

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 39TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31, 32, 35 TO 45, 120 AND 121 (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Hulinsky (Czechoslovakia)
Mr. Kostov (Bulgaria)
Mr. Petrovsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt)
Mr. Fisher (United States)
Mr. Erdembileg (Mongolia)
Mr. Vukovic (Yugoslavia)
Mr. Simard (Canada)
Mr. Kostenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)
Mr. Martynov (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)
Mr. Adeniji (Nigeria)
Mr. Hlaing (Burma)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

* 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-3558.

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.39
23 November 1979

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 31, 32, 35 TO 45, 120 AND 121 (continued)

Mr. HULINSKY (Czechoslovakia): On behalf of a group of sponsors I have the honour to introduce the draft declaration on international co-operation for disarmament in document A/C.1/34/L.32, relating to item 120 of the agenda. The draft is being sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Angola, Benin, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Grenada, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Qatar, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, and Yemen, and by my own country, Czechoslovakia.

In view of the fact that the Czechoslovak delegation has already introduced and broadly explained the initial draft of this declaration as contained in document A/34/141/Add.1, which served as a basis for further deliberations, I wish to devote myself today only to several main aspects that are characteristic of the amended text of the draft that is being submitted. Our draft is the result of a long process of consultations and negotiations with dozens of Member States representing all regional groups. The draft was being deliberated upon for several months even before the start of the current session of the General Assembly, and the deliberations in fact have continued up to the present day. The text of the draft which the Committee has before it now reflects practically all the comments submitted on the substance of the matter and takes into account as much as possible the positions that all groups of States expressed during the discussions. It contains numerous clarifications and improvements, which, we firmly believe, make it broadly acceptable in all respects. The Czechoslovak delegation wishes to express special appreciation to the group of non-aligned countries and particularly the members of its contact group for their valuable assistance and constructive co-operation in drafting the present text.

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

This year's discussion of the questions of disarmament has once again confirmed the determination of the overwhelming majority of Member States to strive for speedy progress in this key issue and their adherence to the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament. The sponsors of the draft declaration believe that the development of international co-operation in the field of disarmament, which is the aim of their proposal, has a substantial bearing on the constructive progress of all disarmament talks. They are guided by an endeavour to promote the comprehensive implementation of the Final Document of the tenth special session. The draft declaration is designed to help to create a favourable climate for the achievement of concrete results, which, among other things, should build the strongest possible bridge between the last special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the next one, in 1982. The fact that the rate of progress achieved is still insufficient indicates that the question of intensifying constructive international co-operation for disarmament is acquiring urgent importance.

The draft declaration therefore emphasizes the urgent necessity of active and joint efforts by all States to intensify the comprehensive implementation of the decisions of the tenth special session in a more co-ordinated spirit and on the basis of broad co-operation on a world-wide scale.

For the sake of establishing a closer link to the objectives of the Final Document, a number of important amendments have been made in the draft to stress its supporting role in the attainment of those objectives and to eliminate the ineffective overlapping of certain formulations with those of the Final Document. The draft also takes fully into account the individual needs of Member States to safeguard their security in accordance with the Final Document.

The draft now reflects in a more concentrated form the priority of nuclear disarmament set out in the Final Document, and we regard this as a useful step towards making the declaration a constructive contribution to that end.

The draft now even more emphatically stresses the fundamental importance of a positive approach by all States to the question of the interrelationship between disarmament and development and the relevant question of overcoming the economic gap between the developed and the developing countries.

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

In our view the draft also expresses the close relationship between disarmament and international security and the need for joint action by States in adopting effective measures for the practical implementation of the security system that has its foundation in the Charter of the United Nations.

The declaration is based on full respect for the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament, as well as in developing international co-operation in that field.

In conclusion, may I express the conviction of the sponsors that the draft declaration on international co-operation for disarmament submitted for consideration by the First Committee will meet with general support from the States Members of the United Nations.

Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): In the course of the general debate in this Committee, the Bulgarian delegation had the opportunity to state its position on a wide range of questions of disarmament. We also listened closely to the statements made by delegations and this gave us the satisfaction of noting that the vast majority of States support the view that it is necessary to accelerate and direct the efforts of the international community towards the adoption of effective measures to halt the armaments race and to proceed to genuine disarmament. The most support was given to the view that the decisions to be adopted at the current session of the General Assembly ought to stimulate and assist those efforts.

I should like now to enlarge upon my delegation's position by offering some comments on two draft resolutions that have been presented to this Committee. It is against the background I have described that my delegation fully welcomes the draft resolution submitted by a group of socialist countries on agenda item 38, concerning the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, document A/C.1/34/L.6. In the opinion of my delegation, this proposal gives further credit to the ever-increasing conviction of the need, along with efforts to reduce and in the final account to eliminate weapons of mass destruction, to make further efforts to prevent the appearance of new types of such weapons based on new scientific principles and technological achievements. The real and far from hypothetical danger that rapid scientific and technological progress might create new forms of the armaments race was lucidly pointed out at the tenth special session. The

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

appearance of the neutron weapon is just one piece of evidence of how imminent, and not imaginary and remote, this danger is, despite assertions to the contrary. That is why we regard as very well grounded the conviction expressed in the draft resolution on the importance of concluding an agreement or agreements which would prevent the utilization of scientific and technological progress for the creation of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons.

My delegation considers that one of the main merits of that draft resolution is the emphasized necessity of undertaking actions without delay for solving this issue on the basis of a comprehensive approach. The effectiveness of this approach lies in the fact that it encompasses the existing standpoints of States; it reaffirms, on the one hand, the elaboration and conclusion of a comprehensive agreement banning the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, whereas, on the other hand, it does not preclude the conclusion of special agreements on various types of such weapons. In this respect it is highly important not to contrast those two approaches but to regard them as complementing each other.

We share the concern of many delegations regarding the attempts to restrict the scope of the current efforts to the elaboration of partial agreements on concretely identified types of weapons. Doubtless this is a major impediment to the response to the numerous appeals made by the General Assembly for application of an over-all and preventive approach. These attempts cannot be characterized other than as representing the desire of certain militaristic circles to preserve the opportunity for the development and manufacture of such means of war as are susceptible of providing them with military superiority. The implications of such policies for international security and the social and economic development of nations, as well as for the very problem of disarmament are well known.

I submit that, in all fairness, a solution to the problem of new weapons cannot be reached by impassively watching their evolution and by initiating negotiations on or concluding agreements banning concrete categories of such weapons only after they are clearly identified. Besides, as has been demonstrated by experience, there exist no guarantees that the appearance of one or another type of weapon automatically leads to immediate negotiations on its prohibition. Proceeding from this consideration, the Bulgarian delegation is firmly convinced that, in order to prevent the appearance of new generations of weapons, there is a clear need to elaborate and conclude a comprehensive agreement as provided for in draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.6.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

The concrete proposals introduced in the Committee on Disarmament constitute, in our view, a good basis for conducting effective negotiations, substantive to the problem. In this respect my delegation would like to cite the draft convention submitted by the Soviet Union, the proposal on the definition of new types of weapons of mass destruction and the draft convention on the prohibition of the manufacture, stockpiling, development and use of neutron nuclear weapons submitted by the socialist countries.

Future negotiations on the really complex problem of the total prohibition of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction could be successfully completed if the existing favourable prerequisites for advancing the question of the total prohibition were to be supplemented by the necessary political will on the part of those States that have so far opposed the achievement of that goal.

I should like, finally, as an expression of our full support for draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.6, to state that my delegation is going to join its sponsors.

My second point concerns A/C.1/34/L.23. A draft resolution on the question of the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons has been submitted to this Committee. That draft has been introduced as a follow-up of the well-known initiative of the Soviet Union at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly. The wide support that Member States give it attests to the fact that it is considered a timely and necessary measure in the over-all efforts to curb the arms race and achieve disarmament. The adoption of the proposed measures would not lead immediately to a reduction of the existing arsenals of States; there can be no doubt however that the restriction of the territorial range of the stationing of nuclear weapons represents one of the necessary steps leading to that goal. In this respect it is important to note that the proposal not only provides for a ban on the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of countries where there are no such weapons at present, but places the complete withdrawal of nuclear weapons from the territories of other countries in its proper perspective.

At the thirty-third session some delegations expressed certain reservations concerning the advisability and the feasibility of that idea. However, the vast majority of countries clearly took the view that its implementation, based on international agreement, would be eminently conducive to checking the

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

proliferation of nuclear weapons and to strengthening international security. It is obvious that in order to reach international consent on that issue it is necessary that all States possessing nuclear weapons, as well as all non-nuclear States, show the political will. In this connexion it is encouraging to note that a significant number of non-nuclear-weapon States have already declared their intention not to allow the placing of nuclear weapons on their territories. Of the nuclear States, only the Soviet Union has so far stated its readiness to commit itself not to place nuclear weapons in those countries in which there are no such weapons at present. We are hopeful that the rest of the nuclear States will follow that example.

The importance of the problem requires that further action be undertaken towards its solution. The proposed draft resolution meets those requirements. The draft contains, along with the reaffirmation of the basic elements of the idea, a proposal for the next logical step: namely, to study the possibility of concluding a relevant international agreement on the matter. I submit that the implementation of that provision would provide the possibility of co-ordinating the viewpoints of States concerning the course to be followed in the future.

To conclude, I should like to express the hope that the draft resolution in question will receive most extensive support from this Committee.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would like to present today draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.33 on the question of nuclear weapons in all aspects, the sponsors of which, apart from the Soviet Union, are another 12 countries: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Viet Nam.

It is universally acknowledged that the highest priority and most urgent task in the field of disarmament is the adoption of immediate concrete measures to call a halt to the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race. As we

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

know, the stockpiles of nuclear weapons which have been accumulated to date are such that their use would jeopardize the very existence of man on earth. We cannot possibly resign ourselves to a situation of that kind; still less can we allow the existing danger to become even more acute. We realize that resolving the cardinal problem of nuclear disarmament is an extremely difficult task which requires great efforts and persistence, but the task is a feasible one, and in any case there is no sensible alternative. This approach is shared, as was shown by the results of the tenth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, by all Member States of our Organization. As is stressed in paragraph 50 of the Final Document, "The achievement of nuclear disarmament will require urgent negotiation of agreements" providing for, inter alia, "Cessation of the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear-weapon systems" and "Cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons".

In furtherance of the ideas contained in the Final Document, the Committee on Disarmament proceeded, in the course of its session in 1979, to a substantive consideration of the question of halting the nuclear arms race and bringing about nuclear disarmament. It can be noted with satisfaction that in the course of the Committee's discussion a useful exchange of views took place on the various aspects of preparations for talks on this question. Another important factor is the fact that the agenda adopted by the Committee on Disarmament includes an item entitled "Nuclear weapons in all aspects".

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The delegation of the Soviet Union, bearing in mind the high priority and importance of nuclear disarmament, together with other socialist countries, presented to the Committee on Disarmament the proposal contained in document CD/4 on negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed. In that document the sponsors made a proposal for practical preparations for negotiations on this question.

In proposing that negotiations be conducted on the question of nuclear disarmament, the Soviet Union is, of course, ready to consider the views of other States on the whole range of questions connected with the substance of the problem and also with the procedure for the conducting of such negotiations. Obviously we should begin with preparatory work aimed at determining the participants in the negotiations and coming to an agreement on a specific agenda and so on. Of course, carrying out the task of attaining the goals of nuclear disarmament is something for which all nuclear-weapon States bear a particular responsibility. The negotiations on nuclear disarmament will be so fundamental in character and of such broad scope and they will be followed by such radical consequences that, if even one nuclear State fails to participate, it will seriously undermine them and will destroy their links with the actual state of affairs in the world and in the final analysis it will affect the results of such negotiations.

We proceed also on the basis of the belief that a certain number of non-nuclear-weapon States will also take part in the negotiations. The most convenient forum for the holding of the negotiations seems to us to be the Committee on Disarmament.

A first step towards the initiation of negotiations would undoubtedly be preparatory consultations which would make it possible to assess the possibility of arriving at agreed proposals with regard to the initiation of negotiations.

Of course, the adoption of measures in the field of nuclear disarmament should go hand in hand with that of international political and legal *measures to strengthen the security guarantees of States.*

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

In the draft resolution we are presenting today there is a specific proposal that all nuclear-weapon States should proceed with consultations regarding the early initiation of urgent negotiations on nuclear disarmament. The Committee on Disarmament is requested, as a matter of high priority, to proceed to consideration of the item concerning nuclear weapons in all their aspects and to submit a report on the subject to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session.

Furthermore, in the draft resolution the nuclear-weapon States are requested to inform the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session of the results of their consultations and eventual negotiations.

The Soviet delegation believes that the practical initiation of consultations with regard to negotiations on nuclear disarmament is a task which should not be delayed. It is obvious that the implementation of that could have a favourable effect on the process of the halting of the arms race and on disarmament in the nuclear field.

In conclusion, the Soviet delegation wishes to express the hope that the draft resolution we are introducing will receive the broadest possible support.

Mr. ABDEL MEGUIE (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): The Egyptian delegation has the honour of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.28, under agenda item 36, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

This draft resolution is not new; it is rather an extension of previous resolutions which have been adopted by overwhelming majorities during the past five sessions of the General Assembly. This attests to the fact that the international community agrees on two important requirements: the first is the need to put an end to the danger that would threaten the Middle East and the world as a whole as a result of the introduction into that region of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction; the second is the

(Mr. Abdel Meguid, Egypt)

need for an effective step forward, such as is represented by this draft resolution, towards the limitation of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, which again is a principle supported by the international community and one that Egypt has long expressed its support for. In order to reaffirm its commitment to that principle Egypt signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, while making Israel's adherence to the same Treaty a condition for its own ratification of it. That has not taken place yet, because Israel has failed to adhere to the Treaty.

The region of the Middle East differs from other regions of the world in two main aspects. First of all, it is a region that is strategically and economically extremely sensitive, and therefore any escalation in the armament systems of the States of the region has far-reaching repercussions on peace and security all over the world. The second difference lies in the fact that that region has been and continues to be the arena of a tragic conflict that has lasted for more than 30 years and that still continues, despite all the serious efforts made to find a solution to it.

The sufferings of the Middle East as a result of the bitter conflict which has lasted for decades and of the wars that have occurred there, in which conventional weapons of the most sophisticated kind have been used, make that region most deserving of the exertion of international efforts with a view to ensuring that nuclear weapons will not be introduced into the arsenals of the region.

Examining the contents of the draft resolution, briefly, one will find that it contains what earlier resolutions on this matter contained and it recalls those earlier resolutions. Furthermore, it reaffirms the contents of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament.

This draft resolution also invites all the countries of the region to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. I would stress again that adherence to that Treaty by the countries of the region of the Middle East would have a very specific meaning, which would go beyond the mere geographical limits of the region and have direct bearing on international peace and security. This is what makes the region in its characteristics different from the rest of the world.

(Mr. Abdel Meguid, Egypt)

The Egyptian delegation feels it must repeat today what it said in its general statement to the First Committee, namely, that it is necessary for the Security Council to play a role in the future stages of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, particularly in those regions where the parties have found it difficult to enter into direct negotiations with a view to agreeing about the necessary arrangement for setting up a nuclear-weapon-free zone. The fact that certain States of the region cannot enter into direct negotiations, must not - whatever the divergences of views and positions concerning the conflict - constitute an obstacle to the limitation of the proliferation of nuclear weapons or the protection of the international community from the effects of the threat of manufacture or use of such weapons under any conditions.

(Mr. Abdel Meguid, Egypt)

It is for this reason that operative paragraph 4 of this draft resolution invites the countries of the region to declare their support for establishing such a zone in the region of the Middle East and to deposit these declarations with the Security Council for consideration as appropriate. The Egyptian delegation has great hopes that the awareness of the threat to the international community will transcend the divergencies existing in political positions so that the General Assembly will be able to reaffirm the need to adopt the necessary measures to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I should like to take this opportunity to explain my Government's objectives in introducing the United States' draft resolution on strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons (A/C.1/34/L.35).

As the representatives in the First Committee are aware, this issue was actively considered by the Committee on Disarmament this year, including serious work in an Ad Hoc Working Group set up for this purpose. From these discussions in the Committee on Disarmament as well as debates in this Committee in previous years and during the special session on disarmament, it is obvious that there are differing views on what arrangements to enhance the assurances already given by the nuclear-weapon States to non-nuclear-weapon States are desirable or feasible.

The Report of the Committee on Disarmament, which was adopted by consensus, reflects those differences. For example, while the report of the Committee on Disarmament (A/34/27) does note in volume I - and I am now reading from paragraph 11 of appendix II - that "There was no objection in principle to the idea of an international convention", it goes on to say that "the difficulties involved were also pointed out" and that other possible arrangements - such as a General Assembly resolution, a Security Council resolution and declarations to be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations - were also discussed.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

The conclusion contained in the report is that "at the beginning of its 1980 session, the Committee on Disarmament should continue negotiations on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons". This can be found in paragraph 13 of that same appendix.

The United States delegation wishes to point out that this conclusion does not attempt to prejudge the further course or the outcome of further negotiations on this issue, which the Committee on Disarmament intends to pursue at its next session. The United States delegation thinks that this is a wise decision and that it would be wise for the First Committee and the General Assembly to adopt a similar approach.

The United States Government firmly believes that resolutions which seek to promote one point of view at the expense of the others are not conducive to progress on this issue and would only complicate the negotiations now under way at the Committee on Disarmament. The United States draft resolution, on the other hand, prejudices the position of no country and thus best serves continued serious negotiations on effective arrangements for negative security guarantees in the Committee on Disarmament.

The United States delegation hopes, therefore, that draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.35 will commend itself to all those interested in a solution to this complex problem and in giving an impetus to the Committee on Disarmament in its search for such a solution.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (Interpretation from Russian): On behalf of the sponsors, Afghanistan, Burundi, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Guinea, India, Japan, Jordan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, the Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela and Zambia, it is my honour

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.31 on the question of Disarmament Week, under agenda item 42 (e), "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". This draft resolution gives an assessment of the work done by Governments and international and national organizations to implement the decisions of the tenth special session and resolution 33/71 D on this question adopted at the last session of the General Assembly. It also indicates the future tasks to be undertaken to intensify the activities of the international community for the purpose of mobilizing world public opinion even more effectively in support of halting the arms race and bringing about disarmament.

The sponsors of the draft resolution have found it necessary for the General Assembly to express once again, as it did last year, its grave concern over the continued arms race, and they have emphasized the urgent necessity and the importance of wide and continued mobilization of world public opinion in support of halting and reversing the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race in all its aspects. This has been reflected in the first two preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution. I do not think that there is any need to explain them in any detail.

Just a little more than a year has gone by since the decision was taken by the tenth special session of the General Assembly to proclaim the week beginning on 24 October, the date of the foundation of the United Nations, a week devoted to promoting the goals of disarmament. This decision of the General Assembly was very warmly welcomed by world public opinion and won the broad support of Governments and numerous international and national organizations. This has been demonstrated particularly by the reports of the Secretary-General containing information about measures taken by governmental and non-governmental organizations in celebrating Disarmament Week and the elements of a model programme of Disarmament Week, as well as by the messages sent to and statements made at the ceremonial meeting of the First Committee devoted to the opening of the Week. All of this has been reflected in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The fourth preambular paragraph refers to resolution 33/71 D relating to Disarmament Week and also to resolution 33/71 G on the dissemination of information on the arms race and disarmament.

In the sponsors' view, the provisions of this draft resolution are of great significance and have a direct bearing on achieving the goal of Disarmament Week. The sponsors believe that the specialized agencies of the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) can and must make an active contribution to achieving the goal of Disarmament Week by disseminating information on the pernicious consequences of the arms race. In their view, that could lead to an even clearer understanding and awareness on the part of world public opinion of the danger of a continuance of the arms race as well as of the urgent need to intensify efforts to curb and call a halt to the arms race and to bring about real disarmament.

On this basis the sponsors believed it necessary for the General Assembly to indicate the need for active participation on the part of the appropriate specialized agencies of the United Nations and the IAEA in promoting the cause of disarmament and, in particular, the holding of Disarmament Week, and have proposed that those organizations step up their efforts, within the framework of their fields of competence, to disseminate information about the consequences of the arms race.

It is also important that they should report to the Secretary-General on their activities along these lines.

Those provisions have accordingly been reflected in the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3.

With regard to the reports presented by the Secretary-General to which I have already referred, I should like to stress that the information contained therein about the measures undertaken by governmental and non-governmental organizations and also the elements of a model programme for Disarmament Week deserve appropriate assessment by the General Assembly, and that is precisely the idea pursued by the sponsors in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. In that paragraph the General Assembly:

"1. Takes note with satisfaction of the reports of the Secretary-General on measures taken by governmental and non-governmental organizations to foster the objective of disarmament and elements of a model programme for Disarmament Week."

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

In operative paragraph 2 the General Assembly would invite

"all States that so desire in carrying out appropriate measures at the local level on the occasion of Disarmament Week, to take into account the elements of the model programme prepared by the Secretary-General."

Naturally, that does not mean any limitation of the scale of the proceedings to mark that Week, which can be determined by the governmental and non-governmental organizations concerned. In the planning of their programmes States could take into account possible measures as proposed in the model programme for Disarmament Week. In order to present detailed information to a broader section of world public opinion on the measures carried out at the national level, and also in compliance with operative paragraph 3 of resolution 33/71 D, the General Assembly would propose that Governments report to the Secretary-General on the measures they have taken.

The sponsors of the draft resolution attach great importance to the active role of international non-governmental organizations in marking Disarmament Week. Their future broad participation in this important international undertaking would continue to serve the cause of the mobilization of world public opinion in support of the halting of the arms race and the bringing about of disarmament. With that in mind the sponsors believe it to be important for the General Assembly to propose that international non-governmental organizations continue in the future to continue to take an active part in activities to mark Disarmament Week and to report to the Secretary-General on the measures they have taken.

In the last paragraph of the draft resolution a request is contained to the Secretary-General, in accordance with paragraph 4 of resolution 33/71 D, to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session a report containing the information referred to in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution.

I should like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to all the sponsors for their constructive participation and important contribution in preparing this draft resolution. We are also grateful to many other delegations that have evinced considerable interest in and made their contribution to the preparation of this document.

The sponsors express the hope that this draft resolution will be adopted unanimously by the First Committee.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

In conclusion, I should like to take the opportunity at this stage of the work of the First Committee to make some additional points on the item under discussion. As representatives know, the group of Socialist States, including Mongolia, this year in the Committee on Disarmament put forward an important initiative with regard to talks on the cessation of the manufacture of all types of nuclear weapons and the gradual reduction of stockpiles of such weapons leading to their total elimination. That proposal, which is contained in document CD/4, aroused great interest among the participants in that Geneva forum. In our view, the discussion in the Committee of this specific proposal about the initiation of talks on the cessation of the manufacture and the elimination of nuclear weapons was useful. A broad exchange of views took place on various aspects of preparing for talks on this question. A good basis was laid by that discussion for the beginning and the continuance of constructive work.

It should be pointed out that that proposal of the Socialist States met with the support of the majority of the members of the Committee on Disarmament. The group of 21 members of the Committee issued a special declaration in support of this initiative of the group of Socialist States.

In their approach to this problem the sponsors proceeded from the belief that appropriate talks should be carried out with the participation of all nuclear-weapon States and a certain number of non-nuclear-weapon States. In this regard the most appropriate organ for preparing for and carrying out the talks could be the Committee on Disarmament. It is important now to translate this into practical terms. This would be an important step towards the implementation of paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

As far as the subject of the talks and other aspects of them are concerned, the main elements are set out in document CD/4. Therefore, there is no need to go into any detail on this. It is universally acknowledged that the attainment of agreement on this vitally important problem will be possible only if we observe the principle that there must be no detriment to the security of any State and that appropriate measures should be carried out stage by stage on a mutually acceptable and agreed basis while preserving the balance of forces. It is important that the preparation and implementation of measures in the field of nuclear disarmament be buttressed by the parallel adoption of political and international legal measures to strengthen the security guarantees of States.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The Mongolian People's Republic, as a member of the Committee on Disarmament, believes that in accordance with the approval of its agenda for next year, the Committee on Disarmament should proceed to genuine talks on the substance of the problem, giving it due priority, and should present an appropriate report to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session.

Of course, we attach the greatest importance to the bilateral and multilateral talks which are now going on in relation to various aspects of the limitation of nuclear armaments, including strategic weapons. It is precisely on the basis of these considerations that the Mongolian delegation became a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.33, which has just been presented by the representative of the Soviet Union. The major presupposition behind this draft resolution is the urgent appeal to all nuclear-weapon States to proceed, in accordance with paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the tenth special session, with consultations regarding the early initiation of urgent negotiations, and eventually with such negotiations on the halting of the nuclear arms race and on a progressive and balanced reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery within a comprehensive phased programme with agreed time-frames, leading to their ultimate and complete elimination.

We should like to express the hope that the First Committee will take a decision on this question by consensus. In so doing it will be making an important contribution to the cause of implementing the relevant provisions of the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The General Assembly at its last session gave broad support to the Soviet proposal and called upon all nuclear-weapon States to refrain from stationing nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. It further called upon all non-nuclear-weapon States which do not have nuclear weapons on their territory to refrain from any steps which would directly or indirectly result in the stationing of such weapons on their territories.

There is no doubt that the implementation of such measures would reliably promote the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The important thing, in our view, is to prepare and adopt an appropriate international agreement. We are sure that it is possible to achieve such international agreement on this important question.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.23, of which Mongolia is a sponsor, examines the need to study the possibility of concluding such an international agreement and calls upon all States to express their views on this subject. The Mongolian People's Republic will follow this decision of the General Assembly, and in due course it will be ready to express its views on this important issue.

We hope that the General Assembly, having adopted an appropriate decision on this subject, will be able at its next session to take steps towards the elaboration and adoption of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. The creation of a universal international legal instrument would constitute an important step towards the achievement of practical measures in the field of nuclear disarmament.

Mr. VUKOVIC (Yugoslavia): Allow me to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.27 on the United Nations Disarmament Commission. As members are aware, the Commission held its first substantive session from 14 May to 8 June 1979. At that session, it considered the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. The Commission informed the General Assembly thereof in its report (A/34/42). As the representatives are acquainted with its contents and with the Commission's recommendations, I do not intend to deal with them here.

Proceeding from the above, and bearing in mind that the Commission's report was adopted by consensus, my delegation has the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.27 on behalf of the following sponsors: Argentina, Bangladesh, Cyprus, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, Peru, Tunisia, Yugoslavia and Zaire. The purpose of the draft resolution is to ensure the adoption of the report and to confirm the recommendations of the Disarmament Commission as well as to secure necessary conditions for the continuation of the work of the Commission in the course of 1980 so as to enable the Commission to fulfil the mandate with which it was entrusted at the tenth special session and at the thirty-third regular session of the General Assembly.

In accordance with this, the preambular paragraphs emphasize the importance of an effective follow-up of relevant recommendations and decisions adopted at the tenth special session, welcome the consensus recommendations on the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament and stress the contribution that the Commission can play in examining various problems in the field of disarmament.

In operative paragraph 1, we endorse the report of the Disarmament Commission on the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. In this paragraph, the Commission is also requested to continue to consider some elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament on which it was not possible to reach agreement at the last session. These elements are contained in paragraph 19 of the Commission's report.

PS/-

A/C.1/34/PV.39
34-35

(Mr. Vukovic, Yugoslavia)

The sponsors feel that such a comprehensive programme should embody the elements mentioned. However, the sponsors have noted that some countries are not prepared to accept our proposal in operative paragraph 1, in which we ask the Disarmament Commission to continue its consideration of these elements.

The sponsors would like to offer the following compromise on that point: namely, that the elements contained in the Commission's report on which no agreement was reached be sent to the Committee on Disarmament. It is our understanding that the Committee on Disarmament, when elaborating the comprehensive programme on disarmament will also give due consideration to these elements.

(Mr. Vukovic, Yugoslavia)

On that basis, I propose to delete part of the text relating to this matter in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. I shall give the text to the Secretariat in due course.

Operative paragraph 2 confirms the mandate of the Commission and fixes the date of its next session. The sponsors consider the date 12 May 1980 to be the most convenient date to start the next session of the Commission.

The agenda of the Disarmament Commission is specified in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. The sponsors believe that the Commission should, at its next session, concentrate its attention on the consideration of the item regarding the advancement of negotiations on disarmament and the effective elimination of the threat of nuclear war. Bearing in mind the importance of harmonizing the views of all countries with regard to this matter, the sponsors propose that this question should be considered within the framework of and in accordance with the priorities established at the tenth special session and with the aim of working out a general approach to negotiations on nuclear and conventional disarmament. The consideration of such a general approach in the aforementioned context, as well as of the relationship between nuclear and conventional disarmament, would contribute, to our mind, towards clarifying these issues and would facilitate the preparation of a comprehensive programme for disarmament and its implementation. This does not preclude, of course, the consideration of other questions on the Commission's agenda, as that is within its own competence.

Operative paragraph 4 requests the Commission to submit a report on its work to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session, while operative paragraph 5 requests the Secretary-General to render all the necessary assistance and to transmit the report of the Committee on Disarmament together with all the official records of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly on disarmament matters. Operative paragraph 6 further requests the Secretary-General to transmit the recommendations of the Commission to the Committee on Disarmament. Finally, in operative paragraph 7, the General Assembly would decide to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-fifth session an item entitled, "Report of the Disarmament Commission".

The sponsors hope that the draft resolution will not create any difficulties and will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. SIMARD (Canada) (interpretation from French): On behalf of approximately 50 countries, whose names I shall not read out because of their number, I have the honour to submit draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.29 on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. However, I should mention here the Polish delegation, whose co-operation and work have made a great contribution to the preparation of the draft resolution. As will be obvious to all, the draft resolution this year is different from those previously adopted, at least with respect to form. We wanted it to be more concise and more explicit.

It expresses regret that an agreement on the complete and effective prohibition of chemical weapons has not yet been worked out; it urges the Committee on Disarmament to undertake at the beginning of its next session negotiations on such an agreement as a matter of high priority; and requests the Committee on Disarmament to report on the results of its negotiations to the next session of the General Assembly.

The Committee on Disarmament, in the course of its last session, did not ignore the question of chemical weapons, as can be seen from its report and the number of working documents submitted on that occasion. Bearing in mind the work done in this field in previous years by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, we believe that the Committee on Disarmament is quite capable of carrying out the task entrusted to it by this Assembly. But it is clear that for this goal to be satisfactorily reached, the co-operation of the main Powers in this field, particularly the United States and the Soviet Union, must be obtained. Those two Powers have been conducting bilateral negotiations for a number of years in order to present a joint proposal to the Committee on the prohibition of chemical weapons. That proposal should serve as a basis for negotiation of multilateral agreement.

As is noted in the report of the Committee, the two Powers did in fact submit a joint report in August 1979. We regret that the report was submitted so late in the session of the Committee; but since it is substantive and very detailed it will doubtless be very useful in the work of the Committee in this field and we all hope that the two negotiating Powers will be able in the *very near future* to submit that joint proposal on the prohibition of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Simard, Canada)

We hope, and the draft resolution clearly affirms this, that the Committee, after all its preparatory work in the field of chemical weapons, will undertake the final phase of negotiations. We are convinced that all members will do everything in their power to establish the conditions necessary to ensure the earliest possible success of the negotiations and that the Committee will be able to devote itself to the task assigned to it: the negotiation of an agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons. The main elements of a future convention, in the opinion of our delegation, have been made sufficiently clear, as have many of the collateral problems attached to the preparation of a convention. We are well aware of the fact that a number of obstacles remain to be overcome before it will be possible to arrive at an agreement, but we believe that as things stand the Committee should be able to establish appropriate machinery for the negotiation of an agreement and to get those negotiations started. In any event, in view of the complexity of the subject, this can only be a long-range task.

Mr. KOSTENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): At this stage of the Committee's work the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic would like to express its views on the draft resolution on the prohibition of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons contained in document A/C.1/34/L.29, just introduced by the representative of Canada.

As in previous years, this year also the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR is among the sponsors of this draft resolution. Our Republic has consistently been in favour of the elimination of chemical weapons from the arsenals of all States. Since 1972 the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva has had before it a draft convention presented by the Socialist countries, including the Ukrainian SSR, on the prohibition of chemical weapons, including the total prohibition of all combat chemical agents.

In the view of our delegation, the essence of the draft resolution submitted by the group of countries is that it directs all States to undertake, as soon as possible, a further search for a mutually acceptable decision in the field of the prohibition of this type of weapon of mass destruction.

(Mr. Kostenko, Ukrainian SSR)

We consider it to be a positive factor that this draft resolution reaffirms the continuity of earlier General Assembly resolutions relating to the complete prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and of their destruction. Those decisions have promoted a more profound and comprehensive understanding on the part of many States of the tremendous danger for mankind represented by the use of chemical means of warfare. The draft resolution once again reaffirms the necessity of strict observance by all States of the principles and objectives of the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare. That international legal document was the first step towards the elimination of chemical weapons. The draft resolution also points to the need for adherence by all States to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction. This represents an important contribution to the cause of genuine disarmament.

(Mr. Kostenko, Ukrainian SSR)

As emerges clearly from document A/34/27, a reference to which is contained in the draft resolution, over the last year active consideration was given to the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons in the Geneva Committee on Disarmament. In particular, at the informal meetings of that multilateral organ for the holding of talks in the field of disarmament a start was made on the discussion of the fundamental elements of the content of a future convention on this subject. Of course, such useful work should be continued at the next session of the Committee as well. An appeal to that effect is contained in operative paragraph 2 of this draft resolution.

Together with the discussion in Geneva, of the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons on multilateral basis bilateral Soviet-American talks have been going on. A substantial fillip to the progress of those talks was given by the meeting in Vienna this past summer between the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Brezhnev, and the United States President, Mr. Carter. In the joint Soviet-American communiqué of 18 June 1979 the Soviet Union and the United States reaffirmed the importance of a general, complete and verifiable prohibition of chemical weapons and agreed to intensify their efforts to prepare an agreed joint proposal to be submitted to the Committee on Disarmament.

In the report of the Committee on Disarmament to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly note is taken with satisfaction of the substantial joint statement by the Soviet Union and the United States of America on 31 July this year reporting on the course of the bilateral talks I have mentioned. The countries which are conducting the talks have reported in detail to the Committee on Disarmament on a number of questions connected with the general, complete and verifiable prohibition of the development, manufacture and stockpiling of all types of chemical weapons, and agreement has been reached between them. On other aspects, talks will be continued.

The Ukrainian delegation considers that this joint communiqué has *made possible a deeper understanding of the complexity of the*

(Mr. Kostenko, Ukrainian SSR)

problems connected with the work on a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons, the purpose of which is the elimination of a whole category of weapons of mass destruction, something that affects one of the most important industries of many countries. We express the hope that these important bilateral talks will be concluded successfully by the presentation of a joint proposal. An important contribution would thus be made to the cause of curbing the arms race and strengthening international security.

The draft resolution which we are discussing on the prohibition of chemical weapons was prepared taking due account of the views and comments of many delegations. That is eloquently demonstrated by the number of sponsors of A/C.1/34/L.29. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR hopes that it will be unanimously approved by the First Committee.

Mr. MARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR attaches great importance to an early resolution of the question of strengthening guarantees of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States and is one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.9 devoted to that problem.

The problem of security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States falls within the general category of disarmament problems, that is to say, the cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons and a gradual reduction of stockpiles thereof to the point of their total elimination.

Like other States of the Socialist community, we entirely share the point made repeatedly in discussion to the effect that the most dangerous threat to peace is posed by the nuclear arms race. We believe that among the complex of issues connected with the arms race and disarmament the question of nuclear weapons should be given the highest priority. However, any problem in the field of disarmament and particularly that of nuclear disarmament, if it is to be resolved, requires an absolutely realistic approach. We cannot imagine that this would be possible if measures were not taken at the same time to strengthen political and international legal security guarantees for States.

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

One such measure could be the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force or the threat of force in international relations. A solution to the problem of nuclear disarmament would also facilitate a limitation of the sphere of the emplacement of nuclear weapons. As representatives are aware, these proposals have been put forward by the Soviet Union at previous sessions of the General Assembly. The proposal to strengthen security guarantees for non-nuclear States is also aimed at the achievement of this goal.

In the view of the Socialist States, the solution of the problem of strengthening security guarantees for non-nuclear States would be achieved by the conclusion of an international legal document in the form of a convention in which nuclear-weapon States would participate, as would countries that would undertake to preserve their non-nuclear status and not permit the emplacement of nuclear weapons on their territories.

The Declaration and Programme of Action adopted at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament also favours the adoption of a legally binding agreement. For example, in paragraph 32 reference is made to the fact that we need "effective arrangements" which would give guarantees to non-nuclear States against the use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Paragraph 59 of the Final Document contains an urgent appeal to nuclear States

"... to pursue efforts to conclude, as appropriate, effective arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons." (resolution S-10/2)

An appeal for the conclusion of an international instrument on this subject in the form of a convention is contained in a document adopted this year at the Sixth Summit Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries and the Tenth Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers.

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

The purport of the discussions at previous sessions of the First Committee and of resolutions adopted on this subject by an overwhelming majority, as well as the purport of the discussion recently concluded in the First Committee, indicate that the non-nuclear-weapon States do not consider the question of guarantees of their security resolved on the basis of unilateral assertions or declarations on the part of nuclear-weapon States. This is an entirely understandable and fully justified position inasmuch as certain unilateral statements, unlike the obligations assumed by the USSR, are accompanied by reservations which provide loopholes that make it possible to disregard certain obligations.

In this regard, it should be recalled that not a single great nuclear Power apart from the Soviet Union supported the resolution adopted in 1972 by the United Nations on the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

What would be the positive significance of a convention? There would be a reduction of the risk or threat of the outbreak of nuclear war as a whole. If there were universal participation in the convention by the nuclear Powers there would be an important reduction in the sphere of the potential use of nuclear weapons. The idea of nuclear-free zones would receive substantial new content.

Together with other measures of nuclear disarmament, such a convention would give additional momentum to the process aiming at the further reduction of nuclear weapons and their removal from the category of weapons threatening mankind.

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

Furthermore, it would result in the elimination of the possibility of the threat of the use of nuclear weapons as a form of pressure on countries that do not possess nuclear weapons - a threat that has been repeatedly made by certain nuclear States in the last decade. The security of the non-nuclear countries would be strengthened if they were to renounce the acquisition or creation of nuclear weapons. Non-nuclear countries, by signing and ratifying the convention, would once again confirm their intention not to adopt a course of acquiring nuclear weapons. In this way the convention would also further strengthen the non-proliferation régime thus reflecting the will of the majority of members of the United Nations.

All this serves to show that what we need is multilateral action in the form of a convention, in accordance with which nuclear Powers would undertake not to use nuclear weapons or to threaten their use against non-nuclear States parties to the convention which renounce the production and acquisition of nuclear weapons and which have no such weapons on their territories. This undertaking could, as provided in the draft convention submitted by the Soviet Union last year, be extended to armed forces and facilities under the direction and control of non-nuclear States, wherever they might be.

All that is expected of non-nuclear States is strict observance of their non-nuclear status. No other conditions are put forward. It is important to point out that the draft convention takes into account the interests of the non-nuclear States in obtaining nuclear energy to be used for peaceful purposes.

The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR, as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.9, on the conclusion of a convention on the strengthening of security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States, calls on the delegations of other countries actively to support it.

The task of the international community is to do everything possible to see that the Disarmament Committee, on the basis of the proposals put forward by the USSR and taking account of the constructive proposals and points made by the delegations of other countries, carries out useful and fruitful work on this question as a high priority task during its 1980 session. Thus, as soon as possible, work could be concluded on the appropriate convention and a contribution made to the implementation of the recommendations of the special session on disarmament.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): I have pleasure in introducing draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.39/Rev.1 on behalf of the delegations of Algeria, Angola, Benin, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mali, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire and Zambia.

The draft resolution is based on an initiative first taken by my delegation in the plenary meeting on 26 October, shortly after it was widely reported that South Africa might have detonated a nuclear device in September. It will be recalled that on 26 October the General Assembly took a decision to request the Secretary-General of the United Nations to investigate the reported explosion by South Africa.

The Secretary-General has since submitted his report - first an interim report, and later a report dated 12 November 1979 contained in document A/34/674. That report contains two replies to the inquiries made of Member States by the Secretary-General. Since one of those replies, namely that by South Africa contains what everybody expected - in other words, a flat denial of the event - my delegation wishes to draw attention to the reply sent to the Secretary-General by the United States. In that reply the United States confirmed that a nuclear explosion might have occurred in the region of South Africa as indicated by a signal communicated by a United States satellite on 22 September 1979. However, the reply also made clear that the United States was unable to obtain corroborative evidence of the fact that a nuclear explosion had actually taken place. The United States promised to submit a further report to the Secretary-General after further inquiries had been made.

Since the Secretary-General submitted his report on 12 November 1979, there have been further press reports quoting sources in New Zealand indicating the discovery of low-level radio-activity in rainwater consistent with the detonation of a nuclear device in the southern hemisphere.

Therefore, it is clear that we have not heard the last of the responses to the Secretary-General's inquiries. It is possible that other replies may still be received from other Governments and other sources. In the light of the importance that was attached to this subject when first raised in the plenary meeting, it is the view of the sponsors of the resolution that there is a need

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

to continue to follow up this matter, for some time at least. It is the opinion of the sponsors of the draft resolution that the First Committee, which deals with disarmament items, which is primarily concerned with issues involving the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and which has shown a consistent interest in the denuclearization of Africa, should play an active part in ensuring that the United Nations pursues this subject, not only in the narrow context of the reported detonation on 22 September, but in the wider context of the concern which has always been expressed by the United Nations - a concern which usually emanates from the First Committee - about the nuclear-weapon capability of the South African régime or its desire to acquire such capability.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

It is in this respect significant to note - and my delegation is very appreciative of this development - that in its reply to the Secretary-General the United States Government stated that a panel of experts had been established to investigate the available data arising from the signal that the United States satellite recorded on 22 September 1979.

The sponsors are of the view that perhaps, since facts have been adduced not only by the United States but by at least one other source, the Secretary-General should also be able to evaluate some of those facts independently.

That is the rationale behind the draft resolution in document A/C.1/34/L.39/Rev.1, which is very, very simple. It merely recalls the action that was taken in October and the report that the Secretary-General submitted subsequent to that action by the General Assembly.

In its operative part, the draft resolution naturally expresses appreciation to the Secretary-General for the action he took in pursuance of the decision of 26 October. In operative paragraph 2 it appeals to all Member States in a position to do so to provide all relevant information at their disposal to the Secretary-General. It is the hope of the sponsors that this information will be forthcoming and that an opportunity will be given for an independent assessment of such information. That opportunity will only exist if Governments do not hesitate to make available to the Secretary-General whatever information and data they have at their disposal. We hope that the Governments that have such information will respond positively to the request of the Secretary-General and the General Assembly.

Operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution requests the Secretary-General to follow the situation closely - action which would be consistent with the importance that has been attached to this question by the international community - and in the light, of course, of further relevant information that would be submitted to him by Member States.

Operative paragraph 4 further requests the Secretary-General, with the assistance of appropriate experts, to prepare a comprehensive report on South Africa's plan and capability in the nuclear field and to submit it to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session. In effect, whatever the result

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

of the present inquiry as to what actually took place on 22 September, I think it is necessary, as the sponsors have indicated in operative paragraph 4, to place the reported event in the proper perspective of the concern the United Nations and its individual Members have always shown about nuclear developments within South Africa. This is not the first time that we have had an indication of active preparations by the Government of South Africa to detonate a nuclear device. It is therefore necessary, in the view of the sponsors of this draft resolution, that the United Nations have an awareness of the true situation, an awareness based on a proper evaluation of the capability of South Africa and on facts that would be assessed by experts, so that whatever further action is necessary could be decided upon by the United Nations in the light of the facts of the situation.

The sponsors have made the draft as simple and straightforward as possible so that it will not create any problem for any delegation in supporting it. We are of the view that this draft resolution is one that tests the will of the membership of this Committee and therefore of the United Nations in the resolve to pursue and get an indication of the facts concerning the nuclear ambition of South Africa. We therefore hope that it will be possible for all delegations to support the draft resolution and that, when the time comes for it to be submitted for a decision, it will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. HLAING (Burma): As the Committee is aware, Burma is the current Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament. I have therefore asked to be allowed to speak to introduce the draft resolution in document A/C.1/34/L.36, after informal consultations with the members of the Committee on Disarmament.

The sole purpose of this draft resolution is to update legislative authority for the Secretary-General to provide services for the Committee on Disarmament. The Secretary-General has in fact been providing services for the Committee on Disarmament under the terms of the authority given him to provide services for the former 18-nation Disarmament Committee.

The Committee on Disarmament has its separate rules of procedure and formulates its own agenda taking into account, inter alia, the recommendations

(Mr. Hlaing, Burma)

made to it by the General Assembly. Rule 17 of the rules of procedure, which the Committee on Disarmament adopted by consensus, states that the Secretary-General of the United Nations will be requested to provide the staff as well as the necessary assistance and services needed by the Committee and any subsidiary bodies which it may establish.

There has already been a substantial increase in the workload of the Committee on Disarmament in its first year of functioning. For example, in 1978 the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament held 85 meetings, whereas this year the Committee on Disarmament has held 155 meetings. Similarly, the documentation has increased from 32 documents in 1978 to 53 documents in 1979.

(Mr. Hlaing, Burma)

Consequently additional services had to be provided for the Committee on Disarmament in 1979. It is necessary also to take into account the establishment of subsidiary bodies such as expert groups, ad hoc working groups, drafting groups and so on, for dealing with various aspects of the work of the Committee on Disarmament, for which adequate staff will have to be provided. The demand for such services may increase in the future, depending on the progress made by the Committee on Disarmament in its work. The draft resolution does not imply the creation of additional posts, but only provides up-to-date authority for the Secretary-General to continue to assign staff to service the Committee on Disarmament according to its workload.

In accordance with rule 37 of the rules of procedure, interpretation, translation, verbatim records, transcripts, documentation and so on will also have to be provided in the official and working languages of the General Assembly of the United Nations, including Arabic - now an official and working language of the Committee - and Chinese, when China takes its seat in the Committee on Disarmament. The Secretariat will shortly submit a statement of the financial implications of the proposed draft resolution.

It is my hope, and this hope is shared by many members of this Committee, that the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: No other representatives wish to speak at this time to introduce draft resolutions or to speak on those already introduced. Therefore it is my intention now to turn to document A/C.1/34/L.40, the draft decision sponsored by Mexico, Argentina and the Philippines and entitled "Study on a comprehensive nuclear test ban". It will be remembered that on Monday the representative of Kuwait requested further clarification on the procedure to be taken in the future when the Advisory Board, whose function it is to advise the Secretary-General on disarmament studies, adopts a recommendation for study, and the procedure the General Assembly must take in order to approve such a study. The representative of the Soviet Union has asked for a vote on this draft decision, but before we take a vote I shall give the floor to the Committee Secretary, who will reply to the representative of Kuwait and also read out the administrative and financial implications involved.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the First Committee): In reply to the inquiries about the procedures for dealing with studies involving the Advisory Board, the Secretariat wishes to draw attention to the following. By paragraph 98 of the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, General Assembly decided that

"At its thirty-third and subsequent sessions the General Assembly should determine the specific guidelines for carrying out studies, taking into account the proposals already submitted including those made by individual countries at the special session, as well as other proposals which can be introduced later in this field. In doing so, the Assembly would take into consideration a report on these matters prepared by the Secretary-General."

In addition, by paragraph 124 the Secretary-General was requested "to set up an advisory board of eminent persons, selected on the basis of their personal expertise and taking into account the principle of equitable geographical representation, to advise him on various aspects of studies to be made under the auspices of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and arms limitation, including a programme of such studies."
(resolution S-10/2)

As may be seen from document A/33/312/Add.1 and document A/34/588, the Secretary-General acquaints the General Assembly with the activities of the Advisory Board in the field of disarmament studies. It is understood therefore that on occasions the Secretary-General may consider it appropriate to draw the attention of the General Assembly to a particular recommendation or recommendations by the Advisory Board for studies to be carried out under the United Nations auspices. As envisaged in the aforementioned paragraph 98 of the Final Document, the General Assembly bears the ultimate responsibility for deciding on the studies to be carried out. Therefore if the General Assembly considers that effect should be given to any recommendation it will have to pronounce itself accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the Committee Secretary for the reply to the question raised by the representative of Kuwait. As mentioned, this draft decision has financial implications. I now call on the Committee Secretary to read them.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the First Committee): This is a note from the Secretary-General which will appear as a document tomorrow morning.

It reads:

"Under the terms of the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/34/L.40, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to prepare the study on the question of a comprehensive nuclear test ban recommended by the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies and by the Secretary-General. The study should include the chapters or sections of the relevant report of the Secretary-General (A/34/588)" - and in this connexion I draw attention to paragraph 14 of that document -

"and should be completed in time to be transmitted to the Committee on Disarmament at the spring session of 1980. It would be carried out in accordance with the procedure described in paragraph 16 of the Secretary-General's report.

"Paragraph 16 of the report referred to, inter alia, states:

'The Secretary-General envisages that this study could be carried out in the United Nations Secretariat, with the help of four consultant experts, engaged for a period of approximately two months. The cost involved, including salaries and travel of the experts, would amount to approximately \$51,000.'

"As indicated in paragraph 17 of the same report, these costs cannot be met from the existing resources or from the budgetary estimates contained in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981.

"Thus, should the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/34/L.40 be adopted, additional appropriations in an amount of \$51,000 would be required under section 2B for general temporary assistance."

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The United States wishes to explain, before the vote, why it proposes to abstain on the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/34/L.40. The United States is not doing so because of any objection to studies generally. We think that each study should be considered on its merits and we have no disagreement with the statement that has been read out on behalf of the Secretariat. It is a legal posture, but that does not mean we automatically have to agree to each study if we do not think it is justified.

In regard to this particular study, in so far as it relates to unclassified matters, there are quite a few studies on the negotiations for a test ban that are of an unclassified nature. If it is classified, I am not entirely sure how it can be carried out. In other words, the dissenting view which says:

"On the other hand, the view was expressed that this subject had been adequately studied, that much of the relevant information was classified and would not be accessible for a United Nations study ..."

(A/34/588, paragraph 13)

is a view that the United States Government holds. It is for that particular reason - not as a generalized objection - that we propose to abstain on this draft decision.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): My delegation also wishes to explain its vote. As the Committee knows, at the meeting of 19 November the Soviet representative gave his views on the Mexican proposal for a draft decision concerning a study on the question of a comprehensive nuclear test ban. Today we should like to reaffirm the

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

position that we took at that time, namely, that this study seems to us to be superfluous from a practical standpoint, as far as the negotiations to achieve a nuclear test ban are concerned. I would emphasize that nothing new could emerge from a study of this nature at the present stage and therefore we feel that this study should not be undertaken. What is necessary, and required as soon as possible, is the completion of the tripartite talks and the opening of the way to a world-wide comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. To achieve that goal, we are convinced, all Member States of the United Nations should unite their efforts. It is to that purpose that my delegation and my Government are devoting their best efforts. To undertake a study of this nature would in no way contribute to the achievement of that goal. That being the case, my delegation intends to vote against this draft decision.

The CHAIRMAN: As representatives know, we have a problem with our voting machine and we must resort to the reliable form of a vote by show of hands. The draft decision contained in document A/C.1/34/L.40 will now be put to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The draft decision was adopted by 84 votes to 9, with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): It was with considerable regret that I had to abstain on this draft decision. My sense of regret is due to the great sympathy I have for the sponsor and his Government and also to our generally favourable position with regard to studies on disarmament. Therefore, my delegation abstained not because we are not parties to the ongoing negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test ban and have not participated in the previous negotiations, but for two other reasons. In principle, it seems to us somewhat belated to start studies on a subject that has been an item of negotiation for some time and has been

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

thoroughly studied in the past. In these negotiations, at least at a certain stage through accession to universal treaties, all nations have had time to ponder the subject. Furthermore - and in this matter I would endorse the comments made by the representative of the United States - it seems to us that the elements of this study are common knowledge. Many publications of private institutions and universities and United Nations publications themselves contain substantial information which probably would suffice to enlighten Governments with regard to the problems inherent in a total nuclear test ban treaty. I believe that if one were to turn to well-known sources - and I am thinking of the remarkable work of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute for one - all Governments interested in the matter could be completely enlightened. There is also another aspect which my Government considers very important, and that is the need to economize. Therefore, as I say, we regrettably had to abstain on this matter. We should have liked to support it, but we were forced to abstain because we believe that this study is not essential but that, on the contrary, to a certain extent it may duplicate sources of information already available.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I should like to say a few words in explanation of my delegation's vote on the draft decision with regard to the study on a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

The reason that we voted for it - although this may sound belated because the matter has been under discussion and negotiation for such a long time - is that there is a widespread opinion that the obstacles to achieving a comprehensive test-ban treaty are not related to any scientific or technical problem but are merely political. Therefore, I believe that the sponsors of that draft decision, and particularly the members of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies, feel that public opinion should be made aware whether it is a matter of technical difficulties or of a political problem. This is very vital to the world at large, and it must be known. We believe that the study should be made for the aforementioned reasons, and we want to make it clear that we voted for the draft decision not because we believe that something unknown will ensue but because we wish to see resolved the question whether the difficulty is scientific or political.

The CHAIRMAN: Before making a few brief announcements, I call on the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, who wishes to make a short statement with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.17, which was adopted this morning.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): This morning I tried in vain to catch your attention by raising my hand, Sir, and I am very grateful to you for giving me the opportunity to speak at this time.

We decided this morning on the continuation of the programme of fellowships on disarmament. In this connexion I wonder whether you might find it appropriate to bid farewell, in your capacity as Chairman of the First Committee, to the participants in the programme who are about to finish their training. My delegation feels that the participants were carefully selected and that they showed a great deal of interest in and curiosity about the programme. I very much enjoyed the contacts which I had with them, both in Geneva and in New York.

On this occasion you might express the hope that, after their return home, the Fellows will be given assignments in which they could make use of the additional knowledge and experience which they gained during their assignment.

The CHAIRMAN: I have had the opportunity of meeting many of the Fellows who have studied under the Disarmament Programme this year, and I have seen many of them here, some probably working even harder than the representatives assigned to this Committee, but I suppose that is a part of the training. They seem to me to have exhibited the kind of talent that is indicative generally of the calibre of representatives that were sent to this fellowship programme.

I sincerely trust that, as some of them have said to me, they will be assigned to various posts in their Governments to deal with disarmament matters. I hope that the programme in its extension will continue to attract students - if I may call them that - of the same high calibre as those I have met on this present fellowship programme. I have only one regret, and that is that my Government had not seen fit to select me to attend the disarmament fellowship programme. To the fellows present here I would say, I wish you all great success in whatever you do. It is to be hoped that you will come back to the First Committee here at the United Nations and continue the fine contribution that you have made so far. Congratulations.

Now I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become additional sponsors of draft resolutions: Guinea, A/C.1/34/L.9; Niger, A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1 and A/C.1/34/L.15; France, the Philippines and Qatar, A/C.1/34/L.29; Egypt, A/C.1/34/L.36; Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo, Tunisia and the United Republic of Cameroon, A/C.1/34/L.39/Rev.1; Sudan, A/C.1/34/L.21; Yugoslavia, A/C.1/34/L.30 and A/C.1/34/L.34; and Mauritius, A/C.1/34/L.40.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: We shall meet next on Friday morning, when draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.30, L.34, L.37 and L.38, which remain pending, will be introduced. On Friday also we hope to be able to take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.6, L.12/Rev.1, L.14, L.20, L.21, L.22, L.25, L.27, L.28, L.31 and L.32.

On Monday, 26 November, we shall take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.3, L.9, L.15, L.23, L.26, L.29, L.33, L.35 and L.38 and the draft resolutions contained in document A/34/29.

On Tuesday, 27 November, we shall deal with draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.30, L.34, L.36, L.37, L.38 and L.39/Rev.1.

I should be glad to be notified of any of these draft resolutions that could be dealt with earlier than at the times I have indicated, should that become possible.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.