



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 25th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 30 TO 45, 120 AND 121 (continued)

- General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Canales (Chile)
Mr. Handl (Czechoslovakia)
Mr. Fein (Netherlands)
Mr. Ortiz de Rozas (Argentina)
U Saw Hlaing (Burma)
Mr. Moultrie (Bahamas)
Mr. Farrugia (Malta)

* 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.1/34/PV.25
2 November 1979

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 30 TO 45, 120 and 121 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. CANALES (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): In an earlier statement in the current debate on disarmament issues we dealt only with questions relating exclusively to nuclear proliferation, methods of verification, denuclearized zones, nuclear security, bilateral talks on the limitation of offensive weapons and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. We pursued this course in order to demonstrate the priority that our country attaches to this stage of disarmament since it will give confidence gradually to continue with the elimination of other types of weapons and since the devastating power of nuclear weapons would one way or another reach all peoples on earth. Now we shall deal with other items on the agenda that are of interest and concern to the international community as a whole.

Since our country is not a member of the Committee on Disarmament, it is not possible for us to take part in negotiating activities that decide upon and give shape to the juridical instruments that will lead to the final objective of general and complete disarmament.

Chile is traditionally a peaceful country. It has organized its national security without detracting from its social and economic development, which will give us the means to solve the more pressing problems besetting our population. The organization and training of Chile's armed forces guarantee compliance with the objectives of a country that has no aspiration other than to maintain internal order, which is the fundamental basis of our progress, and which, externally, serves to protect the inviolability of our territorial integrity and our national sovereignty, two of the fundamental principles of the Charter of our Organization.

In the light of this concept of security we support and shall continue to support every multilateral and regional disarmament initiative. We aspire to general and complete disarmament under strict international control as the sole real

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

guarantee that global security will be maintained and that the co-operation to which all peoples aspire will be made effective while respect is maintained for the principle of juridical equality and equity, which is the fundamental basis of relations between States.

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

In chapter IV of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, a new structure was given to the machinery for the implementation of disarmament measures, in both the deliberative and the negotiating bodies. It was felt that its new method of operation would provide us with the speed that our work requires. It would be premature, however, to weigh the results achieved to date, as it would be to attribute the lack of progress in stemming the arms race to inappropriate structures. That would be a hasty, unfair judgement, since there are many other factors influencing the increase in the means with which States strengthen their national security - in particular, the great Powers, which have responsibility for maintaining international security.

We wish to reiterate some of these factors which have a negative influence on the achievement of disarmament: first, the lack of confidence among States and the absence of a political will to carry out disarmament measures; secondly, the arms race impelled by the concept of peace based on the balance of power and the immense scientific and technological capacity to improve the quality of armaments; thirdly, the tensions in various regions of the world which have been maintained for some time and with the interference of other countries involved in the particular dispute; fourthly, the new methods of struggle, such as terrorism and armed subversion prevailing in various countries in the world, which are used as coercive action for ideological penetration.

The Disarmament Commission met this year, for the first time, and discussed a number of subjects. We hope its future work will be fruitful.

The present session of the First Committee, devoted solely to disarmament questions, appears to us to be an excellent initiative, since we shall be able to submit to the General Assembly draft resolutions which set priority tasks for the Committee on Disarmament. In volume I of that Committee's report (A/34/27) we see the results achieved at its 1978 sessions. We appreciate the effort involved in the elaboration and adoption of the rules governing its operations.

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

We turn now to the main agenda items and the results obtained in respect of the following issues: first, prohibition of nuclear tests, secondly, chemical weapons; thirdly, weapons of mass destruction and radiological weapons.

As to the prohibition of nuclear tests, a subject we dealt with at length in our earlier statement, we regret that no positive results have been achieved in such an important task, despite the efforts made for so many years. As a result the proliferation of this type of weapon continues in its two main dimensions.

The Committee will be pursuing its work during its 1980 session, but only when all nuclear States are willing to negotiate that treaty will genuine success be within reach.

Nor was it possible to reach agreement on ways and means of tackling the question of chemical weapons and, in particular, the establishment of an ad hoc working group for the purpose.

These disarmament measures also have high priority. For seven years now, the General Assembly has been adopting resolutions urging the conclusion of bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Those weapons of mass destruction have enormous devastating effects and can be built, on a larger or smaller scale, by all States. We have already had experience with their use in important conflicts. We acknowledge that this is a highly complex problem because of the existing stockpiles of this type of weapon, the delay in their elimination and the lack of confidence in verification measures. This would be the first time that we could prohibit and eliminate a particular type of weapon. Regrettably, this is no easy task, and the Committee on Disarmament must do all in its power to achieve this in a short space of time.

We consider, moreover, that the entire international community must participate actively in that treaty, especially in the matter of co-operation in verification measures.

This type of weapon is second in priority to nuclear weapons, in terms of destructive capacity, but presents the same problem, in the sense that its elimination should not hinder its peaceful uses, which are very broad and beneficial.

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

Radiological weapons are another type of weapon of mass destruction of concern to the international community. Although we have had no experience with their use in past wars, we do know that their effects are catastrophic and that the accumulation of secondary radioactive products is increasing annually at great speed.

The Committee on Disarmament had before it for consideration a large number of useful documents - in particular, documents CD/31 and CD/2, submitted, respectively, by the delegations of the United States and the Soviet Union, containing their joint proposal on the major elements of a treaty on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons. Regrettably, only a preliminary debate was possible, and it was decided to continue consideration of the joint proposal at the next annual session.

We emphasize that all our efforts and those of the international community should focus on halting the arms race, on weapons of mass destruction, nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, radiological weapons and every other kind of weapon having the same effect.

With reference to environmental warfare, which may have unforeseeable consequences, unfortunately the only achievement was a convention to restrict and regulate its use, but not to prohibit it, as would have been more useful, since it would have prevented its eventual use.

If we want general and complete disarmament, under no circumstances can we allow the emergence of new, modern means of warfare. Nuclear weapons are capable of destroying all mankind; the other weapons of mass destruction can wreak devastation in the theatres of operation of a world conflict and cause heavy losses of human life in local conflicts.

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

For this reason, their elimination takes priority in a plan of action for disarmament. We hope that in the decade of the 1980s we shall achieve these objectives in the field of disarmament.

However, military expenditures, which in 1978 rose to the incredible sum of \$450 billion, serve only to show that, instead of achieving positive results in the field of disarmament, the actions of the great Powers and the countries which produce conventional weapons run counter to the aspirations of the international community. We all hope that the requirements of national security will be met without having to increase military expenditures to the detriment of economic and social development.

Likewise we are concerned at the fact that third world countries are beginning to develop their ability to become producers of arms and military equipment. It is already possible today to obtain fighter planes, tanks and warships in other markets. Because of this, studies by the Committee on Disarmament on the regulation of the transfer of weapons should be initiated without delay. Any delay in adopting appropriate measures would contribute substantially to the promotion of the world arms race.

Our delegation does not wish to repeat the innumerable and awesome descriptions about what could be done in the world if those 450 billion dollars which are spent annually on military activities were to be invested to promote the international co-operation necessary to combat hunger, extreme poverty, disease and illiteracy in the poorest countries of the world. This process of equating security with development is, in our view, very enlightening, but of little effect in limiting, reducing and eliminating the arms race which is encouraged by international distrust and the frequent violations of the basic principles of the Charter of our Organization.

The practical and desirable thing to do is to hold further deliberations, to denounce actions contrary to peace and to negotiate more rapidly all pending treaties and those high-priority disarmament matters submitted to the Committee on Disarmament, where bilateral and multilateral proposals conducive to real disarmament should be concentrated.

We are informed in the report of the Committee on Disarmament of the proposal of the delegation of Italy to discuss an additional protocol to the 1967 Outer Space Treaty with a view to preventing an arms race in outer space (A/34/27, para. 58 (a)). We emphasize this aspect, because in various

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

earlier statements by our delegation both in the Disarmament Commission and in the Outer Space Committee we have stressed the dangers of the militarization of outer space.

It is very useful for representatives to be aware of the statistics provided in its 1979 yearbook, Armaments and World Disarmament, by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI): 80 per cent of the earth's artificial satellites are launched into space for military purposes. They carry out military intelligence missions, aid navigation, provide warning of missiles launched into outer space and data for improved precision of launchings: in short they supplement the effectiveness of land forces and enhance accuracy and destructiveness in warfare (Chapter 4, "Military Use of Outer Space").

The peaceful uses we are seeking to regulate, such as remote sensing, direct television broadcasts, the delimitation of outer space, and so forth, are matters which have been discussed for many years without actually considering their implications for military uses, which would totally transform the studies carried out to date. If we do not consider this question, we shall be contributing to the promotion of the arms race and its development in new dimensions never experienced in previous wars.. The space super-Powers possess the experience which is indispensable for achieving greater co-operation in these studies and their application to new treaties or conventions in this field.

We cannot disregard the fact that this offensive military use of outer space has compelled countries to react with a new system of defensive weapons, the "killer" or anti-satellite weapons. In a world war, these would wipe out progress achieved in the peaceful uses of outer space, so beneficial to mankind, because they would make no distinctions between satellites used for peaceful or military purposes. The progress of science and technology in this field has been enormous. From it has emerged environmental warfare, the use of which, even if regulated by a convention, could not be restricted once war broke out. My delegation believes that each year new military applications will appear for outer space as well as new ways of using space for military purposes.

Can States place their trust in the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States when there exist spy satellites which can learn without restriction our natural resources, our military objectives and all our activities? Over 50 per cent of all satellites have been launched for the purpose of reconnaissance. They provide the photographic and electronic

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

reconnaissance for early warning systems and means of surveillance over the oceans. They have been used to observe areas of conflict in various regions of the world.

We also wish to refer on this occasion to conventional weapons. The great destructive capacity of weapons of mass destruction distracts us as a rule from the analysis of the weapons in most general use, conventional weapons. It is these that most greatly affect the third world countries, which, fortunately, do not possess the technological resources for acquiring weapons of mass destruction. However, the sophistication of fighter planes, warships and weaponry for land combat has made regional conflicts more cruel and has influenced increases in military budgets, delaying the possibility of intensifying social and economic development.

For this reason we believe that the principles of the Charter should be more strictly applied daily, and that the developing countries should settle their disputes by recourse to the principle of peaceful settlement, thus safeguarding their national security.

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

Conventional weapons represent 80 per cent of military expenditure. Thus the earliest achievement of the final disarmament objective, namely, general and complete disarmament under strict international control, to which my country adheres unconditionally, is a matter of urgency.

We have been struggling for 34 years to achieve positive progress in this field, but the results, scarce though they are, have been most frustrating. But we shall never lose hope that in the long run reason will prevail and that we shall achieve a lasting and durable peace. This is the fundamental task of our Organization and all delegations present are trying to find a more direct path leading to the achievement of our final objective.

It is also one of our tasks to mobilize world opinion against the arms race. That is why we feel that it is useful to determine the stages that will allow us to do so and to intensify disarmament studies. I refer, for example to commemoration of Disarmament Week, the holding in 1982 of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the preparation of a world disarmament conference, and so on.

In this final contribution to our debate on disarmament, we feel that we have dealt with most of the issues. We reiterate yet again our strict adherence to all disarmament measures which may be adopted in the various bodies of the new disarmament machinery established by the tenth special session of the General Assembly in 1978 in accordance with its Final Document.

At the same time, we hope that all the resolutions submitted will set tasks for the Committee on Disarmament and not merely pay lip service to the cause of peace. Pious wishes do not contribute to disarmament but merely give the appearance of peaceful intentions, thus giving a distorted image of the progress achieved in the ever-growing arms race.

Mr. HANDL (Czechoslovakia): Today the Czechoslovak delegation wishes to devote attention to some aspects of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament which, in our view, are among the most important ones.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has emphasized on many occasions that it is actively advocating a consistent and comprehensive implementation of the decisions adopted by the tenth special session and that it is prepared to co-operate with all States for the speediest possible achievement of that objective. However, when evaluating the past period, it must be noted, as has been done by many speakers before me, that up to now the decisions of the special session have been fulfilled insufficiently, or only partially. I could, for instance, follow up the statement by the representative of Yugoslavia who emphasized in the First Committee a few days ago that

"... on the whole, no genuine results have yet been achieved in implementing the priority tasks which were unanimously adopted at the special session". (A/C.1/34/PV.10, p. 37)

The new machinery of disarmament negotiations has as yet not managed to prove its higher effectiveness and substantive disarmament issues are frequently considered on a theoretical rather than on the operative basis that is needed. It is true that only a relatively short period of time has elapsed since the special session. None the less, as has been pointed out by many delegations, the session has as yet not been followed by a sharp revitalization of the practical solution of major disarmament problems which, we understand, was one of the main purposes of the special session.

It must also be seen that the causes of this situation are the same as in the past. They consist primarily in the fact that some States are not prepared to adopt broader disarmament measures, that they avoid concrete negotiations, and constantly submit new reasons why these or other concrete measures or proposals should not or could not be implemented. We frequently encounter cold resistance even when we point out the need for more actively developing joint efforts for the achievement of the objectives set out unanimously by the special session and of concentrating our political will on that goal.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

We do not want to be pessimists, because the tenth special session has undoubtedly created great political capital and made it possible for the attention of the entire international community to be focused to an unprecedented degree on the problems of disarmament. However, when speaking of the practical implementation of its results, we think that it is necessary to consider what more could be done so that that capital will not gradually become a dead letter in the United Nations archives, but will lead to the speediest possible progress in concrete disarmament negotiations. If we pose the question in this way and do not give up our search for ways and means of expediting further progress, then no doubt should arise that every step made by us in that direction will surely contribute to the operativeness of disarmament negotiations.

We believe, therefore, that when evaluating the implementation of the decisions adopted by the tenth special session of the General Assembly, the United Nations should not limit itself only to individual partial questions, some of which in themselves are not even of fundamental importance, but should at the same time devote its attention to strengthening and expanding its overall concept of disarmament, the foundations of which were laid by the special session. We firmly believe, as we stressed earlier, that the work towards this goal cannot be in vain but will benefit the practical solution of disarmament issues.

Czechoslovakia submitted to the current session of the General Assembly a proposal to work out and to adopt a declaration on international co-operation for disarmament, which could be a step in that direction. We are convinced that the adoption of this proposal will provide a positive impetus for the intensified implementation of the decisions adopted by the tenth special session. We are conducting constructive negotiations to that end, and we trust that their results will enable us at an early time to submit a broadly acceptable document.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

In its Programme of Action the tenth special session rightly devoted priority attention to the questions of nuclear disarmament and it emphasized that the final goal in that direction was the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons. In its paragraph 50 the Final Document outlined unequivocally the practical course for the negotiations on nuclear disarmament and called for their speedy initiation. Resolution 33/71 H, adopted last year, contains an appeal to all States possessing nuclear weapons to conduct consultations on the speedy initiation of negotiations on nuclear disarmament and to inform the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly of their results. That appeal is also in keeping with the proposal by the Warsaw Treaty countries contained in the Joint Declaration of the Political Consultative Committee adopted in Moscow on 23 November 1978. As early as 1 February 1979, at the beginning of the first session of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, the delegations of the countries of the socialist community submitted a joint working document (CD/4) concerning the initiation of negotiations on the halting of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and the gradual reduction of the stockpiles of such weapons until their complete elimination. It is gratifying that that proposal has met with the support of many delegations, both in the Geneva Committee and at the current session of the First Committee. However, it must be said once again that, although a generally useful exchange of views was held in the Committee on that basis, the key requirement of the tenth special session, to start concrete talks on these questions, still remains a mere wish. Therefore we are of the opinion that the current session of the General Assembly should reaffirm its earlier fundamental decisions to their full extent and call on the Committee on Disarmament to start practical substantive negotiations on the set of problems relating to nuclear disarmament as an urgent question of priority importance.

In our view it is, furthermore, necessary, in the light of the decisions adopted by the tenth special session, to approach the question of the relationship between disarmament and development more concretely and in a more practical spirit. The Final Document emphasizes quite correctly that

"the economic and social consequences of the arms race are so detrimental that its continuation is obviously incompatible with the implementation of the new international economic order based on justice, equity and co-operation." (resolution S-10/2, para. 16)

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

There can hardly be any doubt that today, when arms expenditures are reaching almost unimaginable figures, the halting of their further growth and their gradual reduction are of decisive importance also for the effective solution of the questions of development, including the improvement of the economic situation in developing countries. The Czechoslovak delegation has carefully studied the report by the Secretary-General, submitted to the current session in document A/34/534, containing a study on the relationship between disarmament and development, from which the intricate and complex nature of this problem is apparent. However, it cannot be expected that really tangible progress can be achieved in this field without concrete and effective measures limiting arms expenditures and without their material reduction. That is why we believe that the current session of the General Assembly should give a new impulse to the initiation of practical negotiations on the reduction of military budgets and on the adoption of a relevant international agreement in keeping with paragraph 89 of the Final Document of the tenth special session.

The Czechoslovak delegation appreciates the progress report concerning the study on the relationship between disarmament and international security submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/34/465. The elaboration of the questions that form the outline of this new study - such as the disarmament process and international security, the role of détente in connexion with security and disarmament, and the exploration of international co-operation as a means of strengthening security and promoting disarmament - reflects, in our view, the necessity of strengthening the main positive trends in current international policies and it could make a contribution to the further United Nations work on these issues.

Czechoslovakia attaches great importance to ensuring objective and full understanding of the problems and the necessity of disarmament by world public opinion and, in keeping with that, it is consistently implementing the provisions of the Final Document of the tenth special session concerning the dissemination of objective and truthful information on questions relating to the arms race and to disarmament. In connexion with the implementation of resolution 33/71 G, adopted on this question last year, I should like, furthermore,

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

to mention that a preparatory meeting of experts was held in Prague last June which successfully prepared background documentation for the forthcoming world congress on disarmament education organized by UNESCO. Information on those preparations, in accordance with resolution 33/71 G, is contained in the report by the Director-General of UNESCO in document A/34/147. We believe that the holding of the world congress will be a useful and important step and we shall continue to make an all-round contribution to its work.

Czechoslovakia took an active part in this year's session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the results of which have been summarized in its report, contained in document A/34/42. In our opinion, the Commission has on the whole created a good basis for further negotiations on a comprehensive programme of disarmament and on its particular elements. At the session of the Commission Czechoslovakia submitted a suggestion, reflected in document A/CN.10.7/Rev.1, that, in connexion with the comprehensive programme of disarmament, it is essential to take into account also the necessity of developing and strengthening constructive international co-operation aimed at the achievement of progress in this field and at creating a favourable climate of confidence in relations among States, conducive to the rapid attainment of tangible results in disarmament negotiations. The purpose of this idea is to support the work of the Commission and to make its further activities more effective. In this respect also, Czechoslovakia is prepared to work actively.

The questions that I have mentioned, naturally, do not represent the entire complex of problems related to the implementation of the conclusions adopted by the tenth special session. The Czechoslovak delegation will state its position on other issues also in the course of the deliberations on the draft resolutions submitted.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Committee to a draft resolution, contained in document A/C.1/34/L.4, submitted by the delegation of the German Democratic Republic.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): Last week, when I spoke about the Committee on Disarmament and chemical weapons, I promised not to tax the endurance of this Committee by going through a catalogue of disarmament objectives the Netherlands finds desirable. If today again, in discussing nuclear disarmament, I limit my remarks to a few main issues in this field, it is not because other aspects of the problem are of no or of less importance, but rather so as not to burden the Committee with observations that other speakers before me have adequately covered.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

The topics I shall discuss are six and they are all more or less interrelated. They are: the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT); a comprehensive test ban; a cut-off in the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes; the Non-Proliferation Treaty; negative security assurances; nuclear weapon-free zones.

Now it would seem that these six topics can be grouped roughly under two headings, and this is also the case with other objectives in the nuclear disarmament field that I shall not discuss today.

The distinguishing feature is that some of these disarmament measures relate directly to the acquisition, refining or deployment of nuclear weapons by the present nuclear-weapon States. To this category belong SALT, a comprehensive test ban and a cut-off. This group is often referred to as the prevention of vertical proliferation.

The other group, the Non-Proliferation Treaty, negative security assurances and nuclear weapon-free zones, is directed towards preventing the proliferation of nuclear explosive capability to other States, and is referred to as horizontal proliferation.

The Non-Proliferation Treaty forms a kind of a link between the two groups; although this treaty is mainly directed towards preventing horizontal proliferation, it clearly spells out the premise that nuclear disarmament measures by the present nuclear Powers are an integral part of non-proliferation policy.

The existence of two groups of measures comes out more clearly when we consider the necessary verification measures. In the first group verification is directed towards the nuclear Powers, while in the second group it is mainly applied with respect to non-nuclear-weapon States. Some discrimination has crept in here: while the present agreements between the main nuclear Powers do not involve on-site verification measures, but only so-called national means of verification - satellites and the like - non-nuclear weapon States have accepted nuclear safeguards which are, by necessity, of a rather intrusive character.

A cut-off requiring the same verification measures for both nuclear and non-nuclear Powers would present an opportunity to redress this situation somewhat.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

It is clear that when we talk about nuclear disarmament measures adequate verification is a necessity. For obvious reasons one cannot allow a substantial violation of a treaty to occur. Observation satellites have led to an incredible capacity of national verification by the two main Powers. This capacity was built up by the two main Powers to monitor compliance with their bilateral treaties. With a view to the possible need for a multilateral application of this verification technique, we remain interested in the French proposal for an international observation satellite system, although this is not an easy issue. I hardly need to explain our great interest in being involved, as a member of the international community, in an international seismic system to verify a test ban treaty. Apart from our political interest in such a system, there are sound scientific reasons why a geographically world-wide seismic system would be better than a trilateral system confined to the territory of a few countries. We deplore the fact that the negotiations on a test ban are apparently bogged down, at least formally, on something which could well be solved, for example, by asking other countries for assistance.

It is not impossible that the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban may have something to do with the ratification of SALT II. To my mind, those two measures, although they reinforce each other, stand on their own. They each have their own built-in verification systems that have their own merits. In other words the Netherlands could not accept the proposition that if one fails, the other should also be allowed to fail. The contrary should be the case.

Allow me to mention the unmentionable: if the ratification of SALT II should fail then this must not be accepted as an excuse to abandon the comprehensive test ban and even less to neglect the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference. If SALT II should fail, we trust that responsible statesmen would have the political wisdom and courage to follow through immediately with a comprehensive test ban. This is all the more important as otherwise the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference would find itself in considerable difficulties.

However, having said this I hasten to add that we are fully confident that SALT II will be ratified and that next year, 1980, will also see a draft treaty on a comprehensive test ban, preferably before the Non-Proliferation Treaty conference, and the start of the SALT III negotiations.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

A new element in the SALT III negotiations should be the balance of land-based, continental-range, nuclear missiles in Europe. The growing imbalance, giving the Soviet Union a marked superiority over Western Europe, becomes even less acceptable as the over-all strategic parity between the United States and the Soviet Union is being stabilized. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries show a legitimate concern when they point to the regional imbalance in Europe. Soviet proposals which would be conducive to making this situation permanent are contrary to the main principle of disarmament negotiations, that is, that security should be equally ensured for all. It is however important that the Soviet Union has given indications that it might be ready to enter into arms control negotiations on this matter. This is also the aim of the Western alliance. It must be our task to achieve a positive outcome.

The prevention of a nuclear war not only requires that we do our utmost to stop the nuclear arms race and reduce the existing nuclear arsenals with a view to their ultimate complete removal from this earth, but, by logical necessity, it also requires that we should avoid the further spread of these weapons. Should we allow the number of States possessing nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices to increase, our whole effort would be rendered vain and the hope of mankind to be freed from this horrible threat of total destruction would be rendered pointless. To keep this hope alive is the common responsibility of all nuclear weapon States and non-nuclear weapons States alike.

The accession of Bangladesh, Indonesia and Sri Lanka to the Non-Proliferation Treaty during the course of last year represented an encouraging development and one for which the Netherlands wishes to express its sincere appreciation. This further increase in the support for this principal instrument of the international community to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons, again demonstrates that the vast majority of States is unanimous on this subject. However, only universal adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the full implementation of all its articles can remove the remaining fears of a new proliferation, fears which were recently increased in the light of particular developments. Therefore my Government urgently appeals to all non-nuclear weapons States which have not yet acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty to refrain from all activities aimed at the development or acquisition of any nuclear explosive device, and to accede as soon as possible to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

In August 1980 the second NPT Review Conference will take place. On that occasion judgement will have to be passed on the implementation of all the articles of that Treaty, including articles III and IV on safeguards and international co-operation in the peaceful application of nuclear energy. These closely related issues have been subject to sometimes widely divergent views among the parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty as well as among those that are not parties. Basically those differences of opinion may be reduced to different answers to the by now classical question: Under what conditions can nuclear energy be used for peaceful purposes without creating unacceptable proliferation risks? According to some, the existing rules with regard to safeguards, derived from article III of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, provide sufficient guarantees; whereas others hold that especially the more sensitive stages of the nuclear fuel cycle require additional safeguard measures.

The Netherlands supports the latter line of thinking. We feel that the introduction of the peaceful application of nuclear energy in a growing number of countries and the expansion of the number of sensitive nuclear installations call for strengthening the non-proliferation system. In particular, the application of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards to all nuclear activities in all non-nuclear-weapon States and the further refinement and development of the IAEA safeguards system, among other things by the implementation of article XII of the Agency's statute on the storage of excess plutonium under the auspices of IAEA, are measures which seem urgently needed.

By pleading the need for strengthening the non-proliferation régime the Netherlands does not want to deny the right of all States to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The tension which at present seems to exist between those two goals can and should be removed with the active participation of all the States involved. Therefore, the Netherlands attaches great importance to the international nuclear fuel cycle evaluation which will be completed within a few months. In the period after the international nuclear fuel cycle evaluation the international community will

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

have to face the difficult task of developing, on the basis of the results of the evaluation, a new international consensus on the peaceful application of nuclear energy. For its part, the Netherlands will actively participate in those efforts, since we consider such a consensus indispensable for the maintenance of the international non-proliferation system.

A few words on a cut-off in the production of fissionable materials for weapon purposes. We think that such a measure would be a logical follow-up to a comprehensive test ban. It is verifiable; it is reasonably effective; and it would be the first measure which directly affected the production of nuclear warheads.

With reference to the negative nuclear security assurances, it is not so much the verification provisions that count as the strength of the commitment. This is why there is a feeling that the unilateral negative security assurances given by the nuclear Powers and repeated by some of them on several occasions need, in one way or the other, to be incorporated into some international document. Of course, the security guarantees would be enhanced if a common formula valid for all nuclear Powers could be developed; however, that is not an easy task. We believe that the Committee on Disarmament made a good start in exploring this issue and think that it needs to continue its work as expeditiously as possible, particularly with the NPT Review Conference in sight.

I refer finally to the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones. The Netherlands believes that the goal of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones should be pursued wherever possible and, of course, only with the co-operation of the countries in the region. Recent developments have reinforced the importance of such zones. The world would be safer if nuclear-weapon-free zones were established by the force of a treaty in Africa, the Middle East and South Asia.

Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina)(interpretation from Spanish): I shall advisedly depart from the rule - and I trust that this time you, Mr. Chairman, will not apply it rigorously - because I cannot fail to grasp the opportunity afforded me by this initial statement to congratulate the First Committee most warmly on the wisdom it showed in electing you to preside over our work. As a Latin American I am especially proud to see one of the most distinguished members of our Group presiding with mastery and efficiency over the deliberations of this Committee. As an Argentine also I wish to express satisfaction - a satisfaction not unconnected with the fact that I had the privilege of being the first Ambassador of my country accredited to the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, which enabled me to evaluate the outstanding virtues of your people, of whom you are a distinguished representative.

May I also extend my congratulations to the representatives of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Austria on their election to the posts of Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteur.

The first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament provided the international community with a sound basis for channelling all efforts in this field. The Strategy set out in the Final Document to halt and reverse the arms race makes it necessary now, in the words of paragraph 17, "... to translate into practical terms its provisions... and to proceed along the road of binding and effective international agreements in the field of disarmament." (resolution S-10/2)

The Final Document has also provided us with the appropriate forums to channel its provisions. The Geneva Committee on Disarmament, as a multilateral negotiating body, has an important and special responsibility in this field. It now has a democratic, representative structure which should enable it to negotiate, given the indispensable political will of its members, agreements which command general acceptance and, therefore, a certain possibility of implementation. The representative nature of the negotiating body has been strengthened by the recent announcement of the People's Republic of China that it will participate in its work, beginning in 1980 - a decision that we welcome with satisfaction.

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

By virtue of the system of monthly rotation of the chairmanship, it fell to Argentina to preside over the Geneva Committee during the month of February last. Thanks to the intensive work and co-operation of all its members, the Committee was able on that occasion to adopt its rules of procedure and subsequently the agenda to which it must adjust its work. These two documents complement and develop the decisions of the special session and empower the Committee to carry out its mandate in an orderly manner, thus obviating - or so we hope - the procedural discussions that hampered the work of the two bodies that preceded it.

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

The success of the Committee on Disarmament in organizational and procedural matters was regrettably not accompanied by similar achievements on substantive questions. It is, in fact, well known that it was not possible for the Committee to achieve any progress whatsoever on the total prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests. The same situation arose with respect to chemical weapons. I need hardly go into detail now on the reasons for the stalemate, but I must emphasize that the future of those negotiations cannot continue to depend exclusively on the results of negotiations outside the Geneva Committee. We acknowledge their importance for some of the nuclear-weapon Powers, but at the same time we consider that the Committee on Disarmament is now endowed with the necessary representation, experience and capacity to tackle the elaboration of international instruments on these high-priority items.

We believe that in the course of 1980 the Committee should deal with the substantive treatment of both questions. The importance that the Assembly has attached to the conclusion of a treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests was duly taken into account by the Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies. During the last session of that body, of which I have the honour to be a member, it was agreed to recommend the preparation of a study on the question to be submitted to the Committee on Disarmament at next year's spring session. We hope that work will be completed in time to be of real use in the negotiating of the treaty.

On 9 July 1979 the United States and the Soviet Union submitted jointly to the Committee on Disarmament the elements of a treaty on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons. My delegation could not fail to express its satisfaction at the agreement reached by those two Powers on this question. None the less, we wish to reiterate our view that it is the duty of the Committee to make a thorough and detailed examination of any proposal submitted to it in order to introduce possible modifications or amendments as it deems fit before submitting it to the Assembly for consideration. The urgency with which it was sought to invest action on this draft in the little time remaining to the Committee before the conclusion of its session was worthy of a better cause. It is also exclusively within the competence of the Committee on Disarmament to determine

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

when each category of weapons is to be dealt with in accordance with its agenda and the priorities established by the General Assembly. The new weapons of mass destruction occupy third place in this hierarchy. To give them priority treatment when there are outstanding issues such as the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests and the question of chemical weapons would be tantamount to detracting from the meaning and letter of what was agreed upon at the first special session on disarmament.

There is a trend - and it is not a new one - to divert the attention of the negotiating body to approaches to preventive disarmament or consideration of collateral or secondary measures. This attitude entails the risk of making us forget the imminent dangers actually represented by nuclear weapons in the operative stage. The same is true when attempts are made to focus negotiating efforts on conventional weapons. Without minimizing the importance of possible measures in this field, we believe it necessary to put them in their rightful place, as was done in the Final Document. In this connexion we cannot but be surprised by the fact that it is precisely those countries that lay the greatest stress upon conventional weapons that subsequently resist the adoption of mandatory international measures for their reduction or limitation of their use.

On this, we have a recent and clear example. The United Nations Conference on the prohibition or restriction of the use of specific conventional weapons was unable to achieve its objective - namely, the conclusion of agreements on the limitation of the use of such weapons - as a result of the position on the subject of incendiary weapons adopted by some of the militarily more important countries. Neither the negotiating will of the large majority of those that participated in the Conference nor the excellent conducting of those negotiations by its Chairman, Ambassador Adeniji of Nigeria sufficed to persuade some Powers of the need significantly to limit the use of such weapons. Paradoxically, they continue to favour the adoption of Assembly resolutions aimed at promoting, for example, measures of conventional regional disarmament or restriction of the transfer of this category of weapons to third-world countries.

The United Nations Disarmament Commission, the deliberating body established by the General Assembly, held its first session in 1979. The result of its work has fully demonstrated the wisdom of the decision to create it and to give it its

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

present mandate. Under the excellent leadership of its Chairman, Ambassador Vellodi of India, it has now submitted to us in its report the elements adopted by consensus for a comprehensive disarmament programme. The balance of that document, the product of arduous negotiations, offers an excellent basis for negotiations by the Committee on Disarmament - prior to the holding of the second special session on disarmament, in 1982 - on a draft treaty setting forth the long-term objectives of the international community.

The seven years that it took the United States and the Soviet Union to negotiate the SALT II Agreement had led us to expect more significant results. This notwithstanding, we believe that the signature of that document constitutes a positive achievement. Although its provisions do not reduce nuclear arsenals, its ratification could contribute to the reduction of political tension between the super-Powers.

We assume that both countries acknowledge the importance and urgency that the international community attaches to the adoption of mandatory measures of real and effective nuclear disarmament. Therefore we hope that the SALT III negotiations will be oriented in this direction and that they will be completed within a reasonably short period of time. Were they to move at the same slow pace that resulted in seven years being needed for achievement of the step represented by SALT II, the speedy progress of military technology would turn their results into obsolete provisions even before they went into effect.

I would not wish to conclude without reiterating Argentina's conviction that the provisions and principles agreed on by consensus in the Final Document continue to be the only and best guideline available to the international community to orient efforts in all fields encompassing what we generically call disarmament.

It is our inescapable duty to endeavour now to apply its content fully and to respect the priorities we established a little more than a year ago, applying them at both the bilateral and multilateral levels, both in the Geneva Committee and in the Disarmament Commission and, all the more so, in the General Assembly. Were we to depart from them we should be violating the spirit and letter of what we then adopted and conspiring against fulfilment of our aspirations for the next special session on disarmament.

U Saw HLAING (Burma): Mr. Chairman, in taking the floor for the first time in this Committee, my delegation would like to express to you our deep appreciation for the manner in which you have guided the deliberations of this Committee. We are confident that your knowledge and skill and that of the other officers of the Committee will make a major contribution to bringing the work of the Committee to a successful outcome.

It is not my intention to make a detailed commentary on the wide range of disarmament issues demanding our attention in the First Committee. Several of the representatives who have spoken before us have dwelt on them adequately. Our remarks here are intended to set out briefly the reflections of the delegation of Burma on its approach to the various facets of the disarmament problem.

As may be recalled, born of the experience and sufferings of the Second World War, the United Nations was created - to quote the words of the Charter - "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". The avoidance of war and the search for a more stable and secure basis for world peace must therefore be an overriding aim of all of us. However, world peace continues to be placed in jeopardy by the unabated and geographical expansion of the armaments race, which proceeds in the sphere of nuclear and conventional armaments. The continuing use or threat of use of military force by some nations as an instrument of international policy is yet another militating factor. In this context, the security of States is a cardinal problem. Therefore, the quest for international peace and security through world disarmament constitutes the foremost issue of today.

It is true, of course, that disarmament is a problem whose progress or lack of progress is subject to political factors in the international situation. In this perspective, the efforts at disarmament will depend considerably on an increase in confidence-building measures, which will induce a sense of mutual trust and security and be conducive to the relaxation of international tension. Only then will States be dissuaded from acquiring

(U Saw Hlaing, Burma)

weapons and encouraged to reduce their present levels. In the view of my delegation, any world-wide disarmament strategy must take into account the need for greater and sustained efforts to eliminate the sources of tension in various world regions, as well as to uphold the international rule of law and the peaceful settlement of disputes in relations among States.

The stark reality which faces us today is that the tremendous strides made in the field of military science and technology far outstrip the knowledge and erudition gained in the field of human orientation - political, economic and social - which are the essential basis for the meaningful existence of mankind. This has been manifested in the ongoing arms race. Exorbitant sums of money are being spent in research on and continuing development of new, highly sophisticated weapons of mass destruction, with the result that disarmament negotiations fail to keep pace with military technology. Unless early measures can be achieved to halt and turn back the armaments race, the goal of general and complete disarmament will recede beyond our reach, with the discovery of one ultimate weapon after another. Disarmament, which is hard to achieve now, may become impossible.

Our consistent interest in the question of disarmament is motivated by these considerations, not by visions of the promise of world development, which many hold to be the concomitant of general and complete disarmament. We do agree, of course, that the material and manpower resources released by disarmament could gainfully be utilized to a more purposeful and peaceful end.

The Programme of Action contained in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, has brought us to the threshold of a new phase in disarmament efforts in the coming years. Burma maintains a consistent interest in the question of disarmament, and we are, accordingly, participating in the deliberations of the United Nations and in the Committee on Disarmament to assist in and facilitate the search for practicable agreements intended to lead progressively towards general and complete disarmament.

(U Saw Hlaing, Burma)

Over the past years, on numerous occasions during the sessions of the General Assembly, the delegation of Burma has stated its views concerning disarmament, which remain unchanged and can be summed up by the following principles.

Proposals for international disarmament, while they necessarily interest all peace-loving nations, must be intended primarily for those other nations the intensive nature of whose armaments is properly the objective of all disarmament proposals.

Disarmament measures, to be effective, require the full and active association of all the major nuclear Powers and those with nuclear potential.

The only practicable formula for effecting general disarmament would appear to be for all the major Powers, assisted and facilitated to the extent practicable by the non-armed nations, to seek phased, limited agreements, and to proceed by an aggregation of limited gains to totality of achievement.

The question of nuclear disarmament remains a matter of the highest priority, and special responsibility rests with the nuclear-weapon Powers to carry out measures for nuclear disarmament and to refrain from the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. It would be a reassurance to all nations if a widely acceptable formula could be reached at an early date on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

The achievement of a comprehensive nuclear-weapons test-ban as a priority aim to put an end to the further sophistication of nuclear weapons and proliferation would dispel some of the factors that fuel the arms race and would establish a climate for a major step towards nuclear disarmament. We hope that the parties to the trilateral negotiations will be able to produce an agreement of unlimited duration or of automatic renewal.

The bilateral Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) between the major nuclear Powers is of crucial importance in the stabilization of a strategic balance and can mean a reversal of the armaments race. Burma welcomes the recent SALT II agreements as a significant step towards nuclear disarmament

MP/mb

A/C.1/34/PV.25
44-45

(U Saw Hlaing, Burma)

and hopes that arms limitation will further be sought in respect of intermediate-range weapons.

The elimination of chemical weapons from the arsenals of all States is of the utmost urgency, and the aim of a convention on chemical weapons should be to achieve their comprehensive prohibition.

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world will help curb the spread of nuclear weapons. But no such regional arrangement can be fully credible or workable unless the countries in the region themselves accept it and the nuclear Powers recognize and respect it.

A comprehensive disarmament programme, to have universal appeal, must aim at relaxing international tensions for providing an international environment of confidence and stability conducive to the formulation of meaningful arms control agreements. However, the fact must be kept in mind that this is not a "programme" in the ordinary sense, but is a grave political document having far-reaching political and security implications and carrying short-term, medium-term and long-term commitments for countries large and small. Extreme care must therefore be exercised in preparing a comprehensive disarmament programme so as to ensure that it does not contain, inadvertently or by design, seeds of insecurity for any State.

The newly constituted Committee on Disarmament has been evaluated as the single most important outcome of the special session on disarmament, accompanied by the expectation that it would give fresh stimulus to disarmament negotiations. The first session of the Committee, held in 1979, did useful work, with real achievements in the organizational sphere.

The intensive work of the Committee was covered in 52 formal plenary meetings and 50 informal meetings, almost double the number of those held by its predecessor bodies in a year's session. This effort has borne fruit in the adoption of a complete set of rules of procedure, a ten-point framework as terms of reference and a programme of work, all of which reflect the consensus of the Committee.

The Committee also succeeded in setting up the Ad Hoc Working Group on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The report of this working group should serve as a good basis for further negotiations in the next session. The progress report of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to consider international co-operative measures to detect and identify seismic events is considered a step forward in the endeavour towards a nuclear-test-ban treaty. Both working groups were open to all members of the Committee on Disarmament and reflect its responsibility as a whole.

(U Saw Hlaing, Burma)

On the more substantive sections of its agenda, the Committee was unable to show concrete results, principally because the priority items assigned to the trilateral and bilateral negotiations were making no positive headway. This unfortunately limited the initial efforts of the Committee as a negotiating organ.

In the nuclear age the urgent need for effective disarmament cannot be overemphasized. Though movement in this field has been dishearteningly slow indeed, Burma has, along with most other nations, welcomed what small gains there have been in the direction of disarmament. We should also like to welcome with satisfaction China's announcement that it will participate in the work of the Committee on Disarmament next year.

This year marks the end of the first United Nations Disarmament Decade. It may be recalled that at the beginning of the 1960s the major nuclear Powers came close together on the goal of general and complete disarmament and the main components of a disarmament plan. At the start of the 1970s they came close together again on the goal of limited stabilized balance, leading to the recent SALT II agreement. In the light of this history, we look upon the latest announcement of the Soviet Union on the unilateral withdrawal of its troops from Central Europe and its readiness to limit deployment of intermediate range nuclear weapons in its eastern territory as yet another prelude to a more positive phase in disarmament negotiations. Burma offers no reproach on the past decade. It looks hopefully forward and welcomes the second Disarmament Decade of the 1980s.

Mr. MOULTRIE (Bahamas): We are meeting in the final session of the General Assembly prior to the close of the first Disarmament Decade. As we reflect on the events of the Decade there is reason for despair as well as for hope. Some new initiatives in the field of disarmament have taken place, but progress towards the final goal of general and complete disarmament has been particularly disheartening. Rather than a more secure world, which we had hoped for at the beginning of the Decade, we have witnessed phenomenal increases in the production and stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction which have the capacity for annihilating all of humanity. Yet each year we meet here to espouse guidelines for disarmament. All we seem to achieve is empty rhetoric. The irony of the situation is that in this decade we seem to have moved closer to a nuclear holocaust. My delegation therefore hopes that the 1980s will mark the beginning

(Mr. Moultrie, Bahamas)

of real efforts to create a more peaceful world in which we can concentrate more constructively on the difficult, yet very important, task of social and economic development.

Long before the presentation of the first resolution on the subject, the constant threat of wars prompted an international call for disarmament. Indeed, the whole idea behind the establishment of the United Nations was the preservation of peace and the maintenance of security within the international community. Our achievement since the inauguration of this august body is a sad indictment of the lack of success on the implementation of our deliberations on disarmament.

The question of disarmament has received more widespread attention than any other issue confronting mankind, and rightly so, for arms control is the only method by which we can ensure the survival of the human species. Disarmament has been discussed at several summit conferences as well as at the preparatory and special sessions devoted to disarmament. Attention is now being turned to the possibility of declaring the 1980s the second Disarmament Decade, by means of convening a second special session devoted to disarmament and discussing the desirability of holding a world conference on disarmament. In principle, my delegation supports these and any other efforts which may be geared towards tangible progress in disarmament.

While leadership in the field of disarmament must come from the super-Powers, it should be made perfectly clear that all countries have a role to play. My Government is concerned that some medium-sized and small States are not seeking to curtail expenditure on armaments. My Government is particularly disturbed by reports that South Africa has tested its first nuclear explosive, at a critical time when other peace-loving African States are attempting to denuclearize the region. We support the efforts of Africa in this regard and condemn the Pretoria régime and its collaborators for further threatening the peace and stability of Africa and, indeed, the world. If these allegations are true we are facing a major setback in effecting disarmament measures. Similarly, we support the mandate to declare the Middle East as a zone of peace, and hope that all nations of the region will soon sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

(Mr. Moultrie, Bahamas)

My delegation has supported the idea of establishing nuclear-free zones and zones of peace in various regions of the world. It is for this reason that the Bahamas became a signatory to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, strongly recommending this method as one of the vehicles for curtailing nuclear proliferation and thus heightening the achievement of general and complete disarmament. Needless to say, we hope that all States will ratify the Treaty as soon as possible. At the same time we hope that no effort will be spared to reach agreement on a convention which will prevent the use or threat of the use of nuclear arms against non-nuclear weapon States. Small countries, in particular, deserve an unconditional commitment in this regard.

Despite major disappointments in the past, we look to the new decade with hope. The conclusion of the SALT II agreement is welcomed by my Government and we hope that it will soon be ratified, perhaps before the end of our deliberations this session. SALT II is an important step towards disarmament as the agreement could serve to build trust and confidence, ingredients which are essential for further progress. My Government hopes that negotiations towards SALT III will begin as soon as possible, heralding even more significant progress towards complete disarmament.

Nuclear disarmament, by its very nature, has assumed priority in our consideration of disarmament questions, but this must not be at the expense of our consideration of conventional weapons. While there may have been small reductions in defence budgets, we have witnessed significant increases in expenditure on conventional weapons. In fact, as we move closer and closer towards nuclear disarmament, we can expect a shift to wide-scale production of conventional weapons. Furthermore, it is a source of concern that most countries have been acquiring greater supplies of conventional armaments. Clearly, a re-evaluation of supply and demand warrants speedy consideration. Indeed, if disarmament is to be total, our efforts must be directed to conventional and nuclear disarmament simultaneously.

It is a sad indictment that, although an excess of \$400 billion is being spent on armaments annually, hundreds of millions of people live in a state of indescribable poverty. Many countries are unable to meet the basic human

(Mr. Moultrie, Bahamas)

needs of their peoples, yet we continue annually to witness phenomenal expenditure on armaments. Are we so afraid, or absorbed in our search for power and international control, that we ignore the suffering of humanity? It seems to my delegation that the fact that such a substantial percentage of mankind is destitute represents as much a threat to international peace and security as does an arms build-up. There is an essential link between disarmament and development, which presents an opportunity for the "haves" to demonstrate concern for the "have-nots" of the world. My Government finds it distressing that, in the face of human suffering, such astronomical amounts are spent on armaments, but is heartened that there is an awareness of that fact and that many delegations have turned their attention to this inequity.

At each session there is no lack of reference to the suggestion that savings accruing from the reduction of expenditure on armaments could be used to assist the needy in their development efforts. What is now required is positive action. My delegation would like to express the hope that the Group of Experts which is now considering the relationship of disarmament and development will make concrete proposals to be implemented early to offset this glaring imbalance. My delegation took note of the important statement made by the representative of Sweden, in her capacity as Chairman of the Group of Governmental Experts, on the relationship between disarmament and development. Peace of mind and freedom from the threat of war is a fundamental right of all people and no one should be deprived of the hope for a normal, healthy and long life. While this may sound melodramatic, we are aware that the prospects for the future of humanity evoke a kind of emotionalism which cannot be expressed logically or rationally under any circumstances. What my statement says, in a sentence, is that we need to replace rhetoric and clichés by positive action and selflessness.

My country is less than 60 miles from one of the super-Powers. Our interest in disarmament must, therefore, be more than casual. Disarmament is not, nor should it be, the concern of nuclear or near-nuclear powers alone. Your chairmanship of this Committee, Sir, testifies to that fact. The participation of small, peace-loving nations in recent years has been somewhat of a catalyst in discussions of the question of disarmament.

(Mr. Moultrie, Bahamas)

The contribution of small non-nuclear States could be analogous to the biblical reference: "and a little child shall lead them". The Bahamas, like many other small States, I am sure, would welcome the assurance of peaceful existence in a world that is so threatened with the prospects of extinction.

My delegation welcomes the introduction of the United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament which allows nationals of developing countries to get some experience that could help to promote greater understanding and thereby more meaningful participation. We look forward to the first report on this venture.

Finally, my delegation is confident that, although disarmament items may be perennial in the sense that general and complete disarmament might remain a distant goal for some years to come, we have cause to be cautiously hopeful. The co-operation and understanding demonstrated to date by all Member States indicate that much can be achieved in the future. It is a foregone conclusion that serious negotiations should continue on all aspects of disarmament, if for no other reason than to ensure that mankind may live in peace and succeeding generations may be saved from the scourge of war and universal destruction.

Mr. FARRUGIA (Malta) The various aspects of disarmament are of such vital importance to the international community that none of us can refrain from giving expression to our feelings of frustration at the lack of progress. But, after three and a half decades of discussion, we would do well - all of us - at least to avoid repetitious recrimination and propagandistic rhetoric.

With this aim in view, my delegation will try, as far as possible, not to repeat those ideas and arguments which have been expounded so eloquently by speakers before me, and those which my own delegation has already explained in the past or as recently as the general debate in the plenary meetings.

(Mr. Farrugia, Malta)

We cannot fail to mention our preoccupation with the fact that the discussion of disarmament is increasingly becoming a theatre of the absurd. How else can we explain that, according to recent statistics, there is, by weight, more explosive material on earth than there is food. Why do the industrial nations pass legislation on energy conservation for civilian use but not for military purposes? Why is investment in war machinery running at 2,500 times that in the machinery of peace? Why does the yearly average of expenditure on arms as compared to that on education work out at \$16,000 per soldier as compared to \$260 per student? And why, after intensive negotiations towards commonly-agreed objectives, do the arms control agreements signed not only contemplate weapon levels twice as high as a decade ago but, moreover, are conditioned in advance to increases in arms expenditure, before they can be ratified?

The time has come for the international community to face up to realities. Human survival on this planet cannot be assured as long as a few nations continue to feel free to do whatever they believe to be in their military interests, trying to maintain a precarious balance based on escalation of weapons of mass destruction. They cannot continue to eat up the world's dwindling resources in military activities; they cannot continue to spew poisons into the world's oceans and into space, without regard for the rights of other countries and peoples.

We regret to note, for instance, that 16 years after it was first proposed, a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty has not been negotiated. Once again we urge the participants to step up negotiations to endeavour to finalize an agreement without delay. That would be the best boost for wider adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which is due for review next year. Another incentive to urgent action comes from the reported news of a potential increase in the existing number of nuclear-weapon States - or are we once again destined to wait until it is too late?

(Mr. Farrugia, Malta)

We can derive some consolation from the fact that the situation is not worse. The two super-Powers, on balance, deserve our commendation for the signing of the strategic arms limitation treaty (SALT II), which we hope will be soon followed by its ratification, and for the joint agreement on the banning of radiological weapons. The latter agreement gives us a modest sense of satisfaction in the knowledge that the proposal was first made by my country ten years ago. On another matter also initially raised by the delegation of Malta, we note the continuing advances in laser technology applied to weapon systems.

On the credit side, we have the results of the tenth special session, organized on the initiative and insistence of the non-aligned countries and representing a landmark which should herald a significant change for the better, because in the year 1982 - and that year is not so far away - when the second special session on disarmament becomes due, the international community will insist on an account of tangible achievements attained in the intervening period. Public opinion throughout the world has been alerted as never before, and the people of the world will want results and not excuses. The Final Document of the tenth special session is now our guide and our goal.

The Committee on Disarmament is to be complimented on having, as a start, reached agreement on its rule of procedure. At this stage it is too early to be critical of its substantive work. It is my delegation's strong hope, however, that substantive results will be achieved during the coming years, with the participation of all the nuclear-weapon States.

My delegation is also appreciative of the anticipated reports of the various expert study groups, one of which is engaged in trying to devise an acceptable scheme for assessing military budgeting. We urge that co-operation in this respect will be forthcoming from all, particularly those States with the highest expenditure on - and consequently the greatest responsibility for - disarmament. It must by now be abundantly evident that a substantial proportion of the action-reaction momentum of the arms race originates precisely in wrong assessments and "worst case" arguments advanced by opposing military strategists on the basis of suspected, incorrectly assessed data.

(Mr. Farrugia, Malta)

We welcome the timely Soviet proposal to withdraw 20,000 troops and 1,000 tanks from Central Europe and to decrease the number of medium-range missiles. No single practical proposal for arms reduction can be arbitrarily set aside. Each must be carefully evaluated, especially since talks have been stalled for more than six years. What the international community must guard against would be a corresponding increase of armaments in international waters or in outer space to balance eventual reductions in Central Europe. Hence the proposal, while commendable, requires careful study for its wider implications.

The non-aligned countries have assumed the burden of making up for the inertia of the super-Powers in trying to maximize co-operation and decrease confrontation. In the final communiqués of recent meetings culminating in the Havana summit, the 95-strong Non-Aligned Movement made many suggestions on avenues for improving prospects for world disarmament, with which my delegation is in complete agreement and which, therefore, I need not repeat.

A major area of application will be the creation of zones of peace and co-operation through regional approaches. The definition of the concept of zones of peace was a particularly positive outcome of the special session on disarmament. It is hoped that full co-operation will be given to the littoral States of the Indian Ocean, as well as those of South-East Asia, to transform their regions into zones of peace. The hard work and intensive negotiations undertaken by these groups of countries will later serve as models for the establishment of zones of peace in other areas, in particular the Mediterranean and Caribbean seas.

The yearning for the peaceful reunification of Korea deserves international support. The presence of foreign troops is the most visible obstacle, as it frustrates the peaceful dialogue which is the necessary prerequisite to the solution of the economic and political problems facing that country. Renewed efforts are necessary to reduce military confrontation in as many trouble spots as possible all over the world.

(Mr. Farrugia, Malta)

The practical contribution of individual countries remains our main source of hope. Cumulative individual efforts can add up to an impressive totality of achievement. My own country has conscientiously searched for what it can contribute on its own and it has acted on its findings.

On 31 March of this year, in accordance with its declared policy of non-alignment, Malta achieved its deliberate aim of making its maximum contribution to peace in the Mediterranean. By peaceful negotiations and without any violence, Malta terminated the British military bases previously stationed on the island. By this act we closed the door on centuries of our previous historical role and entered a new phase. The dismantling of the bases inevitably meant doing away with the annual rent and losing several thousand jobs as well as millions of dollars in foreign exchange generated from activities associated with the former military bases. Despite these negative economic disadvantages, the obligation had to be assumed. Military personnel have now been replaced by tourists; former service establishments are being converted to hospitals, living quarters, old people's villages and tourist complexes; the erstwhile naval dockyard, instead of catering to warships, has been converted to commercial ship-repairing, handling civilian ships and tankers plying their peaceful trade through the Mediterranean. What we now seek is a collective effort by friendly neighbouring States to guarantee our economic well-being and our security, neutrality and non-aligned status in the common interest.

(Mr. Farrugia, Malta)

I conclude by stressing the need for all countries, irrespective of ideology or allegiance, to make a positive contribution to disarmament, rather than to wait for others to take the initiative. We also need to be objective in our assessment of initiatives advanced by any other country, preferably favouring the optimum version when interpreting the motives or reasons behind any move aimed at maintaining the momentum created by the tenth special session. We cannot afford to do less; the negative experience of the past cannot be projected into the future because all of us will be the losers. The advance of technology should not be our enemy but rather our tool.

The chairman of the Club of Rome, in his opening address to the eleventh annual meeting, said that mankind is now at a cross-roads. The choice lies between a glorious future on the one hand, or chaos and catastrophe on the other. The years ahead still provide us with the opportunity to make our rational choice. The last decade, to put it mildly, was not characterized by significant progress; this was perhaps most evident in the failure of the disarmament negotiations. We have to strive to reverse this negative trend. My country's contribution towards this end has already been given whole-heartedly and will not be lacking in the future when our energies will be concentrated exclusively on disinterestedly promoting peace in our region.

The position we will take on the draft resolutions presented before this Committee will be guided by the perspectives I have outlined.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.