

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1755th
MEETING

Tuesday, 10 November 1970,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Tribute to the memory of General Charles de Gaulle, former President of the French Republic	1
Agenda items 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 93 and 94:	
Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (continued)	
Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (continued)	
Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (continued)	
Implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: report of the Secretary-General (continued)	
Establishment, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency, of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (continued)	
Status of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2456 B (XXIII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) (continued)	
Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security (continued)	5

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

Tribute to the memory of General Charles de Gaulle, former President of the French Republic

1. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before continuing the debate on the items on our agenda, I wish to express the shock I felt when I heard of the sudden death of one of the greatest men of France and of our day. General Charles de Gaulle was a man endowed with a far-seeing mind and of a moral fibre capable of coping with any adversity; he had a profound sense of history and a clear-cut understanding of world problems. He worked indefatigably for the greatness of his country, friendship among peoples and peace. The death of this leader, of this hero in both war and peace, the last survivor of the great military leaders of the Second World War, is a matter of great sorrow to the world. I believe that I will be interpreting the unanimous feelings of members of this Committee when I express to the Government and the people of France our profound sorrow at the death of this great leader and statesman, and I would request the delegation of France to transmit to its Government, its people and the family of the late General de Gaulle our deepest condolences.

2. In memory of the late General I would request members of the Committee to stand and observe a minute's silence.

The members of the Committee observed a minute's silence.

3. Mr. MORTENSEN (Denmark): On behalf of the group of West European countries and others, I wish to express our most sincere sympathy to the French delegation on the death of General de Gaulle. One of the great figures of this century, indeed of any century, has passed away. General Charles de Gaulle was the unique statesman of our time, a man of vision and a man with the will to realize his visions. Ever since he became the natural leader of the Free French during the Second World War he never lost sight of his sacred aim: to regain the independence of France. During his long struggle, he became the personification of France and when independence was achieved we witnessed the happy fusion of General de Gaulle with his people, a phenomenon which has never been equalled. Since then France has always been at the centre of de Gaulle's endeavours. We share the sadness and mourning that has gripped his country. Anyone who has lived in France in the time of General de Gaulle will realize that his place in the hearts of the men and women of France was marked by the way in which they shared the good and bad times of their common fate.

4. His vision of a free, regenerated Europe became the centre of his activities. He put his status, his personality and his prestige to the task of expiating the enmity between the traditional antagonists on the old continent. Thereby, he, more than anybody else, laid the only solid foundation on which the Europe of the future could be built. But his vision reached even further. Through a process ranging from *détente* to *entente* and co-operation, he put his efforts into breaking down the artificial barriers which were the result of the Second World War.

5. Charles de Gaulle was not only in this way a European in mind, but he also persistently pursued his ultimate goal: a world of peace and security. His life was marked throughout by a special dignity that never left him. His belief in his country and his people remained his guide. France has lost a great son; Europe has lost the man who healed the wounds of old conflicts and remained a vigorous, albeit often controversial, voice in the endeavours to form a new future. The world has lost a great statesman.

6. Mr. CHRISTOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): In the name of a group of delegations of socialist countries, I would like to present to the French delegation our most sincere condolences on the occasion of the death of General Charles de Gaulle. Now that this tremendous

statesman has left the world arena to enter history forever, men of goodwill, I am convinced, will remember the great role played by him in the Second World War.

7. Having filled the history of France for over a quarter of a century, this powerful personality, General de Gaulle, put his exceptional talents as a statesman, his political clear-sightedness and his authority at the service of the most noble causes of understanding among peoples and international peace and thus, at decisive moments of our time, earned the gratitude of the whole of mankind.

8. Mr. ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the 23 members of the Latin American group, it is my honour to express to the French Government and people, through its delegation, our profound grief at the death of General de Gaulle.

9. This is an irreparable loss, not only for his great country which he loved so dearly, but for all mankind that saw in him one of the great spiritual reserves of man.

10. Charles de Gaulle was one of the great personalities of his day and he left a profound mark on history. He left the positive mark of hope and creativity, that hope which was embodied by him in 1940 when he refused to accept defeat and the humiliation of occupation. For the community of free men, therefore, he became a symbol of valour and freedom. He lived the history of his day and he gave it a sense and a direction: a sense of freedom and the direction of progress.

11. The news of his death has shocked all peoples and each citizen of every country. He was able to reconcile the idea of authority with that of freedom, to which he was always faithful.

12. Charles de Gaulle fought not only for his own country but for a France that was the expression of the ideas and concepts of all mankind.

13. "France goes back to the mists of time; France is living; the century beckons her"; it is thus that de Gaulle saw and loved his land of culture and freedom, the place for man, for human creativity and culture, the France that men like de Gaulle have enriched and strengthened.

14. In these moments of shock and grief the Latin American nations wish to pay a tribute to France, a tribute of friendship, loyalty and gratitude for all that men like de Gaulle have done for mankind and for the freedom of man.

15. Mr. BAYÜLKEN (Turkey) (*interpretation from French*): As chairman of the Asian group and in the name of my delegation, I should like to express the deep emotion we felt and our sadness on learning of the sudden demise of General de Gaulle, the former President of the French Republic and the great leader of the French people.

16. General de Gaulle was one of the greatest personalities of our century. The work accomplished by him has left its imprint on our times and will forever testify to his exceptional qualities.

17. General de Gaulle did not put his talents and his skill as a statesman only at the service of his country, but at the

service of the whole of mankind. Thus, throughout his political career, he earned not only the gratitude of his country but also the respect and esteem of the international community. We shall always remember his great contribution to self-determination and understanding among peoples.

18. Turkey and France are linked through traditional and centuries-old ties of friendship. These feelings were once more expressed during the memorable visit of General de Gaulle to Turkey. We vividly recall the enthusiastic and spontaneous welcome which the Turkish nation gave to this great French leader during his visit to my country in 1968.

19. In the name of the members of the Asian group and in the name of my delegation, I should like to ask the French delegation to be kind enough to transmit to the Government and the people of France and to the family of this great man our most heartfelt and sincere condolences.

20. Mr. EPANGUE (Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): It is not without deep feelings that the African delegations have heard of the death of General de Gaulle and I wish to tender to the French delegation the condolences of the African delegations, as well as those of my own delegation, on this sudden bereavement.

21. General de Gaulle was not only a great military man but also an eminent Head of State; a great writer but also and above all one of the political figures of our day.

22. Historic ties linked the African peoples in general and the Cameroonian people in particular with General de Gaulle. Already in his *War Memoirs* General de Gaulle had spoken of the active people of Cameroon who in 1940 sent their sons in the bitter trial of the Second World War to fight, shoulder to shoulder, with the free French forces.

23. In his *Mémoires d'espoir*, General de Gaulle gives pride of place to the African Heads of State. As far as the Head of the Cameroonian Republic itself is concerned, he attributed his success to his prudence in domestic matters and his policy of reserve in foreign affairs.

24. General de Gaulle died in silence and with dignity. As a great French philosopher said, I would say: "The dead govern the living." It is true; those ideas which governed the activities of General de Gaulle throughout his entire life will continue to guide both the French and other peace-loving peoples of the world.

25. Whether it is a question of what General de Gaulle himself called "a certain way of thinking of France" or whether, particularly as far as we are concerned, it is a question of what we might call a certain way of thinking of General de Gaulle in the world at large, or whether, even more as far as we Africans are concerned, it is a question of the right of peoples to self-determination, because General de Gaulle was truly the father of decolonization in Africa, it is thanks to his personal work that today we are witness to the greatest transformation in post-war history.

26. To conclude, I would ask the French delegation to transmit to the French Government, to Madame de Gaulle and to the family of the late General de Gaulle the most

sincere condolences of the delegation of Cameroon and of the other African countries. I would cite a French poet, and say: "Those who dutifully have died for their country have the right to be prayed for by the people at their grave; among great names theirs are the greatest. All glory beside theirs fades and passes away."

27. Mr. EL-ERIAN (United Arab Republic): On behalf of the other Arab delegations and the delegation of the United Arab Republic, I wish to convey to the delegation of France our sense of loss at the death of a great son of France and a great world statesman and liberator. The impact of President de Gaulle on the twentieth century is universally recognized. We in the Arab world recall his stand for the freedom and liberation of his country during the Second World War, which set a shining example of eternal value to the cause of freedom. We also recall with gratitude his support of the right of the Algerian people and other African peoples to self-determination and national independence, so brilliantly recalled to us by the representative of Cameroon. We also recall with gratitude his stand with us, ever since 1967, for the cause of peace and justice. We wish to say to the French delegation that we share in their sadness and mourning today.

28. Mr. LEONARD (United States of America): I should like to add the voice of the delegation of the United States to those that have already so eloquently paid a tribute to General de Gaulle. He was a great man, a very great man indeed. There is nothing we can say today that will add to his stature or console his family and the people of France for his loss. I would, nevertheless, be grateful to the representative of France if he would transmit to his Government and people this expression of deep admiration for one of the most outstanding figures in the whole line of great men which his nation, the oldest of our allies, has given to the whole world. He was a symbol of resistance, however long the odds, of resistance to oppression and evil, and of struggle for freedom, for truth and for justice. And after the war had been won, he became a symbol of reconciliation among peoples, a symbol of the hope to build a better future. In our country, as everywhere, his loss will be deeply felt.

29. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): On the occasion of the death of the outstanding French statesman, General de Gaulle, we should like, on behalf of the delegation of the Soviet Union, to ask the representative of France in our Committee to transmit to the delegation of France at this twenty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly and to the family of the deceased President our heartfelt condolences.

30. President de Gaulle, through his many successful activities during the Second World War and the post-war period, has left a deep imprint as an outstanding political and military figure in his country. As the leader of the heroic resistance movement, he made an invaluable contribution to the struggle of the peoples against Hitlerite Germany. In France's darkest hour following the invasion of the country by the Hitlerite aggressors, General de Gaulle raised high the standard of battle and united the hopes of the French nation in the fight against the Nazi oppressors. As Head of the Government and President of

French Republic, he made an enormous contribution to the cause of European security and to the creation of mutual understanding among peoples in the post-war world.

31. We would make special mention of the tireless efforts exerted by General de Gaulle in developing relations in all fields between the Soviet Union and France, efforts which made a remarkable contribution to the cause of extending mutual understanding among peoples and the strengthening of international peace.

32. We wish to express our feelings of grief and our heartfelt sympathy in memory of this outstanding leader of the great French people, Charles de Gaulle. We are deeply grieved by his sudden death.

33. Mr. YAPI (Ivory Coast) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of the Ivory Coast has learned with profound emotion of the death of General de Gaulle, former President of the French Republic. The loss of this outstanding statesman, whose name is so closely bound up with the history of our time, especially that of the peoples formerly under French administration, is deeply felt in the Ivory Coast, where he enjoyed high esteem and respect. Indeed, he understood the profound and legitimate aspirations of our people and bent every effort to help us achieve full sovereignty in friendship with his country.

34. The delegation of the Ivory Coast shares the grief of the French delegation and would request it to transmit to the Government and the family of the late President our most sincere condolences.

35. Mr. PORTER (United Kingdom): As representative of the country which was proud to welcome General Charles de Gaulle to its shores at the time when he rallied to his side Frenchmen who were able to continue the fight for the freedom of their fatherland, I should like to pay tribute to this great man and to offer the sincere condolences of my delegation to the French delegation.

36. By command of Her Majesty the Queen, flags in Britain are being flown at half-mast today as a mark of respect.

37. General de Gaulle will always be regarded with admiration and affection by the British people for his heroic services to the cause of freedom during the worst years of the Second World War. For us, he will also be remembered as the man who inspired the French people during and after the war and helped to rebuild a strong and prosperous nation. His influence was world-wide. He was an outstanding leader. He made distinguished contributions to military and political thinking and to the literature of his country. He was one of the few very great international statesmen of our time, and his death is a sad loss for France and for the world as a whole.

38. Mr. ANAS (Afghanistan) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the delegation of Afghanistan, I express my deep feelings of sympathy and my sincere condolences to the people and Government of France on the death of General de Gaulle.

39. General de Gaulle was a great personality who earned the respect of all peoples of the world. He lived a life of

glory. Twice he saved his country. He was a monument of courage, determination and wisdom.

40. He did not want a solemn State funeral. According to his will, he asked for a quiet burial in the cemetery of his own village. It is this last mark of modesty that adds the final page to his glorious biography.

41. His memory in the years to come will inspire all mankind.

42. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation feels very deeply the death of General de Gaulle because of the powerful and historic ties between my country and one of its motherlands. Standing like a figurehead during the Second World War, General de Gaulle through those dark days held high the torch of hope.

43. The former President of France was able to bring to its apex the prestige of his country, a cause to which he devoted his whole life. His name is already engraved in history.

44. The delegation of Canada shares the morning of the French people and Government, to whom we express our deepest and most sincere condolences.

45. Mr. HARBI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): If General de Gaulle were able to hear us still, I am sure that he would not be pleased by all these tributes to his memory, since that man, born to a wholly exceptional destiny, did not live for himself, but for his country, France, with an intense passion which obsessed him. He knew that he embodied the very values and the vocation of France. "I, France" he often liked to say.

46. The man whose destiny twice set him on the political stage, first in initiating and in organizing resistance against European fascism, and then in reconciling France with herself and with the peoples that she had once colonized, will remain in the history of his country and elsewhere as the one who best understood the meaning of history, who changed the ties of subordination into ties of co-operation in the interest of his country and its partners.

47. We Algerians have a particular reason for admiring and loving the man who alone was capable of leading France and the French to admit the fact that Algeria was a nation and of inaugurating between the French people and the Algerian people fruitful as well as friendly co-operation.

48. The encouragement of a policy of national independence, the constant and determined struggle against all hegemonies, of which he was the architect, earned him friendship and popularity in the countries of the third world. His life, his thought, his conduct will remain a great source of inspiration to all.

49. Mr. BHAGWANTAM (India): The news of the death of General Charles de Gaulle has shocked all of us. On this sad occasion I wish to say a few words expressing the feelings of the Indian delegation.

50. General de Gaulle was undoubtedly a great world figure and will be remembered as a great military general.

But that is not all. We think he was as great in peace as he was in war. General de Gaulle was a man who achieved many things not only for his own country but also for the whole world. He was the symbol of freedom. He was the symbol of truth and of justice—and this is of great significance for peoples of the entire world. For us, in the latter part of his life—and we remember this with gratitude—he did a great deal to improve and strengthen the cultural ties between India and France. His loss through death, though a very great and irreplaceable one for France, is equally great for the whole of Europe and indeed for the whole of the world.

51. On behalf of India I wish to join the other delegations here in expressing our sorrow and offering our condolences to the family of the late General de Gaulle and to the great French nation. I would request the delegation of France to convey on this sad occasion the feelings of the Indian delegation to all the people of France.

52. Mr. CARACCILOLO (Italy) (*interpretation from French*): Although the feelings of all our delegations have already been expressed by the chairman of the Western group, I wish to express to the French delegation, as a representative of a country which is linked to France through ties that have their roots in the very distant past, which have been strengthened by a close-knit co-operation in every field and by the pursuit of common ideals, the particularly deep condolences of the Italian delegation.

53. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): The Ambassador of Turkey, who is the chairman of the Asian group, gave eloquent and moving expression to the emotion that all of us feel on the passing away of one of the great figures of this century, General Charles de Gaulle.

54. At the same time, the stature of this son of France is such that we in Pakistan, although of another continent, identified with him because of his profound understanding of the aspirations and yearnings of the third world, in the liberation of which he played so noble a part and to which he always gave aid and comfort.

55. I have no words to express our respect and veneration for this towering figure of our age, this hero who now enters the pantheon of history.

56. A great contemporary of his, Winston Churchill, proclaimed as his own personal motto: "In war, resolution; in defeat, defiance; in victory, magnanimity; in peace, goodwill." In the life and work of General de Gaulle those words were made flesh.

57. The delegation of Pakistan bows in homage and sorrow to his memory and offers its deeply felt condolences to the delegation of France.

58. Mr. MOMBOULI (People's Republic of the Congo) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of Cameroon has already expressed, on behalf of the African group, the condolences offered by all Africa on the sudden death of General de Gaulle.

59. I shall like, on behalf of the delegation of the People's Republic of the Congo, because of the common history

that linked Brazzaville with France during the Second World War, to say how deeply touched the Congolese people have been on hearing the sudden death of General de Gaulle.

60. I would simply ask, in the name of my Government and of the Congolese people, the delegation of France to transmit to the bereaved family our deepest condolences.

61. Mr. MATTEI (France) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. Chairman, it was with deep emotion that my delegation received the words of condolence which you were good enough to ask me to transmit to France, to my Government, and to the family of the great man who has passed away.

62. I thank you, as I thank all delegations that expressed their views, as well as the countries in whose names those delegations spoke.

63. I ask the Committee to rest assured that those condolences and the bereaved feelings of the international community are matched by the sense of grief which the whole French nation feels today.

64. The man of the appeal of 18 June, the man of the resistance, the man who remained faithful to his allies in the difficult hours, the man who restored public liberties in France, the architect of decolonization, reconciliation, *détente* and peace; that man who had deep roots in his country's past but who was also open to changes in the world, enabled France, in pride and independence, in friendship and co-operation, to regain its place in the community of nations.

65. My delegation has just received testimony to this, and to us, in these sad hours, it is a powerful solace. We thank you from the bottom of our hearts.

AGENDA ITEMS 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 93 AND 94

Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/7958, A/7960 and Corr.1, A/7961, A/8059-DC/233, A/C.1/1001, and 1010, A/C.1/L.523)

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

Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/7967/Rev.1 A/8059-DC/233)

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

Establishment, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency, of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (*continued*) (A/8080)

Status of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2456 B (XXIII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) (*continued*) (A/7993 and Add.1 and 2, A/8076, A/C.1/L.522)

Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security (*continued*) (A/7994)

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

66. Mr. THYNESS (Norway): Even if my delegation can associate itself fully with all the eloquent and moving tributes to the memory of General de Gaulle, it is impossible to start today's debate without paying homage to that great patriot and world statesman. My Government will express its deep sorrow to the French Government in the General Assembly today, but the death of General de Gaulle is a momentous occasion, affecting people as well as Governments. That towering figure, who played such a large part, in our time, in shaping events and in charting the course of history, will no doubt loom even larger as time goes by and it becomes possible to evaluate the true extent of his impact on his country, on Europe, and on the world. The Norwegian people bow their heads in sorrow and in respect.

67. Several of the preceding speakers in this debate have deplored the fact that no real disarmament measure has been agreed upon during the last quarter of a century. At the threshold of the Disarmament Decade the only exception would seem to be—as already mentioned by the Swedish representative—President Nixon's decision last year to dismantle the United States' resources for biological warfare.

68. At the same time, however, we ought to keep in mind that we are living in a world community that displays sharp conflicts of interest, aims and aspirations, and where sufficient consensus about principles of peaceful, organized coexistence and co-operation simply does not exist.

69. Given this situation, it would seem inappropriate not to take account of the important progress that has occurred in the area of arms control during the 1960s and the various significant arms control measures agreed upon, such as the limited test-ban Treaty,¹ the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*], the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America,² and the draft treaty now before us on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the sub-soil thereof [A/8059-DC/233, *annex A*].

70. With regard to current negotiations, my Government considers particularly significant the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) initiated last year, and resumed in

¹ Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480 (1963), No. 6964).

² United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634 (1968), No. 9068.

Helsinki a few days ago, by the United States and the Soviet Union.

71. In our intervention in this Committee last year [1696th meeting], we welcomed the initiation of the talks and expressed the hope that the preliminary talks would develop into substantial negotiations that would lead, not only to a limitation, but also to a reduction of nuclear strategic weapons. Although we realized that the talks presented an extremely delicate and intricate task, and that patience would be necessary, we expressed the belief that the strategic arms race had reached an important threshold, and that time might be running out for achieving control. We stressed the fact that technological development could overtake the best of strategic arms control proposals.

72. Looking at the situation today, my Government is happy to observe that our hopes have been fulfilled in so far as the preliminary talks have developed into serious negotiations. Technological development has, however—at least to some extent—resulted in deployment and contemplated deployment of new types of weapons, which we fear may further complicate a strategic arms limitation agreement. We nevertheless hope that the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks have already been able to slow down what would otherwise be a much more far-reaching and more dangerous development—the testing and deployment of strategic weapons—and that they may achieve results that will imply a curbing of the strategic arms race and a durable stabilization of the strategic weapons relationship. This in turn could open up the possibility for a limitation, and subsequent balanced reductions, of those weapons.

73. In our view, even limited agreement or understanding between the two super-Powers in this vital area could lead to further improvement of the relations between the two countries and thus contribute to a general lessening of tensions. We also consider the negotiating progress in itself as valuable, since the talks presumably provide both sides with an increased understanding of each other's capabilities and intentions. This could have a significant ameliorating influence on the pernicious action-reaction cycle in the arms race.

74. Finally, on this point, we would seriously hope that none of the parties in the talks would take steps that would make the prospects for a strategic arms limitation agreement disappear. In particular, we should like to warn against an unproductive prolongation of the negotiations which could result in the super-Powers going ahead with weapons programmes that would otherwise not be undertaken, with a view to strengthening their bargaining positions.

75. If the talks bring about stabilization in the strategic weapons area, they might have a stabilizing effect also in other fields.

76. Considering the region of Europe, which has been referred to by several speakers, we believe firmly that, if one avoids destabilization of the military situation, it should be possible to maintain the existing stability at a lower level of forces and armaments. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization alliance has on a number of occasions proposed negotiations on mutual and balanced force

reductions in Europe and has, over the years, devoted considerable time and study to this problem. The Warsaw Pact countries have recently responded, limiting themselves, however, to a general statement suggesting discussions of a reduction of foreign forces on the territories of European States. My Government nevertheless hopes that the preliminary soundings and bilateral talks aimed at clarification, at present under way, will eventually provide a common basis for discussing a balanced reduction of forces and armaments in Europe.

77. Because of the unresolved political issues, which to a large extent remain so despite indications of developments towards an increased political stabilization in Europe, it is essential that any reduction of the military forces in Europe should not seriously alter the military stability. I believe that this is a requirement which is in the interest not only of the members of the two military alliances but also of other European nations and indeed the world, which has twice been ravaged by wars that originated in Europe.

78. Concerning the prospects of a complete test-ban treaty, my Government strongly hopes that the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks will result in an agreement or understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States of America that would eventually help to pave the way for the conclusion of a complete test-ban treaty.

79. Since we are not yet at that stage; since the question of a complete test-ban treaty does not limit itself only to the two super-Powers; and since a complete test-ban treaty is desirable in itself, here and now, and could even be conceived of as a preliminary step towards a strategic arms limitation agreement—for all these reasons there is a strong case for working out means of verifying the compliance with a complete test-ban treaty. This would demonstrate to present and potential nuclear-weapon States, as well as all other States, that there is a reasonably credible way of detecting violations of a complete test-ban treaty. If this were accomplished, we believe it would be difficult for those States which might be interested in continuing nuclear tests underground to do so without seriously challenging world opinion.

80. If the whole question of verifying a complete test-ban treaty could be solved by on-site inspection, there would be no problem. The same would apply if it could be demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt that national means of verification—such as national seismic stations—would suffice.

81. As these means of verification are not acceptable or believed to be sufficiently reliable, the United Nations last year decided on a most valuable exploration into the field of a world-wide exchange of seismic data [resolution 2604 A (XXIV)]. My Government is most grateful for the Canadian initiative in this direction and for the many positive replies [A/7967/Rev.1] to the Secretary-General's questionnaire concerning the Member countries' seismic facilities. We are also grateful for the efforts made by Canada to analyse what could probably be achieved in terms of seismic detection by exchanging seismic data on a world-wide scale [A/8059-DC/233, annex C, sect. 34]. It is most encouraging to see the fact demonstrated that there are indeed great potentials in this field, and my Govern-

ment is ready to support further initiatives in this area, such as the draft resolution mentioned by the representative of Canada at the 1749th meeting on 2 November.

82. Over the years the Norwegian Government has consistently supported the efforts—particularly in co-operation with the other Nordic countries—to achieve the necessary technical basis of a complete test-ban treaty. My Government has also co-operated with the United States in building in Norway one of the world's two largest seismic stations. This seismic array station—designated NORSAR for short—will be completed some time next year. We hope that this installation will in large measure increase our knowledge in the area of detection seismology and thus constitute a significant contribution to the general aim of achieving agreement on a complete test-ban treaty. I should like to stress that we hope NORSAR will attract seismologists from other countries for shorter or longer periods of study and that we are looking forward to co-operating with all interested nations in using this facility for joint international research projects in detection seismology.

83. My Government has noted with satisfaction the joint submission on 1 September 1970 by the United States and the Soviet Union of the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof.

84. The draft treaty has already received wide support. My Government hopes that the General Assembly will endorse the draft treaty and recommend that the depositary Governments open it for signature as soon as possible.

85. Some have tried to belittle the importance of this particular treaty, arguing that it is rather unlikely that any nation would use the sea-bed for deploying weapons of mass destruction. Be that as it may, we have at any rate been warned that the capability to do so already exists. Closing the option to deploy weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed could also be considered as contributing to increased stability among the nuclear Powers.

86. The draft treaty would, if implemented, also constitute a first step towards the reservation of the sea-bed for peaceful purposes. International co-operation in the exploitation of the sea-bed should now not risk being obstructed by actual or planned deployments of weapons of mass destruction. Thus the treaty may contribute not only to arms control and disarmament but also to the project of creating an international régime for the exploitation of that part of the wealth of the sea-bed, the ocean floor and the subsoil which is in the process of being recognized as a common heritage of mankind.

87. The considerations that have been the basis for our general attitude towards this arms control measure have also inspired us in our attitude towards the question of verification.

88. First, we have a preference for a system of verification which would later be adapted to a possible extension of the ban to include other kinds of weapons also.

89. Secondly, we have supported all attempts to obtain a system of verification in which as many countries as

possible would have a right to participate and which would be operated within an organized international framework.

90. Against this background, the provisions for verification in the draft treaty are not entirely satisfactory.

91. The fact, however, that the draft treaty now also stipulates that verification may be undertaken through appropriate international procedures within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with its Charter gives some hope. At least this would be an acknowledgement of the principle that there ought to be an international procedure, and this acknowledgement might be of help in working out the rules and regulations for peaceful exploitation of the sea-bed and the ocean floor.

92. With regard to the question of biological and chemical weapons, our basic position is very clear: current international negotiations should aim at achieving an effective ban on the use of biological and chemical weapons and on their development, production and stockpiling, including a ban on the use in warfare of tear gases and herbicides. An internationally negotiated agreement on such a comprehensive ban on the use of biological and chemical weapons would provide a clear demarcation line in warfare between the use and non-use of gas and would further reduce the risk of escalation to other types of chemical weapons.

93. To achieve this aim it would seem necessary to base oneself on a pragmatic view of world society. Therefore, a complete ban on the use and possession of biological and chemical weapons must be backed by a credible guarantee that all nations will respect such a ban. The form in which this guarantee must be given will of course depend on the amount of mutual trust among nations and the degree of likelihood that States will or will not produce and use biological and chemical weapons.

94. We do feel, however, that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva has made progress in this area of arms control and disarmament; the many valuable contributions from its members have at least served to highlight and clarify the problems involved.

95. With regard to the dispute as to whether to deal with the two types of weapons separately or together, we are inclined to think that we would be well advised to take what we can get at present in this area as in others in our field of interest. I should like to quote the representative of Poland who stated on 2 November, when discussing the question of general and complete disarmament:

“We should strive for the creation of a definite pattern of negotiations wherein each successive disarmament measure resolving a concrete problem would serve to reinforce the effectiveness of the preceding agreed measure, while at the same time laying down the groundwork that would favour and facilitate still further disarmament agreements.” [1748th meeting, para. 104.]

96. By what I have said I do not imply that the prospects for progress on the prohibition of biological and chemical warfare cannot be discussed concurrently. As a matter of fact this approach has already been adopted by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. In this

connexion we should like to support the position taken by the representative of the Netherlands when he stated on 5 November [1751st meeting] that, in his interpretation, this approach could be reconciled with paragraph 6 of the memorandum of the group of 12 in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [A/8059-DC/233, annex C, sect. 39], stating that both chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons should continue to be dealt with together in taking steps towards the prohibition of their development, production and stockpiling and their effective elimination from the arsenals of all States.

97. To sum up, Norway considers that an agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union on strategic arms limitation would constitute a particularly important contribution to a general reduction of tension in the world. My Government is actively supporting the efforts of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to reduce the military confrontation in Europe. We have strongly supported efforts directed towards an ending of the nuclear arms race and we consider the non-proliferation Treaty, which came into force on 5 March of this year, as a significant milestone. Further work remains to be done, however, on the full implementation of this Treaty.

98. I have briefly outlined Norway's contribution to a possible complete test-ban treaty, and I should like to end this statement by extending my Government's best wishes for the future work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, in particular with regard to the Committee's continued and important work on the problems of biological and chemical means of warfare.

99. Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria) (*interpretation from French*): It was with a feeling of deep sadness and sympathy that my delegation learned of the unexpected demise of General de Gaulle, former President of the French Republic. The news was for us a cruel blow. It is with deep regret that we realize that the world has lost one of its most eminent statesmen and one of the most courageous leaders of this century. We remember with heartfelt gratitude the fundamental role played by General de Gaulle during the Second World War, as well as his decisive contribution to the rebuilding of the European continent.

100. May I, in the name of the delegation of Austria, express to the representative of France our most heartfelt condolences and ask him to be kind enough to transmit to the Government and people of France, as well as to the family of the deceased, our deepest sympathy on hearing of this tragic loss.

[The speaker continued in English.]

101. The number of items which we are called upon to consider during our general debate on disarmament testifies to our deep interest in the problems of disarmament and to our firm determination to come to grips with a development which ultimately might decide our survival in this world.

102. The number of problems and issues to be commented upon in the space of time allotted for consideration of the disarmament question in the First Committee also makes it imperative to establish priorities and organize any interven-

tion in the debate in such a way as to ensure the most effective contribution to the deliberations on these items. Accordingly, in my statement in the present discussion, I propose to deal primarily, although not exclusively, with those items that are the subject of negotiations within the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

103. As to the other items on our agenda, which are of equal importance and of course closely related to the issues before the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, we reserve our right to intervene in a more detailed fashion at an appropriate stage of the debate.

104. In addition I should like to say that my delegation also intends to deal extensively with the encouraging and very useful reports of the International Atomic Energy Agency on the implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States [A/8079 and Add.1] and on the establishment of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes [A/8080], on the occasion of the discussion of the Agency's report to the General Assembly. Indeed, it is stated in the Agency's report on the implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States that this report repeats in somewhat different presentation the information communicated to the General Assembly in the annual report of the Agency. The reasons for that duplication are understandable, since most of the recommendations of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States are similar to the agency's own programme and objectives.

105. While the Austrian delegation is happy to see in this coincidence of purpose a clear strengthening of the role of the Agency, we should like also to draw attention to this duplication which should be borne in mind and dealt with in the manner proposed by the delegation of the Netherlands [see 1751st meeting]. In fact, consultations are already under way which, we hope, will lead to the adoption of a satisfactory draft resolution in this respect.

106. Let me turn now to the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [A/8059-DC/233], and in particular to measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament.

107. The most important development in this field was certainly the entry into force on 5 March 1970 of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII), annex]. Austria, which was among the first to sign and ratify the Treaty, has from the beginning supported the concept of an agreement to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

108. The entry into force of that agreement means, of course, giving practical implementation to all the provisions of the Treaty, including the establishment of a safeguards system under the International Atomic Energy Agency as envisaged in article III of the Treaty. The safeguards system would constitute adequate guarantee against the diversion of nuclear energy from peaceful uses to nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

109. As we know from the detailed reports of the Agency, the Board of Governors, meeting early in April 1970, set up a Safeguards Committee as a committee of the whole. The

task of the Committee, which is still meeting, was to advise as an urgent matter on the Agency's responsibilities in relation to safeguards in the context of the non-proliferation Treaty. The Committee has in fact already approved a set of safeguard principles to be used in negotiations between the Agency and the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. My delegation is gratified to see that the agency has tackled this problem with its accustomed dispatch and circumspection.

110. The coming into effect of the non-proliferation Treaty has also led to further consideration by the Agency of the establishment of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. An encouraging and informative report of the Agency has been submitted in this respect, which reflects, among others, the results of a panel on peaceful nuclear explosions held in Vienna at the Agency's headquarters in March of this year. In addition to reviewing the available information on experiments with peaceful nuclear explosions, the panel also gave considerable attention to the future activities of the Agency.

111. My delegation is satisfied with the progress made so far. We are, however, aware, given the present state of this technology, that further study will be required before we will be able to assess correctly the contribution of peaceful nuclear explosions in an international context. We believe that continuation of the efforts at present under way at the International Atomic Energy Agency would constitute the best possible way of furthering our common goal.

112. Though we are encouraged to note that now almost 100 States have signed the non-proliferation Treaty and almost 60 States have deposited their instruments of ratification, we cannot fail to observe that only the widest possible acceptance of the Treaty will eventually lead to its desired objective. The Austrian delegation would therefore like to join delegations which have already done so earlier in this debate, and appeal to those countries that are still considering their position to adhere to the Treaty.

113. The next step after achieving a halt in the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons would be to endeavour to contain the continuing vertical proliferation or sophistication of nuclear weapons. The third step would then lie in attempting to eliminate these weapons altogether.

114. An auspicious beginning regarding the limitation of the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons was made last year by the opening of bilateral Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) between the Soviet Union and the United States. We continue to view these talks, which took place in Vienna earlier this year and are now being resumed in Helsinki, as a natural outcome of the spirit underlying the non-proliferation Treaty, in which the nuclear Powers undertook "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament". We share the view of the Secretary-General, who has described these negotiations as the most important and fateful disarmament discussions since the Second World War, and hope anxiously for their positive outcome.

115. The talks on the limitation of strategic armaments between the two super-Powers should, in order to achieve

lasting results, be accompanied by renewed efforts in the field of the test-ban issue. Much to our regret we have to note that in the present report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, seven years after the conclusion of the Moscow partial test-ban Treaty,³ hardly any signs of progress can be found regarding the deliberations on a treaty banning underground nuclear weapon tests.

116. In the past the opinion prevailed that two aspects of the problem were mainly responsible for preventing the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The first was of a technical nature, namely, how to develop adequate means of verification to ensure the observance of such a treaty in all environments. The second aspect was a political one, namely, the decision and determination of the nuclear Powers to discontinue testing in any environment.

117. The means and resources available for test-ban monitoring through seismological detection have considerably improved in recent years, as also might be concluded from the Secretary-General's report pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2604 A (XXIV) concerning the provision of certain information in the context of a proposal for the creation of a world-wide exchange of seismological data [*see A/7967/Rev.1*]. This development would point to the fact that the problems of extending the Moscow Treaty to underground testing are tending more and more to be of a political nature only. We would therefore think that under the present circumstances the decisive step to achieve a break-through towards such an extension would lie more and more in the political field, in the decision by the major Powers to end nuclear tests in all environments. We are, however, aware that the technical aspect is not yet solved and intend therefore to co-sponsor a draft resolution that would urge Governments to consider improving their capability to contribute high-quality seismic data with assured international availability in order to facilitate the achievement of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

118. The complexity of the question of disarmament is directly related to revolutionary progress in science and technology. It is therefore logical that in the last few years disarmament efforts have been directed to problems which are closely linked to this technical evolution. Here I have in mind particularly the attempts to prevent the spreading of the nuclear arms race to the marine environment and specifically the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof, the text of which is contained in an annex to the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Although this treaty is not a disarmament measure in the strict sense, it is one more step towards excluding vast parts of the human environment from the further spread of nuclear weapons. Thus it should be mentioned together, in particular, with the 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies [*resolution 2222 (XXI), annex*], which banned nuclear and other mass destruction weapons from outer space and provided for the demilitarization of celestial bodies, and also with the Treaty for the Prohibi-

³ Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480 (1963), No. 6964).

tion of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, known as the Treaty of Tlatelolco,⁴ which for the first time has established a nuclear-weapon-free zone in an inhabited part of the world.

119. We appreciate the serious efforts that have led, in the first instance, to an agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union on the principal aspects of the sea-bed treaty, and later on to its revisions in the light of suggestions made in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and during our debates in the First Committee last year. What my delegation would wish to underline in this context is the fact that the treaty, which in essence represents a bilateral self-limitation, has been negotiated and finalized multilaterally. We sincerely believe that the present draft, the third revision of the original draft submitted by the co-Chairmen, truly reflects all the requirements that, in the present situation, can realistically be asked of a treaty of that kind. My delegation, which has decided to co-sponsor the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.523 commending the draft treaty, has done so not only because the suggestions we put forward last year were taken into account in this third revision, but also because we are convinced that the treaty meets the interests of all of us.

120. In this context let me also say that we support the proposal to keep the question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and ocean floor on the agenda of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Indeed, in accordance with article V of the draft treaty, the parties to it undertake to continue negotiations concerning further measures in the field of disarmament for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed.

121. I should like now to turn to non-nuclear measures of arms control and disarmament, in particular to the question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. The fact that a sizable part of the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament is devoted to the discussion of this problem testifies to the urgency attached to its solution and also seems to indicate that possibilities exist for overcoming most of the remaining difficulties. One difficulty is, of course, the unresolved question of whether to tackle chemical and bacteriological weapons in a single instrument or separately, an issue which is closely linked to the problem of verification. Various very useful suggestions have been put forward with respect to the latter. However, no practical and generally acceptable solution was found. I would limit my comments here and express the hope that it will be possible for the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in a further round of negotiations to come closer to the objective which we all desire: the complete elimination of all chemical and bacteriological weapons. Pending the achievement of this goal, all appropriate measures should be taken to strengthen the Geneva Protocol of 1925.⁵ We are aware of the shortcomings of the Geneva Protocol, but feel that action in this direction will favourably influence our further efforts to ban and eliminate all chemical and bacteriological weapons. In this

context we are happy to note that during the past year 10 States have found themselves ready to accede to the Protocol and that the United States, on the national level, has set in motion the process of ratification.

122. When last year the General Assembly declared the decade of the 1970s as a Disarmament Decade [*resolution 2602 E (XXIV)*], it also recalled that general and complete disarmament was the primary and ultimate goal of the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and in fact of all our endeavours in the field of disarmament. Since in the past the political situation made it unrealistic to expect any comprehensive agreement on general and complete disarmament in the foreseeable future, the Committee on Disarmament concentrated its efforts rather on the partial and confidence-building or collateral measures of disarmament. We ourselves continue to see much merit in following the course taken during recent years in the pursuit of effective measures of arms control and arms limitation in any area, however restricted, where agreement seems possible. Nevertheless, we also welcome the proposals which have been put forward this year in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in response to General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV), which requested the elaboration of a comprehensive disarmament programme. Even from a methodological point of view, these proposals, which show the interrelationship of disarmament measures, are very valuable, because they are likely to help us to concentrate our endeavours on the most significant and essential issues.

123. Before concluding, let me express the hope that this Committee will be given the necessary opportunity to discuss the problems raised by the item introduced by the delegation of Romania [*A/7994*]. We believe that a discussion and study of the economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security might indeed provide the basis for a synthesis of our work in the various committees of the General Assembly. It would follow up a similar study carried out in 1962⁶ and make us aware of what we stand to gain if we continue our efforts with the requisite determination and perseverance. It would also contribute to a better understanding of one of the most crucial problems with which mankind is faced today.

124. In the "Declaration on peace and disarmament" [*A/C.1/1001*], presented recently on behalf of five Nobel Peace Prize laureates, it was restated that the arms race is linked with unrest and suspicion between nations. May I express the hope that we will be able to bring about the climate of confidence and mutual understanding that must be the basis for lasting measures of disarmament.

125. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): Before beginning my statement on the subject before the Committee, I should like to associate myself and my delegation with all that has been said here this morning in praise of Charles de Gaulle and in sorrow over his death. No words of mine can adequately measure his inestimable service to his country in war and in peace, as a soldier, a patriot, President and leader of giant stature. He was an unparal-

⁴ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634 (1968), No. 9068.

⁵ Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare (League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV (1929), No. 2138).

⁶ *Economic and Social Consequences of Disarmament* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 62.IX.1 and 62.IX.2).

leled inspiration to the French people and he became himself a symbol of France and a legend in his own time.

126. He will have many monuments to his greatness, none more imposing or more lasting than his achievements in Africa. There can be no better testimony, I believe, to the enduring friendship between France and her former colonies in Africa than the many warm and, indeed, affectionate tributes that I have listened to from African delegations in this Committee this morning.

127. I should like to convey to the representative of France the deepest sympathy of my delegation and of the Government and people of Australia.

128. Each year, in our consideration of arms control and disarmament in this Committee, we assess progress during the 12 months that have passed and make recommendations for future action. The opportunity to take part in this debate is of particular value to countries such as Australia, which are not members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. This year we again have, as the basis for our discussions, a comprehensive and detailed report from the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [A/8059-DC/233] and at the outset of this statement I should like to record my delegation's appreciation both of the work that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has done this year and of the most useful report it has produced.

129. The range and complexity of disarmament problems make it somewhat difficult for outsiders to follow the course of negotiations in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. But this must not lead us to regard disarmament as an academic exercise, divorced from the realities of everyday living. On the contrary, closely interwoven as it is with the whole texture of national policy, it demands the scrupulous attention of all of us in this Committee. For this reason, I would like to begin my statement today by setting our certain considerations which, my delegation feels, should apply to the negotiation of measures of arms control and disarmament.

130. Perhaps most important, those responsible for this work should have clearly in mind the close and intimate relationship that exists between their endeavours and the security of all nations and all peoples of the world. This would imply that measures of arms control, if they are to be successful, must make a genuine contribution to the security of nations and, conversely, that they must not have the effect of setting individual States or groups of States at a disadvantage. This has to be an important determinant of their effectiveness and, therefore, of their acceptability.

131. In addition, arms control negotiations, if they are to be productive, require a wide understanding of the issues involved and a willingness to negotiate seriously for the common good and without polemics. This can only imply a process of trying first to isolate the areas of difficulty and then of working seriously to resolve them by seeking texts capable of commanding consensus support. The path to this objective lies through full, frank and co-operative discussions. My delegation feels that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament remains the most appropriate forum for detailed multilateral disarmament negotiations,

and the Committee will continue to have our support for its work.

132. It will be evident that, whereas the threat to national security is world-wide and contagious, it can and does differ both in degree and in kind from country to country and from region to region. It follows that the extent of the threat can also vary in proportion with the geographical location of nations and that in this respect some countries are more favourably situated than others. Thus, the security problems faced by the two big Powers between each other differ from the security problems that exist on the continent of Europe. In turn, these two sets of problems differ from a third set—the insecurity that rules, for example, in various developing regions of the world, where some smaller countries are facing a constant challenge below the nuclear threshold in maintaining their integrity and their independence.

133. From this it is clear that if measures of arms control are to be successful they will have to be responsive to differing security situations in different parts of the globe. Nations as a whole will not normally be disposed to judge such measures from the point of view of one standard selective list of criteria. They will judge them primarily from the point of view of their own circumstances, with their own security in mind. In this situation, arms control negotiations need to be approached in a flexible and pragmatic frame of mind and not necessarily in accordance with any preordained set of priorities, although, of course, it may be helpful from a planning point of view to develop such a set of priorities to act as general guidelines and objectives along the path of negotiation.

134. My delegation believes that we can take encouragement from the advances made in regard to arms control in the 1960s and, more particularly, in the past year. This, we hope, will prove to be a good omen for even more significant progress during the Disarmament Decade of the 1970s.

135. The report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to the General Assembly contains in annex A a draft treaty to prohibit the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof. My delegation is gratified to note that this draft treaty has gained broad acceptance in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, and we hope that it will in turn gain widespread support from the nations of the world.

136. Australia has supported efforts in the United Nations, and particularly in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, to negotiate an effective sea-bed treaty, and we have followed these negotiations closely and sympathetically. When an earlier draft⁷ of this treaty was under consideration at the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly, my delegation indicated its willingness to support a resolution commending it for signature. The Assembly, however, felt then that more work was necessary to make the draft treaty effective and more widely acceptable. To signify its interest in such an outcome, my

⁷ *Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1969, document DC/232, annex A.*

delegation co-sponsored General Assembly resolution 2602 F (XXIV), which asked the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to continue work on the draft treaty.

137. We consider that the efforts of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament during 1970 have brought about certain improvements to the text. The important considerations for Australia in examining the draft treaty are that it should be as equitable as possible in the obligations it imposes upon parties and that it should make a real contribution towards advancing the security of States. It should also be capable of attracting widespread adherence if it is to fulfil the purposes for which it is designed.

138. The current version of the draft treaty contains new and, I think, improved provisions concerning the means of defining the areas of application of its undertakings and also concerning verification. We consider it essential, as a matter of principle, that international treaties bearing upon disarmament should contain provision for adequate verification so that parties can feel confident that other parties are respecting their obligations. In the case of this draft treaty, article III, which deals with verification, bears the imprint of many hands, but it is by no means to belittle the contributions of other countries to pay a tribute to the Canadian Government for the suggestions its representatives have made for improving this article.

139. My delegation believes that this draft treaty should be kept separate from and without prejudice to other questions affecting the seas and the sea-bed, such as those concerning territorial limits and exploration and exploitation of resources. We therefore attach particular importance to article IV of the draft treaty.

140. Seen in the light of the foregoing, the draft treaty as it is now before us seems generally to meet Australia's requirements, and its objectives are acceptable to us; we would be prepared to support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.523, which would commend the draft treaty to Governments and express the hope for the widest possible adherence to it. Confirmation of this initial attitude and a decision in regard to signature will have to await studies that are continuing in Australia.

141. Perhaps the main achievement over the past year was the entry into force on 5 March of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*]. Australia signed this Treaty, subject to certain understandings and interpretations, and welcomes the fact that it has taken effect. We hope that, in time and with the co-operation of the international community, it will become a fully effective barrier against the spread of nuclear weapons. To underline this point, the Australian Government said in a statement on 27 February 1970, when it signed the Treaty, that it would co-operate closely with other Governments in seeking clarifications and understandings in relation to those matters which must be resolved before Australia could proceed to ratification, being convinced that a treaty which was truly effective in preventing the further proliferation of nuclear weapons would be a major contribution to the security of the world as a whole.

142. We also welcome the promising start of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) between the United States and the USSR, which resumed in Helsinki last week. I am sure we would all agree that a balanced and verifiable limitation of such armaments would help to reduce fears all around the world.

143. The records of the proceedings in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament this year indicate that the question that is attracting most attention in the Committee is that of the control of chemical and biological means of warfare. This subject has a long history, but rapid technological advances in recent years have made more urgent the problems of developing by international agreement a further series of constraints to strengthen and supplement those that already exist in the Geneva Protocol of 1925.⁸

144. The Australian Government looks at the menace of chemical and biological warfare from its position as a party to the Geneva Protocol, which it has supported and will continue to support. I may say that we are pleased to note that the Protocol has gained strength through the accession of several more States during the past year. At the same time, because the Protocol is not entirely adequate for current purposes, my Government supports efforts to formulate with a minimum of delay additional effective measures of control over chemical and biological weapons of war.

145. A study of the records of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament this year indicates that all members of the Conference devoted attention to this matter. Many also took the additional step of submitting working papers dealing with various aspects of the problem. This activity has furthered the process of defining the areas of major difficulty and clarifying views thereon.

146. It has also revealed differences of approach. On the one hand, the United Kingdom delegation to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has submitted a draft convention [A/8059-DC/233, *annex C, sect. 2*] that would require an undertaking from its parties never to engage in biological methods of warfare; it proposes that action in regard to the more difficult question of chemical warfare should proceed separately. Eastern European representatives in the Committee, on the other hand, have supported a draft convention originally submitted by the communist countries during the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly,⁹ which would treat both subjects together.

147. Without wanting to prejudice the issues at this stage of consideration, my delegation inclines towards the United Kingdom approach, on the understanding that efforts to deal effectively with chemical warfare would proceed independently and with appropriate urgency. On the theory that a bird in hand is worth two in the bush, I suggest that it is better to grasp and utilize what is possible of

⁸ Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare (League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV (1929), No. 2138).

⁹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda items 29, 30, 31 and 104, document A/7655.

achievement now than to hold out for the ideal comprehensive agreement that may lie some distance in the future.

148. We are given to understand that it might be possible, with goodwill, to reach consensus in the near future on a workable agreement covering biological warfare, whereas if we wait for an effective and widely-supported instrument covering both chemical and biological warfare we might have to wait a long time. The reasons for this are simple and, in our view, compelling. Chemical weapons pose particularly difficult problems in regard, first, to a generally accepted definition of the threshold of control; secondly, to the means of accommodating legitimate peaceful activity; and thirdly, to verification. It may take some time to solve these difficulties in a manner that is widely acceptable. If on the other hand we approach the question pragmatically, the answer would seem simple: let us have the biological convention now and work with renewed vigour towards a chemical convention to complement it. My delegation regards as cogent the arguments on this point advanced on 4 November by the United Kingdom representative [1750th meeting] and hopes that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament will look afresh at this proposition in 1971.

149. I would add, in this regard, that the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.526 would have our support as being a good way of handling the problem of chemical and biological warfare at this session of the General Assembly.

150. The work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament this year has brought home the problems involved in devising an acceptable and effective system of verification that would ensure compliance with any further treaties, particularly in regard to chemical warfare. One obvious difficulty lies in resolving significant differences of opinion as to the threshold at which further controls would take effect. In this regard, we need to bear in mind that problems of verification will increase in proportion as the threshold is lowered.

151. The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament now has at its disposal a large amount of information, both technical and political, about the verification question. In this particular field, technical and political considerations are regrettably but inevitably linked; my delegation, however, continues to hope that it will be possible to devise a system of control that is technically adequate, on the one hand, and politically acceptable, on the other.

152. It may be, therefore, that the time has come for the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to draw together the strands of thought that have been expressed in regard to verification provisions in a chemical-warfare treaty, in the hope that by so doing it will be possible to find a basis for an acceptable formula. We note that several delegations in the Committee have supported a suggestion, originally made by Japan, that a study might be carried out to this end. My delegation would be happy to add its own support to this initiative. We note in this regard that the representative of Japan made some interesting suggestions, during his intervention in our debate on 4 November concerning further action on the question of verification [*ibid.*].

153. I turn now to the question of the testing of nuclear weapons. As a country in a part of the world where nuclear testing in the atmosphere is still going on in disregard of world disapproval as in the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963,¹⁰ and as a party to that Treaty, Australia reiterates its firm opposition to atmospheric testing and restates its support for a comprehensive nuclear test ban, effectively verified. Continued atmospheric testing, in our view, not only weakens the force of the partial test-ban Treaty but increases the difficulty of reaching broad agreement on a comprehensive test ban.

154. As we understand the position, the big Powers remain divided in their attitudes as to the means of verifying compliance with a comprehensive test-ban treaty, and the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament indicates that the Conference has made no significant advance on this front during the past year. My delegation was among the sponsors of resolution 2604 A (XXIV), which sought from Governments information about the seismological stations from which they would be willing to provide records on the basis of guaranteed availability. It was widely recognized by Member States that developments in seismology have been influencing consideration of a test ban to an increasing extent in recent years and that these developments might be brought to bear on the verification problem. Thus the object of the resolution was to help in clarifying what facilities would be available for an organized international exchange of seismological data as an adjunct to a comprehensive test ban.

155. I might mention that the Australian reply [*see A/7967/Rev.1*] to the Secretary-General's inquiry pursuant to resolution 2604 A (XXIV) indicated that there are 56 seismographic stations in Australia, of which 55 are of the conventional type and one, operated jointly with the British Government, is an array station. Twenty-five of the stations are operated by the Australian Government and 31 are non-governmental. All but one of the 56 stations indicated a willingness to contribute in one form or another to the sort of international exchange of data towards which resolution 2604 A (XXIV) might lead. The only exception was a small station which simply did not have the necessary capacity to take part at this stage. I think we can claim that that reply to the Secretary-General represented a forthcoming and constructive response by both government and non-government stations alike.

156. We note from the replies to the Secretary-General's inquiry that about 80 countries have responded to the circular. Of these, an overwhelming majority either provided substantive information about their seismological facilities or said that they had none.

157. It is a matter for regret that a few countries did not feel able to provide, in their replies, the information sought by the General Assembly's resolution because we had hoped that a broad and detailed response would prove useful both to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and to the Assembly in their consideration of the problems involved in the negotiation of a comprehen-

¹⁰ Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480 (1963), No. 6964).

sive test ban. We were also disappointed to note that, despite the significant response so far, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament itself apparently did not take this matter much further at its sessions in 1970. We would like to hope that the Committee will pursue it during the coming year, if only because it would be logical to expect that those countries that did reply substantively to the Secretary-General will be expecting some use to be made of their contributions and their offers of help.

158. I should like to note incidentally that, according to scientific advice available to my delegation, the continuing improvement of seismology and the wider dissemination of its findings could contribute to at least two desirable scientific objectives in addition to its relevance to a comprehensive nuclear test ban. In the first place, it would increase our knowledge of the seismicity of the earth and our ability to locate accurately the origins of earthquakes. In the second place, it would enable us to use nuclear explosions that we can identify precisely as to time and place as a means to study the behaviour of the various types of earth wave and to determine accurately their times of travel through various terrains. These would seem to be valid additional reasons for persevering with this initiative.

159. As a postscript to my remarks about the comprehensive test ban and the exchange of seismological data, let me add that, on the basis of present technical information, we are not yet convinced that an effective comprehensive test ban could be concluded at this stage without any provision for on-site inspection. Notwithstanding the improvements in seismology, we do not consider that it is yet capable of detecting and verifying all underground nuclear explosions of military significance.

160. The focus of attention in matters of arms control over the past decade has been on nuclear and other

weapons of mass destruction. And indeed it is right that these weapons should have been given prior attention. But this must not be allowed to obscure the need to examine more closely the problems involved in establishing control over conventional armaments.

161. In the 25 years of the existence of the United Nations, there have been many conflicts, some of them long, bitter and expensive, fought entirely with conventional arms. It is estimated, we note, that the value of world military expenditure in 1969 was \$US 200,000 million, compared with \$US 139,000 million in 1964. Over this six-year period more than \$US 1 million million have been spent on arms and armed forces. Most of this money went on the appurtenances of conventional warfare, not on strategic weapons. It is clear that such expenditure represents a major burden on the economies of nations at a time when the need to channel all available resources towards the goal of economic development has never been greater. For these reasons, it would seem to my delegation to be timely for the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to look again at the problems of controlling conventional armaments.

162. The foregoing are the general comments of my delegation on the main aspects of arms control and disarmament that are now before the Committee.

163. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): Tomorrow morning we will hear the delegations that were unable to speak this morning, although their names were on the list, namely, Romania and Uruguay; then the delegations of Czechoslovakia, Burma, New Zealand, Iran and Nepal will speak. Three other delegations would like to speak if there is enough time.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.