of our hopes as to the future turn of events in our region. It is this sense of acute awareness of the current situation in the Middle East that has prompted the delegations of Bahrain, Egypt, Iran and Kuwait to produce a new draft resolution on that subject which I have the honour to introduce on behalf of the sponsors.

The present draft contains in essence the same elements incorporated in previous resolutions of the General Assembly on that subject. The first three preambular paragraphs recall the basic and significant features of past decisions. International desire for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the region of the Middle East has never been lacking. However, the level of consciousness as to the need for more resolute action has substantially been heightened during 1977. That significant fact has been recorded in a new preambular paragraph. Growing universal interest in a lasting peace has been matched during the past several months by the soaring level of apprehension over possible proliferation of nuclear weapons, particularly in that sensitive region of the world. Therefore, another new paragraph has been suggested to reflect that reality.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

It has generally been recognized that in trying to promote the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world due notice should be taken of their special political and social characteristics. The seventh preambular paragraph is an effort to give expression to that fact.

Recognition of the peculiarities and complexities of the region leads to a logical conclusion: the need to explore possibilities that might create momentum towards the goal of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. The eighth preambular paragraph is an attempt to underscore that idea. Given the intricate nature of this question, it is obvious that more than a traditional approach to solving the problem involved is required - hence our emphasis on the need to create momentum should be seen in that light.

While we are groping for possibilities to lead us along the tortuous road in the direction of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in our area we cannot afford to let ourselves be overtaken by irreversible situations. Time is a precious element in our race against possible developments that might have a direct bearing on the future course of events in our region. If we look upon the proposal under discussion as a serious undertaking then it is incumbent upon all of us to keep those eventualities in mind and to back up both our intention and determination by going well beyond the usual paying of lip service to this cause.

In the circumstances indigenous to that area there are certain basic requirements that first must be satisfied in order for the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East to receive a genuine push forward. The operative paragraphs of this draft resolution are intended to be responsive to those necessities.

To be sure, none of the operative paragraphs is new; they reiterate exactly what was said about this issue in last year's resolution. The difference is, however, their newly acquired significance in the light of ongoing developments in the Middle East region. Moreover, more attention is paid in the new draft to the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones and the connexion between such zones and a viable non-proliferation régime based on the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

It is an undeniable fact that, by carrying out the mutual obligations envisaged in the operative part of this draft, a gigantic step will be taken towards preventing the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons in that region, thus contributing significantly to the goals of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Besides, any positive action in that direction would go a long way in breaking the existing cycle of mistrust and mutual lack of faith which has so many times frustrated efforts to bring about peace, justice and security in that area.

I can hardly overemphasize the crucial importance of the role of the nuclear-weapon States, as stipulated in operative paragraph 3 of this draft resolution. Suffice it to say that the seriousness with which they approach this question, their action or lack of it, could well be construed as a test of the credibility of their non-proliferation policies throughout the world.

I turn now to operative paragraph 4 in which the sponsors have reiterated their invitation to the Secretary-General to continue to explore possibilities of making progress towards the goal of this draft resolution. The circumstances which, in our opinion, had led to the original invitation in previous resolutions are still valid; so is the context within which we envisage the role of the Secretary-General in this respect. I shall therefore refrain from reviewing them again.

In conclusion, I once again draw the attention of representatives to the observations that I have made, and, in the light of them, I commend this draft resolution for unanimous adoption by this Committee.

Mr. MIHAJLOVIC (Yugoslavia): Our statement will deal with the report of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament (A/32/41) and with the draft resolution relating to agenda item 52 (A/C.1/32/L.11).

We have listened carefully to the statements of a number of delegations which have presented their observations, ideas and expectations in connexion with the special session devoted to disarmament. That session should, according to the unanimous view, constitute a turning-point and create the necessary conditions making possible, on the basis of the documents it will adopt, a

(Mr. Mihajlovic, Yugoslavia)

more rapid progress towards solving the problem of disarmament as one of the major problems of our time.

The initiative of the non-aligned countries to convene a special session devoted to disarmament has met with the broadest support of the States Members of the United Nations because it reflected not only general concern over the unsatisfactory situation in the field of disarmament - which is characterized by an ever more intensive arms race, especially nuclear, and its extension to all regions - but also a firm resolve to take stock of the road covered by the international community in the field of disarmament and to determine new approaches and courses of future action.

We are particularly interested in that second aspect aimed at the formulation, as emphasized in the debate, of a new strategy for disarmament. Our thinking along those lines has very much in common with the views already expressed in this Committee. Actually, it seems to us that it is primarily a broadly manifested desire to make a constructive contribution to the success of the special session which has been clearly expressed in the work of the Preparatory Committee so far.

The special session on disarmament will also take place in a period preceded by intensive efforts by the USSR and the United States of America to reach further agreements within the context of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) negotiations and, together with Great Britain, with regard to the conclusion of a treaty on the comprehensive ban of all nuclear-weapon tests. Within the framework of those positive endeavours one should also mention the efforts of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) to bring to a close, as soon as possible, the negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons.

Those favourable circumstances encourage us to believe that - as some other speakers have also said - it is perhaps not too optimistic to expect the realization of some of those agreements before the special session. Such an outcome would encourage fresh efforts for achieving genuine disarmament measures and for creating a favourable atmosphere for a search for common solutions at the special session.

(Mr. Mihajlovic, Yugoslavia)

May I submit some of our preliminary thoughts on the contents of the document or documents of the special session on disarmament.

As regards the elaboration of one or several final documents for the special session, we favour the drafting of a single document. That is, as noted in the report, the prevailing view in the Preparatory Committee. However, we have an open mind and are ready to take into consideration other solutions, too, if such proposals enjoy broad support.

(Mr. Mihajlovic, Yugoslavia)

The decision accepted in principle by the Preparatory Committee to the effect that the final document of the special session should consist of four parts - namely, preamble, declaration on disarmament, programme of action and machinery for disarmament negotiations - meets the wishes of the members of and other participants in the work of the Preparatory Committee.

We believe that the preamble to the final document should be sufficiently comprehensive, as it should relate to the document as a whole. The preamble should reflect the current situation in connexion with the arms race and point to the harmful consequences of this race for international peace and security and the social and economic development of the world. It should also say something about the current efforts being exerted towards the achievement of disarmament measures and make an appraisal of the results achieved. We also feel that it will be necessary to mention in the preamble some basic principles relating to international peace and security, the role of the United Nations and the objectives and priorities of the international community in the field of disarmament.

The declaration on disarmament should embody, in our view, a sum of clearly formulated principles of long-term value. It should embody both those principles which have already proved their value and those whose universal value is being confirmed in everyday practice. We have in mind, for instance, principles that would affirm that the regulation of armaments and disarmament and the achievement of general and complete disarmament as a final objective are the common obligation and responsibility of all the States Members of the United Nations.

One of the principles should affirm that the measures for the limitation, reduction and elimination of armaments, until the attainment of the objective of general and complete disarmament, should be implemented in a balanced manner so that no State and no group of States should, in the course of this process, acquire military advantages over another State or group of States.

One of the important principles should relate to the need to ensure, in all the phases of implementation of measures, a balance of mutually acceptable rights and obligations as between nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear weapon States.

(Mr. Mihajlovic, Yugoslavia)

The principles should also emphasize that all types of weapons and systems of mass destruction that pose the greatest threat to international peace and the survival of mankind should enjoy the highest priority among all disarmament measures.

Conventional weapons, and especially the development of new systems of weapons which, by their effects, come close to nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, should find their place among the principles on disarmament, it being understood that a definitive solution with regard to the limitation and reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces can be found only within the framework of general and complete disarmament.

Among the principles particular stress should be laid on the fact that the development of science and technology constitutes a common heritage of mankind and cannot be the privilege of one country or group of countries only. Within this context it would be necessary also to incorporate the principle that all countries, without discrimination, should have access to scientific achievements and technology for the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes as one of the important sources of accelerated economic development, of the developing countries in particular, and to provide also that appropriate international safeguards be applied to all States without discrimination.

One of the important principles should relate to the role of the United Nations, in view of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and its competence with respect to disarmament and the regulation of armaments under the Charter. One of the essential conditions of establishing this role and strengthening the responsibility of the United Nations in this field is that it be kept informed of the results of disarmament negotiations in time and in an appropriate manner.

The programme of action, or programme of disarmament, in our opinion, should be sufficiently ambitious but also should be set within a realistic time framework which would make its implementation possible. We have in mind the drafting of a programme which in terms of its dynamics and priorities could be implemented in determined phases that would not be rigidly fixed in terms of time. Consequently, there should be, in the course of the drafting of the

(Mr. Mihajlovic, Yugoslavia)

programme of action in the Preparatory Committee, a clear conception of what is desired and what can be achieved within a relatively short period of time and what should be a long-term programme of action. In order to prevent such a programme from becoming a dead letter there should be provision for machinery for a periodic review of its implementation. The proposals submitted here suggest that such a review should be carried out at a second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in the course of 1981, or at an appropriate time. These proposals seem to us reasonable as they provide for the necessary continuity in maintaining the momentum that we wish to attain by convening the special session.

With regard to the machinery for disarmament negotiations, the Yugoslav delegation has explained its views on several occasions within the framework of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. It is not our intention to repeat them in detail here as we will have the opportunity to present our views in the course of the work of the Preparatory Committee and at the special session. At this time, however, we should like to lay particular emphasis on the importance that we attach to the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. In this respect the representative of Yugoslavia in this Committee, Ambassador Jaksa Petrić, said, inter alia, in his speech on 27 October 1977:

"The United Nations could play a very important role in elaborating negotiating principles, drawing up programmes of measures and actions, promoting and linking the present negotiating mechanisms, and intensifying its own activity by having, among other things, the Political Committee become a body dealing exclusively with problems of disarmament and international security, by reviewing the progress achieved as well as providing the necessary impetus for further negotiations ..."

(A/C.1/32/PV.13, p. 57)

We also believe that in the course of the preparatory work for the special session an analysis of the existing machinery for negotiations should be made in order to make it possible to draw definitive conclusions concerning its positive aspects and short-comings. In this the Yugoslav delegation will be guided by the well-known maxim that the best should never become the enemy of the good.

(Mr. Mihajlovic, Yugoslavia)

This means that everything necessary should be done, without hampering the disarmament efforts taking place within the existing bodies, such as the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, to make that Committee a true negotiating body and, by necessary improvements, more efficient and representative.

In concluding, may I once again emphasize the Yugoslav delegation's appreciation of the constructive and workmanlike approach that characterized the Preparatory Committee's sessions, the spirit of understanding that prevailed and the readiness of its members to co-operate most actively in the search for generally acceptable solutions, as well as our hope that it will successfully complete its work of drafting the declaration on disarmament and the programme of action. I also wish to express the hope that this Committee will adopt by consensus both the report of the Preparatory Committee and the draft resolution on the special session, which were so ably introduced by the representatives of Argentina and Sri Lanka respectively.

Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden): I have asked to be allowed to speak in order to introduce two draft resolutions: the first, under agenda item 51, regarding the publication of a disarmament periodical, and the second, under agenda item 38, with respect to incendiary and other specific conventional weapons which may be the subject of prohibitions or restrictions of use for humanitarian reasons.

Beginning with the publication of a disarmament periodical, I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.13 on behalf of the delegations of Austria, Denmark, Finland, Italy, Jordan, Norway, Romania, Tunisia, Venezuela and my own country.

By resolution 31/90 of 14 December 1976, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to implement as soon as possible the measures recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Review of the Role of the United Nations in the Field of Disarmament falling within his area of responsibilities. An important aspect of the recommended measures is the information activities of the United Nations.

It is our belief that the efforts towards disarmament of the United Nations and its Member States will be more fully supported by public opinion once people get better informed of the preconditions for our work and of possible results of alternative lines of development. Information activities have important implications for the possibilities to achieve results, but regrettably this aspect has in the past been rather neglected. Furthermore, we feel that Governments need to be kept informed about current facts and developments in the disarmament field. These should be brought to Governments, as well as concerned citizens, accurately but in very readable form.

The United Nations Disarmament Centre has prepared the first volume of the United Nations Disarmament Yearbook. It is the view of my delegation that this first yearbook will prove of great importance as a source of information in the field of disarmament. The elaboration of this volume is an impressive achievement, inter alia, considering the limited time that has been available for accomplishing it.

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Review of the Role of the United Nations in the Field of Disarmament also recommended that upon publication of the yearbook

(Mr. Hamilton, Sweden)

the General Assembly should consider publishing a disarmament periodical. The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.13 is intended to follow up the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations, which the General Assembly adopted last year by consensus.

As regards the text of the draft resolution, the first preambular paragraph refers to the General Assembly resolution of last December which endorses the proposals made by the Ad Hoc Committee. The second, third and fourth preambular paragraphs make reference to the 18 October 1977 report of the Secretary-General (A/32/276), in which he indicates the measures so far carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the General Assembly - in particular, the publication of the United Nations Disarmament Yearbook. The last preambular paragraph recalls that the report of the Ad Hoc Committee, which was adopted by consensus, contains a recommendation to the effect that the General Assembly shall consider publication of a disarmament periodical.

Operative paragraph 1 contains guidelines as to the material and information to be presented in the periodical. I may note that the substance of this paragraph is identical with the wording in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee. May I add that it is our understanding that the periodical should be published in all working languages of the Assembly, on an average of three numbers a year.

As regards the amendment to this draft resolution submitted by the representative of Saudi Arabia, Ambassador Baroudy, in document A/C.1/32/L.15, I wish to state that draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.13 limits itself on purpose to the carrying out of a decision in principle already taken last year by consensus: namely, to ask the Secretary-General to publish a disarmament bulletin. The thought-provoking idea on the preparation of a United Nations candid film on wars and their consequences does not fit in this context. The question of the bulletin has been carefully considered, first at the Ad Hoc Committee on the Role of the United Nations in Disarmament and later on at the thirty-first General Assembly session. This has not been the case with the proposal of the film, which in the opinion of the sponsors should be considered separately.

(Mr. Hamilton, Sweden)

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.13 would therefore appeal to the representative of Saudi Arabia to kindly reconsider his proposal. A withdrawal of the proposed amendment would considerably facilitate a decision on the disarmament bulletin. I need hardly stress the importance of the bulletin, which will have a major role to play, inter alia, in giving important information on the forthcoming special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

My delegation would like to believe that, in view of the fact that the recommendation by the Ad Hoc Committee regarding a periodical has already been approved by the General Assembly, there is reason for hope that the draft resolution can be adopted by consensus in this Committee.

Turning now to the second item of my statement, I have the honour today to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.29, on agenda item 38 - Incendiary and other specific conventional weapons which may be the subject of prohibitions or restrictions of use for humanitarian reasons - on behalf of the delegations of Austria, Finland, Jordan, Netherlands, Norway, Tunisia and my own country.

Before doing so, I see a need to dwell somewhat on the history of this item and to provide a brief summary of where we stand today after the conclusion of the Geneva Diplomatic Conference on International Humanitarian Law.

The major developments on the weapons issue have until now unfolded outside the immediate United Nations framework: namely, through the four sessions of the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law, in two expert Conferences at Lucerne and Lugano and in various technical and legal expert forums. The most substantive United Nations contribution to the item is found in the Secretary-General's reports on napalm and other incendiary weapons and in Governments' comments thereon. Apart from this, the evaluation of the weapons issue has merely been registered in this Committee of the General Assembly through the annual resolution on incendiary weapons and other weapons which may be deemed to cause superfluous injury. Those resolutions constitute important expressions of the world-wide desire to restrict or prohibit the use of

MP/tg

A/C.1/32/PV.32
24-25

(Mr. Hamilton, Sweden)

some particularly cruel weapons. They have not, however, dealt directly with the details of negotiations. This has very properly been left to the Diplomatic Conference, which at its first session established a separate committee on weapons to tackle that matter.

(Mr. Hamilton, Sweden)

Over the last five years considerable efforts have been made by many delegations to advance the weapons issue. My own country joined forces early with a number of neutral, non-aligned and other countries in presenting concrete proposals on a number of weapons, including incendiaries, mines, some small calibre projectiles, and certain blast and fragmentation weapons. Over the years these proposals have been further refined in the light of technical and medical research and international discussions.

Although the negotiations within the Diplomatic Conference have advanced at slow pace, we can today register that the last session of that Conference did finally achieve certain progress in the weapons field and managed to lay some ground for future work. Within a working group of the whole, veritable negotiations over different texts were pursued. In certain cases, drafting of nearly agreed texts was possible, whereas in others a certain stalemate persisted. Some information on the present state of affairs is presented in the Secretary-General's report (A/32/124). The Diplomatic Conference could thus register agreement on the desirability of banning the use of weapons which for their primary effect rely on the use of projectiles non-detectable by X-ray. This is hardly a major category of weapons - some even doubt its existence - but it was, nevertheless, a welcome statement of positive intentions.

Secondly, and more important, there was wide agreement on the need to protect the civilian population by restrictions on the use of landmines and booby-traps and by rules on the registration and neutralizing of such weapons. There was less progress with regard to incendiaries, including napalm. Here the problem is less technical than political and military. My country, together with many others, remains convinced that the phasing out of most kinds and uses of incendiaries is possible without upsetting any military balance. We remain hopeful that through some accommodation on all sides it will be possible to find a common ground for agreement.

With regard to small calibre projectiles we have to recognize that significant differences of opinion still prevail. The question is complex, both medically and technically. The question of especially injurious small calibre projectiles comes to the fore at the time when both military alliances seem to be getting ready to embark upon supplying their armed forces with new, efficient,

(Mr. Hamilton, Sweden)

light automatic rifles with projectiles of a smaller calibre than the current 7.76. In this process they may, however, have overlooked the need to avoid increasing the normal wounding power of the new weapon beyond the legitimate goal, which is to render an adversary hors de combat, but not to cause superfluous injury. This is the major reason why Sweden, together with others, has advocated a ban which would in essence restate the existing ban on the dum-dum bullet, from 1899, which forbids the use of bullets "which expand or flatten easily in the human body". Our proposals have not yet met with general approval.

This, however, is an issue which the international community should not allow to slip out of its hands. Both military alliances are capable of developing bullets with significant early tumbling and excessive wounding propensities. It seems vital that those who order and design munitions should take steps to avoid an escalation in the wounding power of one of the world's most common weapons. We are convinced that this can be done without impairing the military utility of the new weapons in question. If this is true, it is a development which we must encourage with or without agreements.

In order not to tax the Committee's collective patience too hard, I shall not deal with certain other weapons categories dealt with by the Diplomatic Conference. They will have to be taken up in due course in the negotiation we are jointly planning.

As a result of the discussions achieved in the Committee of Weapons of the Diplomatic Conference, there has emerged unanimous agreement that a special conference on weapons should be called in 1979 with a view to reaching agreements on various weapons categories and on a review mechanism.

The Diplomatic Conference having concluded its work, the question of specific conventional weapons which may be the subject of prohibitions or restrictions of use for humanitarian reasons has now reverted to the United Nations, where continued negotiation will have to take place.

At the Diplomatic Conference in Geneva, as well as in the informal consultations on this question held just before the First Committee started its work, and in the following negotiations about a draft resolution, there was and is unanimity that a conference should be held in 1979. There is also agreement that the conference should be carefully prepared, with regard both to procedural

(Mr. Hamilton, Sweden)

and to substantive matters. Regrettably, it has, in spite of the intensive efforts of the sponsors, not yet been possible to find common language for the setting up of a preparatory committee or preparatory conference. As is not unusual in such discussions, the main problems have related to the actual composition and procedures of a preparatory committee or conference.

As to the decision-making process I wish to underline that it must be the preparatory committee, or preparatory conference, which by itself take decisions in procedural matters. However, I would in this context say the following.

Sweden realizes that in matters of humanitarian concern which also have military and security aspects a careful balance must be obtained. Without prejudging the decision by the preparatory committee or conference, which has to decide on all questions of procedure, the formula must in my mind ensure that for all practical purposes and based on previous experience in this field, decisions on substance will always be the result of the widest possible agreement. If this is not the case, they will be impracticable.

Moreover, in our opinion it is not correct to say that the conference itself will adopt agreements that are binding for the participants. Protocols or conventions will of course be worked out in the usual manner. These will however not be binding for a State only by mere adoption at the conference. What is needed is that States sign and ratify the protocols or conventions.

The reason participants in the Diplomatic Conference - and for that matter other conferences of the same kind - have been striving for consensus was the awareness that if there were not such unanimity a large number of States would not sign and ratify the texts. Such awareness will certainly also guide future negotiations regarding the weapons we are discussing. I think we can all agree that in the opposite case the work of the conference would risk being meaningless.

Negotiations among the members of the First Committee have not so far been concluded. Nevertheless, because of the time limit for submitting proposals, the sponsors have found it necessary to introduce the draft resolution before the consultations have come to an end.

(Mr. Hamilton, Sweden)

However, we trust that in the coming days the ongoing consultations will be successful in meeting the different views of all parties concerned. In that manner we would be able to present a revised version of this draft resolution, which includes decisions to hold a conference in 1979 and appropriate arrangements for its preparation. These elements are, as all members can note, not included in the present draft. It is of course self-evident that these elements must appear in this year's resolution. Otherwise there will not be time enough to prepare the conference in 1979, on the convening of which there is unanimity. We sincerely believe that our points of view are not so far apart that they cannot be bridged. My delegation, on behalf of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.29 pledges to all members of this Committee support for renewed efforts to achieve this goal in the few days that we still have left to us.

Mr. CHAMPENOIS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I should like to introduce the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.26 submitted by my country on the regional aspects of disarmament which come under item 51 of the agenda.

For a year now, Belgium has repeatedly returned to the question of disarmament from the regional standpoint. At the thirty-first session my delegation set forth its ideas in the First Committee and communicated to Member States a memorandum on this subject.

The Belgian viewpoint is therefore widely known as are the reasons for which we submitted this year a draft resolution advocating a study of the regional aspects of disarmament. To a greater extent even than last year, we are convinced that the United Nations should devote systematic attention to the numerous possibilities offered by the regional approach to disarmament and armaments control as well as to appropriate measures to increase confidence and stability

Indeed, the arms race has steadily developed and has come to affect all parts of the world, including those which have hitherto been relatively spared this phenomenon. The report on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race is eloquent on this. Without denying the priority that we should continue to give to the reduction and ultimate elimination of weapons of mass destruction as well as to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons which constitutes by far the gravest threat to mankind, we note that the bulk of military expenditures in the world is being devoted to conventional weapons. Thus a considerable proportion of the world's resources is being devoted to military expenditures which end up being incommensurate with the requirements of the legitimate security of States and stability in international relations. Indeed, above a certain level armaments actually contribute to engendering insecurity, instability and uncertainty as to the real or presumed intentions of the various parties. There logically follows from this a chain reaction the process of which is liable to get out of control by involving whole areas in an arms race that can only prove ruinous. The process ends by assuming an absolutely inexorable character that it seems impossible to escape, at least at the level of each individual State. This phenomenon, which was for a long time the sad privilege of Europe, has now the tendency to spread throughout the

(Mr. Champenois, Belgium)

whole world precisely at a time when in East-West context détente has been manifesting itself, particularly in the form of bilateral and multilateral negotiations aimed at a balanced reduction of forces, and while the first measures designed to increase confidence in stability are being implemented.

Furthermore, the unprecedented increase in conventional weapons throughout the world is disturbing because it only serves to increase the risk of nuclear proliferation. Indeed, the arms race leads logically to the search for the perfect weapon which, far from being an absolute guarantee, serves by way of reaction only to increase the risks of a total conflagration.

The modern world is marked by a steadily growing interdependence. Events that occur in one part of the world are liable to affect, directly or indirectly, the whole of the international community. That is why disarmament - and primarily the halting of the arms race - is a matter within the responsibility of every State and every part of the world. That is why, in our view, the regional approach is not incompatible with the global approach. On the contrary, they are mutually complementary. The Belgian proposition entails no relaxation, therefore, of efforts that have been made towards general and complete disarmament. We know, moreover, that this remote objective can be really attained only to the extent to which disarmament itself will also have made progress on a regional basis. Furthermore - and this remark applies in particular to Europe - a substantial reduction in nuclear weapons can only be conceived of in terms of a balanced reduction of conventional weapons in circumstances that will provide an undiminished degree of security for each State.

The regional approach to disarmament is not really a new one. Our Organization has already considered it, particularly within the framework of a study on nuclear-weapon-free zones which has made it possible to indicate a number of possibilities and guiding principles. Certain regional agreements have already been concluded. I am thinking in particular of the Treaty of Tlatelolco on the denuclearization of Latin America. This is an entirely essential contribution to peace and security. Similar resolutions every year are aimed at the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world. We very much hope that it will be possible to embark upon that course advocated by them, provided that certain basic criteria are respected.

(Mr. Champenois, Belgium)

The report on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race also stresses, without going into detail, the opportunities offered by the regional approach, particularly within the conventional weapons field.

Negotiations are going on in central Europe with regard to a balanced reduction of forces, and the Helsinki Conference has made it possible to adopt a number of measures designed to increase confidence and stability. It therefore appears to us that numerous possibilities exist at the regional level which, in the light of the interdependence that I mentioned, would help to bring us closer to what remains our priority objective, namely, general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

The purpose of the Belgian proposal is to identify systematically what those possibilities are, to study their implications from the standpoint of general and complete disarmament and to define, as has been done for the nuclear-weapon-free zones, a number of guiding principles the application of which would be left to the initiative of the States concerned within the same region, because in the final analysis it is up to those States themselves to make an assessment, within their sovereignty, of the necessary conditions to assure their security.

I should like to be very clear about this last point. The United Nations cannot and should not replace States either in assessing the advisability of measures to be contemplated or in defining ways and means of implementing these measures. In this specific case, the role of the United Nations would be to draw up a reference document setting forth the various regional possibilities. These are the goals and the limits of the study proposed by Belgium, and they are to be found in the three operative paragraphs in the draft resolution before this Committee.

(Mr. Champenois, Belgium)

We also think that this work of reflection should be undertaken immediately so as to prepare, as specifically as possible the debate which the special session on disarmament will inevitably be devoting to those questions, depending on the various items of its agenda. Thus, the study proposed by Belgium should be staggered over successive stages, in such a way as to take account of decisions and recommendations which may emanate from that special session.

The initial phase would consist in calling on States to make known their views on the regional aspects of disarmament, including measures designed to increase confidence and stability. These national communications, in our view, constitute the point of departure required for any study. We have seen, indeed, that it was the task of States themselves to decide, in the exercise of their sovereignty, on the specific measures which could be adopted on the regional level. This is the purpose of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. These national communications should be available so as to be transmitted to the special session for the purpose of information. They could in this way contribute to the debate. This is the aim of operative paragraph 2.

The study proper would be undertaken subsequently. The Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of qualified governmental experts, could make a compilation of the various national communications. On this basis - and also in the light of the views and points made at the special session on disarmament - it should be possible to go into detail with regard to the data of the problem and to draw a certain number of conclusions and a number of lessons which would constitute for the international community a useful basis of reference. That is the purpose of paragraph 3. The scope and modalities of the proposed study would be determined in the light of the national communications which are sent in. Thus, having indicated the objective in terms of which these communications would be made, we propose that the final decision to embark on the study should only be taken at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Champenois, Belgium)

The draft resolution which we submit is drafted in very general terms. At this quite preliminary stage of reflection, Belgium does not intend to prejudge what might be the conclusions of the study it proposes, without Governments having had first of all the opportunity to make known their views with regard to the merits and difficulties of the regional approach.

However, in anticipation of what might be the national contribution of Belgium, I shall state briefly what in our view might be the important points about regional approach.

It seems to us, first of all, that the needs of security are more easily understood among States in the same region. It is easier to identify the elements of negotiation at the regional level, or at the level of a group of States, whether they be measures of limitation, of reduction or any other measures designed to increase confidence.

The regional approach has the merit of offering great flexibility of application. Indeed, the prospects for agreement vary from one region to another, depending on the political and military factors and, in particular, on the existence of conflicts. It is obvious that in these cases regional measures cannot be envisaged outside a preliminary political settlement. However, a situation peculiar to a given region could at a certain time promote certain types of specific measures, when they might be inapplicable in other parts of the world or at the world level.

Now the regional approach offers possibilities in the nuclear and conventional weapon fields. I have already mentioned nuclear-weapon-free zones which, in appropriate circumstances, could serve as an effective means of strengthening security while contributing to non-proliferation. It is also at the regional level that the problems posed by negative guarantees can be the best appreciated, and the better identified.

Within the conventional weapon field, where the development of the arms race has escalated as never before, States in the same region could agree on a definition of armament norms, or norms of non-armament, which would ensure their security without, however, obliging them to incur expenditures which are becoming ever more intolerable burdens in comparison with the economic and social needs which have to be met. Thus these States could agree on a reciprocal basis

(Mr. Champenois, Belgium)

on measures of limitation or non-acquisition of certain types of weapons, the appearance of which in a given region might have a destabilizing effect. States outside the region considered could of course be invited to respect the norms laid down there, particularly with regard to the transfer of weapons.

It has been said that the regional approach could offer numerous possibilities within the realm of measures designed to increase confidence and stability. Some of these measures - and some of them, we must acknowledge, are still in an embryonic stage - were adopted within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Experience has shown that they effectively contribute to an improvement of the political climate in a given area. Of course, confidence measures are still not themselves true measures of disarmament, but we know how much disarmament is a matter of the prevailing climate, and hence the importance of defining, within the military realm, conduct and rules of conduct liable to improve the political environment.

These are some of the possibilities offered by the regional approach. In our view, they should be studied in a systematic way because they can make an effective contribution to the development of conditions which will bring us closer to general and complete disarmament. Without advocating any particular solutions, and without wishing to replace States themselves in decisions which ought to be theirs alone in the exercise of their sovereignty, and in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, the General Assembly could do some useful work by ensuring that the international community is provided with a reference document indicating the possibilities offered by regional approaches, which perhaps have not been sufficiently explored hitherto.

The draft resolution before the Committee is the result of a long series of contacts. It has been repeatedly amended so as to take account of the views, suggestions and points made. We think that in its present form it does largely meet these concerns. We should like to believe, therefore, and we certainly hope, that it will be widely approved.

Mr. de LAIGLESIA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): As I pointed out in the course of the general debate when discussing disarmament issues, the Spanish delegation considers that the possibilities opened up by the regional approach to disarmament in all its aspects is of major importance. It is for that reason that we warmly support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.26, sponsored by Belgium.

Similarly, pursuant to that line of reasoning, we agree entirely with the two draft resolutions contained, respectively, in documents A/C.1/32/L.17 and L.18 regarding the broadening of the Treaty of Tlatelolco which we trust will take place very soon.

Moreover, as we all know, Spain is a member of the Committee on the world disarmament conference, and we therefore are one of the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.25.

We are also sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.16 which refers to the holding of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and which calls for the preparation of a report to study the relationships that exist between disarmament and development. To that end it is proposed that a group of experts be set up to deal with the matter, and we wish to offer our co-operation with such a group.

Finally, the Spanish delegation wishes to support the initiative of a number of countries interested in convening a conference to limit the use of incendiary and other specific conventional weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious, in accordance with the decision taken by the Diplomatic Conference on International Humanitarian Law in its resolution 22 (IV), which appears in document A/C.1/32/L.29. We believe that that is an extremely interesting draft. However, in light of what was said at this meeting by the representative of Sweden, we would hope that it would be reinforced by specific measures that might lead to the convening and the preparation of that conference since we attach enormous importance to it and intend to take an active part in it.

Mr. NEAGU (Romania): I take this opportunity, on behalf of the Romanian delegation, to make a few comments on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.26 just introduced by the representative of Belgium. One of the fundamental conclusions - and I should say the common denominator - of all the opinions expressed during the debate in our Committee on disarmament consists in the generally acknowledged necessity of adopting, on a world-wide scale and with the participation of all States, effective measures for general and complete disarmament - first of all, nuclear disarmament.

My Government strongly supports that idea and our delegation has had the opportunity to present its views concerning the place and the role that the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament can and is expected to play in the launching of a genuine disarmament process on a world-wide level. In our view, the attainment of the final goal, which is that of general and complete disarmament, requires not only efforts undertaken on a world-wide scale but also of regional and even individual actions. By individual actions we mean that the big, strongly armed countries can proceed unilaterally to some troop and armaments reduction. Such efforts, far from being detrimental to the actions undertaken on a world-wide scale, represent in our view a logical, complementary move likely to exert a positive influence and to stimulate the whole process of military disengagement and disarmament.

A regional approach that would be a part of the endeavours of a universal character and would be accepted by all the States from a certain area presents in our view several specific advantages. Let us mention a few. First, the working out and adoption of disarmament measures are undertaken under comparatively homogeneous geopolitical conditions. Secondly, the security interests of the States are in general similar or even common. Thirdly, the number of States engaged in negotiations and prepared to become parties to the potential agreement is rather low. Fourthly, the States involved know each other well and are connected not only by their geopolitical situation but also by their common history. Besides, more than once a basis has already been provided by bilateral and multilateral agreements of good-neighbourliness and co-operation.

During the discussions on disarmament issues in this Committee, many delegations have welcomed the idea of creating nuclear-weapon-free zones in different areas of the world and have emphasized their importance for the

disarmament process as a whole. The denuclearization of Latin America under the Tlatelolco Treaty confirms the importance and utility of the regional approach to nuclear disarmament. The many proposals set forth by several States throughout the years, some of which have become items on our agenda, bear witness to the fact that the Member States are deeply interested in the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

In our delegation's view, the success obtained in the regional approach to nuclear disarmament justifies and requires further steps aimed at strengthening mutual confidence and stability and reducing the armed forces and armaments. That necessity is particularly felt in Europe where more than in any other part of the world there is at present an unprecedented concentration of armed forces and modern armaments, including nuclear weapons. In Europe there are about 8 million troops, more than 45,000 tanks, more than 15,000 military aircraft and some 11,000 tactical nuclear payloads.

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

It is on that continent that the two military blocs - the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact - are confronting each other. It is also on the territory of many European States that foreign military bases and foreign troops are located. Mankind can never forget that it was on the European continent too that were started the two world conflagrations which took place in our century, taking a toll of tens of millions of victims and causing immense material damage in all fields of human activity and irretrievable losses of art treasures of the nations.

Through the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, signed two years ago in Helsinki, some measures have been adopted with a view to strengthening mutual confidence among the participating States. Those measures include notification of major military manoeuvres, exchange of observers at those manoeuvres, notification of major military movements, and restraint in military activities. It is worth mentioning that new efforts are at present being made in Belgrade to consolidate and develop those measures designed to promote confidence and stability.

However, we deem that that is only a beginning which must be continued and developed by proceeding resolutely to effective military disengagement and disarmament measures. To attain that goal vigorous steps are required to secure the withdrawal of nuclear arms from the territory of the European States which do not possess such weapons and to conclude a treaty that would establish obligations for the participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe to refrain from the first use of nuclear weapons.

Effective measures should also be taken for dismantling military bases and withdrawing within their national boundaries the foreign troops now stationed on the territory of other European States. At the same time, untiring efforts are required by all the European States to achieve a significant reduction of armed forces, weaponry and military expenditures. An increased need is felt nowadays to do everything possible to bring about the simultaneous dismantling of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty and, as a first step in that direction, the suppression of their two military organizations.

It goes without saying that stimulation by the United Nations General Assembly of any measures taken by States towards military disengagement

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

and disarmament on regional levels would represent an important contribution towards the attainment of the ultimate goal, which is general and complete disarmament.

In the light of these considerations of principle, the Romanian delegation appreciates the initiative of the Belgian delegation in presenting the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.26 concerning regional disarmament, and my delegation will vote in favour of its adoption. Romania is ready to join other interested States in making a constructive contribution so that the efforts made on a world-wide scale within the United Nations might be completed with effective steps towards military disengagement and disarmament on a regional level, especially in Europe.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.18 relating to Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco), which I now have the honour of officially introducing to the First Committee, is a document sponsored by the 22 Latin American delegations listed in it. Those delegations have also sponsored the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.17, which I introduced earlier this morning.

Draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.18 recalls the previous resolutions of the General Assembly on this subject, nine of which call on the nuclear-weapon States and urge them to ratify Additional Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. The preamble of this draft resolution also reiterates the Assembly's firm conviction - and that conviction is particularly timely in the light of the contents of resolution 3472 B (XXX) of 11 December 1975 - that, for the maximum effectiveness of any treaty establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone, the co-operation of the nuclear-weapon States is necessary, and that such co-operation should take the form of commitments likewise undertaken in a formal, legally binding international instrument, such as a treaty, convention or protocol.

After recalling with particular satisfaction that four of the five nuclear-weapon States have already become parties to Additional Protocol II of the Treaty, the draft resolution again urges the fifth to sign and ratify that Protocol.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

For more than three years now the Soviet Union has stood in a position of absolute isolation on this matter. So far as the sponsors of this draft resolution are concerned, the refusal of that nuclear-weapon State to heed the repeated appeals of this Assembly is incomprehensible in view of the fact that, among the five States to which Additional Protocol II was constantly open, it was precisely the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which has most frequently advocated - and sometimes through its highest leaders and spokesmen - its own unreserved support of the idea of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The most recent example of that dichotomy between words and deeds can be found in another draft resolution, A/C.1/32/L.2, submitted to the First Committee more than a month ago. In that draft resolution the delegation of the Soviet Union itself proposes that the General Assembly solemnly urge "on behalf of all States Members of the United Nations" that:

"All non-nuclear-weapon States should establish nuclear-weapon-free zones, which may cover entire continents or large geographical areas, as well as groups of States or individual States, and nuclear States should respect the status of such nuclear-free zones." (A/C.1/32/L.2, para. 6)

In draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.18 there is a reference to that proposal by the Soviet Union which, furthermore, coincides with the position that has been stated by that country for a number of decades. In proof of this, suffice it to recall that the two commitments basically inherent in Additional Protocol II as far as the nuclear weapon States are concerned when signing and ratifying it are identical to those which the Soviet Government spontaneously announced its readiness to assume in 1966. At that time, as can be seen in a document of what was then the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, ENDC/167, Mr. Kosygin, the then Chairman of the Council of Ministers of his country, said, among other things, that the Soviet Union was ready to commit itself not to use nuclear weapons

"... against non-nuclear States ... which have no nuclear weapons in their territory." (A/6390. annex)

This, as is well known, is a requirement that is completely fulfilled by the States parties to the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Mr. Kosygin went on to say that the Soviet Union was prepared to assume an obligation "to respect the status of any denuclearized zones which may be established" on the sole condition that "other nuclear Powers" committed themselves to act in the same way. This requirement too has been complied with fully as far as the militarily denuclearized Latin American zone is concerned.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.18 therefore have reason to hope that the imminence of the eighth special session of the General Assembly, which is to be totally devoted to disarmament, will provide an additional incentive to the Soviet Union finally to heed the repeated urgings of the most representative

organ of the international community and to sign and ratify Additional Protocol II to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco).

Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union attaches great significance to the problem of prohibiting the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, viewing it as an extremely urgent task and believing that to postpone a decision on it is inadmissible. I should like to remind the Committee that, guided by this, the Soviet Union in 1975 appealed for the inclusion in the agenda of the thirtieth session of the General Assembly as an important and urgent matter of the item on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, and submitted an appropriate draft treaty on this question.

The General Assembly adopted a resolution which, in particular, requested the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to consider this proposal in the light of the draft treaty on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons submitted by the Soviet Union. Two years have elapsed since then and we have to acknowledge that the Committee on Disarmament has done quite a lot of, in our view, useful work. With the participation of highly qualified governmental experts various aspects of the problem of the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons have been considered. As a result of an exchange of views in which an increasing number of participants in the Committee on Disarmament were involved it proved possible to narrow down differences to a certain extent. In particular, it proved practicable to reach an understanding that in individual cases when concrete forms and types or systems of weapons of mass destruction appeared it was possible to prepare appropriate drafts of agreements or treaties. As we know, such consultations on the question of the prohibition of radiological weapons are being conducted at the present time and there are grounds for believing that those consultations will be successful.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

In the course of the work of the Geneva Committee, certain difficulties were encountered, particularly with regard to the question of defining the term "new forms and systems of weapons of mass destruction". Also, certain differences emerged in the approach to other questions, particularly the problem of control. But I think I have every reason to state that no one had any doubts about the urgency and importance of the question of banning the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction.

That is entirely understandable because in actual fact every day demonstrates the possibility of developing and manufacturing new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction even more fearful and deadly than those which already exist. It suffices to familiarize oneself with press reports and with statements of authoritative specialists - scientists - to realize once again the real urgency of this problem.

Guided by that consideration, the Soviet Union, together with the German Democratic Republic and Hungary, has become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution submitted in document A/C.1/32/L.4, which, in the light of the quite considerable experience of the two years of negotiations on this subject in the Committee on Disarmament, has confirmed the goal set forth in General Assembly resolutions 3479 (XXX) and 31/74, that is, the preparation of the text of an international treaty on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction.

We believe that we should continue to pursue that goal until we succeed in producing an acceptable agreement.

As we know, another draft resolution has been submitted on this subject in document A/C.1/32/L.5. It contains a number of provisions to which we have no objection, in general. However, in our view, it is too general in character and the main thing is that it bypasses the question of the need for preparing a binding agreement that would prohibit the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Nor does it take into account the fact that in the Committee on Disarmament a certain amount of work has already been done, with the assistance, as I said, of highly qualified governmental experts, including some from countries which are co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5.

In substance, what is being proposed here is that we forget the work that has been accomplished and leave that very important work half done. The co-sponsors of these draft resolutions held consultations in order, if possible, to work out a single draft, and we should like to take this opportunity to point to the constructive nature of those consultations and to the certain degree of readiness on the part of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5 to seek an acceptable text.

Unfortunately, I must say that those consultations were not successful. In the course of them, the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4 expressed their readiness to see to it that a compromise resolution would include an number of provisions of both the preambular and operative parts of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5. At the same time, the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4 considered and continue to consider that the draft resolution on the agenda item on the preparation of an agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons should distinctly call for a continuation of negotiations for the conclusion of a general, binding agreement.

We consider that the draft resolution cannot disregard the great amount of work done by the Committee on Disarmament, with the assistance of qualified experts, on reaching accord on the text of a mutually acceptable agreement, or the fact that this work should - in the light, of course, of the priorities which exist in the Committee on Disarmament - be continued. It is necessary, in our common interests, for it to be brought to a successful conclusion.

The Soviet delegation believes that the absence from draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5 of the key provision I have mentioned makes too obscure the formulation of the task of the Committee on Disarmament with regard to the prohibition of new weapons of mass destruction and, therefore, from our viewpoint, does nothing to promote a solution of this problem.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

On the other hand, the need for a radical solution to the problem of prohibiting the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons is met by the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.4, and I appeal to delegations to support that draft resolution.

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands): I should like to ask a question. In draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.13, which was introduced this morning by the representative of Sweden, a proposal is made to start the publication of a disarmament periodical. That very interesting proposal followed from the recommendations made by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Review of the Role of the United Nations in the Field of Disarmament. Although draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.13 gives some information about the possible contents of the disarmament periodical, my delegation - and, I suppose, others also - would be very interested to hear a little bit more about the set-up and the contents of the periodical. For example, the relationship between the Disarmament Yearbook and the periodical is not completely clear to my delegation. For example, what would be the size of the periodical, how often would it appear, what kind of articles would it contain, and so on?

I should like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, to invite the head of the United Nations Disarmament Centre, Mr. Björnerstedt, to provide us with some more information before we proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.13. That would perhaps be a good occasion also to discuss the interesting proposal in draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.15 made by Ambassador Baroody of Saudi Arabia to make a film on the scourges of war. We share the motives of Ambassador Baroody to a great extent.

(Mr. Meerburg, Netherlands)

However, I have the feeling that perhaps films of this kind already exist, although I do not know. I should be very happy to receive relevant information - for example from OPI - on this question. I wonder also whether the issue which Ambassador Baroody proposed does not fall within the activities of UNESCO.

The CHAIRMAN: With regard to the information sought by the representative of the Netherlands, the Secretariat has made note of it and will reply tomorrow morning.

I should like to announce the following additional sponsors of draft resolutions: A/C.1/32/L.4, the Byelorussian SSR and Mongolia; A/C.1/32/L.11, Thailand; A/C.1/32/L.16, Afghanistan, Mauritius and Peru; A/C.1/32/L.20, Byelorussian SSR; A/C.1/32/L.21, Venezuela; A/C.1/32/L.25, Jordan; A/C.1/32/L.27, Qatar; A/C.1/32/L.28, Jordan.

Because of the lateness of the hour, I suggest that we adjourn now and vote on draft resolutions this afternoon. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that it is so agreed.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.