

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records\*



FIRST COMMITTEE  
42nd meeting  
held on  
Wednesday, 24 November 1976  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 42nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland)

CONTENTS

Reduction of military budgets: report of the Secretary-General /34/

Incendiary and other specific conventional weapons which may be the subject of prohibitions or restrictions of use for humanitarian reasons: report of the Secretary-General /35/

Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /36/

Urgent need for cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /37/

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3467 (XXX) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) /38/

Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean /39/

World Disarmament Conference: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference /40/

Effective measures to implement the purposes and objectives of the Disarmament Decade /41/

Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa /42/

Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects: report of the Secretary-General /43/

Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East /44/

Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /45/

Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia /46/

/...

\* 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 LX-2332.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/31/PV.42  
26 November 1976

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests /47/

Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /48/

General and complete disarmament /49/:

- (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament;
- (b) Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency;
- (c) Report of the Secretary-General

Strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Review of the Role of the United Nations in the Field of Disarmament /50/

Implementation of the conclusions of the first Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons /116/

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49,  
50 AND 116 (continued)

Mr. HUSEIBEH (Jordan): At this belated stage of my participation in the work of the Committee on the item of disarmament, may I extend to you, Mr. Chairman, my congratulations on the exemplary manner in which you have been conducting the work of the Committee on this very crucial issue.

A careful consideration of the documents, the studies and the draft resolution which are presently before us shows the extent of proliferation to which the question of disarmament is ipso facto susceptible, and the complexities of the problems to which it inevitably givesrise. It goes without saying that my delegation will give its complete support to most of the draft resolutions presented for our adoption. After all, who in his senses would refrain from cursing the dark? But while saying that, I feel duty-bound to make a number of observations which I feel are germane to disarmament, lest our resolutions, commendable as they are, become little more than the Utopian's dream, an expression of ephemeral euphoria. Let us take for example the item entitled "Reduction of military budgets", and I take this opportunity to express appreciation for the report painstakingly prepared by the Group of Experts on the reduction of military budgets. I must confess that the analytical and operational problems involved in the concept and procedures of relative assessments, calculations and hence reporting, were truly formidable and baffling. As these matters were not entirely clear to me, I was somewhat relieved that the experts themselves stated that there were several technical issues which have been left unresolved, largely because the political choices required a level of technical detail and specialization which could be supplied only by professionals in the narrow subfields involved. I should not be surprised if those professionals in the subfields were to seek more professionals in more substrata subfields.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

I remember some 25 years ago, when I was doing graduate work at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, examination day finally arrived. It was in 1952 when the Korean war was being warmed up. The question consisted of three to four sentences which said:

"If the United States, having decided on an armistice in the Korean war, were to phase out its military budget from" -- and I am now speaking from memory -- "US 70 billion to US 40 billion per annum, over a period of five years what would be the effects of such phasing out on national income, employment, etc?"

I mention this little personal experience, for which I sincerely apologize, to highlight the fact that the item on the reduction of military budgets is a far more complicated subject than mere procedures on the structuring and classification of military expenditures and credible reporting systems by various Governments. The all-important question -- and I wish to make it clear that I am not giving any political value judgements at this moment -- is that the military producing capacities in almost all the highly industrialized countries have expanded so greatly, have become such inherent components in their economies that it would be sheer fantasy to expect any appreciable reduction overnight by virtue of a resolution of the General Assembly except after taking into account equivalence and sufficiency for legitimate self-defence. An equally, if not a more important study, is to calculate, in real terms, what it means to convert \$300 billion worth of military hardware produced by millions of gainfully employed workers into peaceful goods and services over X number of years. But then this is not the whole answer. The productive capacity of industrialized countries at present far exceeds the peacetime consumer capacity to purchase because the consuming community is still a relatively small fraction of humanity and the majority of humanity does not yet have the means to buy.

This then brings us to another area, which, though seemingly different, is very much interrelated. I am referring to the proposed new economic order which aims at enhancing the living standards of two thirds of the human race. This can and should be done, not only on ethical grounds but on utilitarian grounds as well. The industrialized countries by converting a larger portion of the \$300 billion into the production of capital and consumer goods for a vastly enlarged producer and consumer public throughout the world would be more than adequately compensated for the partial loss of markets for wasteful and non-productive instruments of production.

(Mr. Museibeh, Jordan)

Having said that, I am not unmindful of the fact that, unless and until the human race undergoes a fundamental metamorphosis in its essentially schizophrenic nature, combining both good and evil, the gregarious instinct as well as the latent aggressive instinct, the desire for peace as well as the irrational drift to war, the dedication to law and justice and the temptation to succumb to greed and covetousness will continue to be manifest. So long as human nature has these built-in, acquired or instinctive impulses, it would be highly improbable that the world could achieve within the foreseeable future the ultimate hope of complete world disarmament -- nuclear and conventional -- commendable as this would be to humanity in its entirety.

The report of the Ad Hoc Committee deserves our deepest appreciation for its comprehensive canvassing of the views of numerous Governments on this cherished goal. My Government likewise supports the convening of a special session of the General Assembly to focus attention on this all-important issue upon which the survival of humanity depends. But my delegation agrees with the Ad Hoc Committee's findings, namely that universal participation including, in particular, the participation of all nuclear-weapon States should be forthcoming and, secondly, that adequate preparations must be assured. No member country of the United Nations would wish to see the authority and prestige of the General Assembly further eroded by stark failure resulting from inadequate study and preparation. The convening of the proposed session can have the value of a moral catalyst by focusing world attention on such a life-and-death issue but producing concrete results, even at a later and more appropriate date, would obviously be more gratifying and more conducive to achieving the desired goal.

There are two reports, one by the distinguished Secretary-General, pertaining to the prohibition of incendiary and other specific conventional weapons on humanitarian grounds and the other, on chemical and bacteriological weapons, by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

My delegation cannot but give whole-hearted endorsement to the two reports. Jordan is among the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.13. Even while assuming the possibility of armed conflict somewhere, sometime in the world and while deploring war as a hateful instrument of policy, except -- as the Charter recognizes -- as an act of self-preservation, there must be minimum civilized rules

(Mr. Museibeh, Jordan)

to regulate the conduct of war. Life and death hang precariously in the balance in times of war as we all know full well. But there is a difference, a qualitative difference, between dying an instant and peaceful death by a bullet or a rocket and the more heinous exposure to torture and agony which would precede death or even prolong its coming by the use of biological, chemical and high incendiary devices. I have seen many people maimed beyond recognition by such inhuman devices. The sooner and the more decisively we act to prohibit the uses of such inhuman devices the more greatly the general feeling will be enhanced that even in wars there is a feeling of common decency below which humankind would not allow itself to fall.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

The conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, dealt with in General Assembly resolution 3478 (XXX) adopted in December 1975, which called upon all nuclear-weapon States to enter into negotiations not later than 31 March 1976 along with some non-nuclear member States, does not seem to be anywhere near initiation. Of the nuclear Powers, only the Soviet Union has responded affirmatively. We all recall how relieved the world was when the Partial Test Ban Treaty was concluded in 1963, thus reducing the dangers to our small planet of contamination and atomic fall-out. Latecomers among some of the major Powers argued then that the prohibition was discriminatory and favoured the "haves". However, when we consider that today there is a far greater awareness of how precious a possession a clean environment is and when we consider that the number of countries with nuclear know-how is multiplying and will continue to multiply as years go by, it is imperative that a more positive response should be forthcoming to the General Assembly's call, particularly from the group of major nuclear States. My delegation also wishes to be a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.16.

My delegation, while appreciating the underlying considerations which prompted a number of friendly countries to submit a draft resolution on item 45 concerning the convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, with a view to strengthening that convention, does not subscribe to the view that the proposed convention should be referred back to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament for further modification and that the adoption of the convention should be postponed to the thirty-second session next year. The item itself is of the utmost importance and urgency for the environment and hence for the world in its entirety. There is no a priori perfection in any convention on any item, especially in this novel and innovative field. Only trial and error can reveal loopholes which must be closed. The convention, which has the sponsorship of many States representing different regional groupings, seems to be adequate enough to warrant adoption at this thirty-first session. Moreover, article VI of the convention specifically provides that any State Party may propose amendments to it. Article VIII, moreover, stipulates that five years after the entry into force of the convention a conference shall be convened to review its operation and its effectiveness.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

My delegation therefore finds no compelling reason to refrain from supporting its adoption this year, as proposed.

The last item on which I have some comments to make is the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones under item 43 of the agenda, on which the Secretary-General has presented a report which essentially transmits the views of a number of Governments on this crucial issue. An apt description of the situation is that the genie is now out of the bottle and our urgent task is to contain it. My delegation supports without reservation all nuclear-weapon-free zones, whether already established or in the process of being established in the various regions of the world.

As for the region of the Middle East, a draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/31/L.19 and most ably introduced yesterday by my colleague, Ambassador Hoveyda of Iran, is now ready for our consideration. It recalls General Assembly resolutions 3263 (XXIX) of 9 December 1974 and 3474 (XXX) of 11 December 1975 commending the idea of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. The draft resolution, among other things, urges all parties concerned to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty as a means of promoting this objective under an effective system of safeguards and on a reciprocal basis.

It is to be deplored that the reply of Israel on this pivotal issue has been evasive and negative, making its acceptance of non-proliferation contingent upon negotiations between all States in the region as an indispensable requirement for the establishment of such a zone. This is really putting the cart before the horse. The Arab States directly concerned have expressed clearly their readiness to engage in negotiations with Israel at the earliest possible date with a view to achieving a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. They cannot, because of obvious and internationally recognized principles, negotiate on secondary issues, important as they may be, when their territorial integrity and their sovereignty are undermined by Israeli occupation of their land. Furthermore, treaties on non-proliferation, disarmament and partial or total bans on the testing of nuclear devices are the concern of the whole world and not of



(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

this particular region or any other. It is for this reason that such treaties are multilateral and universal in character and are treated as such by the United Nations. In all candour, I feel duty bound to stress that the almost 200 million people of the area will not indefinitely allow themselves to be held to ransom by one recalcitrant State's monopolistic hold on this awesome weapon and the barely disguised declarations of some of its leaders to include it in its military options. This is candid talk which deserves to be heeded. It is to be unthinkable that anyone in his right mind would ever even contemplate such a course of action, but people, including policy-makers, have as much irrationality as rationality in their metabolism. It is for this reason that I wish to stress that the survival of the Middle East is inevitably related to the survival of humankind. It is the concern of all of us, including those friendly to Israel.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Jordan for his kind words addressed to me personally. The Committee takes note that his delegation wishes to become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.16.

Mr. KHAN (Pakistan): Mr. Chairman, I am taking part in the debate in this Committee for the first time. Therefore, please permit me to extend my felicitations to you and other members of the Bureau on your election to guide the deliberations of this important Committee. The Pakistan delegation is confident that, under your able stewardship, it will prove possible to make meaningful progress this year on the numerous and complex issues which are under consideration in the First Committee.

The main purpose of my statement is to introduce the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.6 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

In his statement to the Committee, the representative of Canada appealed to those States which have not adhered to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) to do so or to give an equally binding and verifiable commitment to the objectives of non-proliferation. The acceptance of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia is a most feasible way in which non-nuclear States of this region can give their commitment to the non-proliferation objective. The establishment of such a zone in this region is particularly urgent in view of the present danger of nuclear proliferation which exists there. It would also greatly enhance the security of all the States of the region against the nuclear threat.

My delegation is convinced that the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia is a realistic objective. By endorsing, in principle, the concept of the zone in South Asia, and calling for consultations among the regional States, the General Assembly has provided the political and moral support of the international community to this endeavour. It is reasonable to hope that, given goodwill and co-operation, agreement can be reached on the establishment of the zone in the near future. Furthermore, there is a broad measure of agreement on the subject among the States of South Asia as well.

The first and most fundamental point of agreement among the South Asian States is their common commitment not to acquire or develop nuclear weapons. This provides a solid basis to devise agreement on the modalities by which these unilateral declarations are to be translated into binding multilateral form. Second, all the States in the region are agreed that the arrangements for

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

denuclearization should be "developed and matured" by the States concerned through mutual consultations. We believe that the assistance of the Secretary-General and of the United Nations Secretariat will be valuable in promoting the objective of the nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. Third, there is a common desire to see that, if possible, the scope of the denuclearized zone should encompass other interested neighbouring non-nuclear-weapon States besides the States of South Asia. Pakistan believes that the initial arrangements should be worked out among the South Asian States since this region is contiguous, has a common history and, most important, all the States in the region have renounced nuclear weapons. But we would welcome, as provided for in operative paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 3265 B (XXIX), other "neighbouring non-nuclear-weapon States" which may be interested in joining the denuclearized zone.

We believe that in this case, as on other proposals for nuclear-weapon-free zones, the General Assembly should continue to encourage and urge the States concerned towards the objective of denuclearization. It is for this purpose that my delegation has submitted the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.6 which I have the honour to introduce to the Committee.

The first preambular paragraph of the draft recalls the resolutions of the General Assembly which endorsed, in principle, the concept of the nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia and called for consultations among the regional States and such other neighbouring non-nuclear States as may be interested. The second, third and fourth preambular paragraphs reiterate previous pronouncements of the General Assembly regarding the value of denuclearized zones for non-proliferation and security, especially of the South Asian States. The fifth preambular paragraph notes the important declarations of the South Asian States renouncing nuclear weapons. The sixth preambular paragraph underlines the necessity of consultations among the above-mentioned States and the importance of avoiding any action contrary to the objective of establishing the denuclearized zone. The last preambular paragraph recalls the role which was envisaged for the Secretary-General in this exercise in General Assembly resolution 3265 B (XXIX).

The operative paragraphs of the resolution flow directly from the above-mentioned considerations. The reaffirmation by the General Assembly of its endorsement, in principle, of the concept of the nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia is essential to lend impetus to the consultations for its establishment.

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

The second operative paragraph urges the States concerned to continue to make all the necessary efforts towards this objective. This formulation does not prejudice the modalities by which the objective is to be pursued by the States concerned, i.e. whether through contacts and consultations within the United Nations framework or outside. It underlines, however, as have previous resolutions, that in the meantime the States concerned should not do anything contrary to the objective of establishing the nuclear-free zone. The explosion of a nuclear device, in whatever guise, would be, we feel, an action contrary to this objective.

The third operative paragraph makes it possible for the Secretary-General to assist the States concerned in their efforts to establish the zone. Such assistance may be needed if the parties concerned do not find it possible to set up their own machinery for consultation, as also in clarifying which other neighbouring non-nuclear States may be interested in joining the zone, the obligations which the nuclear Powers are prepared to undertake with respect to the envisaged zone, the procedures for verification of peaceful nuclear programmes and so forth.

Finally, the last operative paragraph would merely seek to maintain the question on the agenda of the next General Assembly, at which time further consideration could be given to the Secretary-General's report and to any progress as may be made on this proposal in the meantime.

Pakistan's proposal for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, and our support for denuclearization in other regions, reflects our conviction that, despite the lack of positive action on the part of the major Powers to restrain the arms race, the non-nuclear States should take it upon themselves to avert the nuclear threat at least in their own regions. It is in the interest of all those who wish to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to encourage by every possible means the establishment of such nuclear-free zones. We are confident that the members of this Committee will once again declare their unequivocal support for the objective of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia and ensure the adoption of this resolution with their overwhelming support.

I should like to take this opportunity to offer some comments on the draft resolution attached to the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean in document A/31/29.

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

The proposal for a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean is mutually complementary to Pakistan's initiative for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. For, it is obvious that a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean would imply the denuclearization and absence of nuclear arms not only from the area in the Indian Ocean itself but also from the territories of its littoral States.

Pakistan's views on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace have been expressed consistently on many occasions. During his visit to Sri Lanka in December 1975, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, outlined our approach to this question.

The Prime Minister of Pakistan underlined that, for the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, the elimination of great Powers rivalry and dismantling of foreign military bases is essential. However, he pointed out that the rivalries of the great Powers in the Indian Ocean are, in part at least, a reflection of the disputes, tensions and conflicts among the States of the region. While such differences and tensions exist within the region, it will be difficult for the littoral States to take united and resolute action to achieve the elimination of the foreign presence from the Indian Ocean. A zone of peace in the Indian Ocean requires that regional States be assured against threats from both within and without the region.

For this purpose, Prime Minister Bhutto suggested that one of the important tasks was to create an effective system of security within the region which could be expressed in the form of a code of conduct to guide the relations among the Indian Ocean States. Such a code of conduct would include a commitment to abide by the principles of the United Nations Charter; an agreement to respect and implement resolutions of the United Nations; an agreement to maintain a reasonable ratio of naval and military forces among the major littoral States of the Indian Ocean, and a commitment not to acquire, develop or introduce nuclear weapons into the Indian Ocean region.

My delegation wishes to commend the skill and ability with which Mr. Amerasinghe, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee and currently the President of the General Assembly, conducted the proceedings of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

The draft resolution attached to the report of the Ad Hoc Committee in document A/31/29 is by and large procedural in nature. However, in certain of its provisions, especially preambular paragraphs 3 and 4, the draft resolution touches on the substance of the question. In this respect, it is the considered view of the Government of Pakistan that the draft resolution does not fully reflect the views expressed by Pakistan on the subject. Therefore, despite our continued and deep interest in ensuring the earliest possible implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, the Pakistan delegation will be constrained to abstain on the draft when it is put to a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Pakistan for his statement, in the course of which he introduced the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.6. I thank him also for his kind words addressed to me personally and to the other officers of the Committee.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I have the honour formally to submit to the First Committee draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.18 concerning Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, the Treaty of Tlatelolco. On this matter the General Assembly has already adopted eight resolutions in each of which it urged the nuclear-weapon States to sign and ratify that international instrument. The draft that I am submitting is co-sponsored by the 21 Latin American delegations listed in the document.

Apart from recalling the previous resolutions, the draft reiterates the firm conviction of the General Assembly that the co-operation of the nuclear-weapon States is necessary for the greater effectiveness of any treaty setting up a nuclear-weapon-free zone, and that that co-operation should take the form of commitments, likewise undertaken in a solemn international instrument which is legally binding, such as a treaty, convention or protocol.

This is particularly important in the light of the content of resolution 3472 B (XXX) of 11 December 1975, in which the General Assembly solemnly adopted, among other provisions, the following "definition of the principal obligations of

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

the nuclear-weapon States towards the nuclear-weapon-free zones and towards the States included therein". That definition reads as follows:

"In every case of a nuclear-weapon-free zone that has been recognized as such by the General Assembly, all nuclear-weapon States shall undertake or reaffirm, in a solemn international instrument having full legally binding force such as a treaty, a convention or a protocol, the following obligations:

"(a) To respect in all its parts the statute of total absence of nuclear weapons defined in the treaty or convention which serves as the constitutive instrument of the zone;

"(b) To refrain from contributing in any way to the performance in the territories forming part of the zone of acts which involve violation of the aforesaid treaty or convention;

"(c) To refrain from using or threatening to use nuclear weapons against the States included in the zone." (General Assembly resolution 3472 (XXX) of 11 December 1975)

The third and last paragraph of draft resolution L.18 recalls with particular satisfaction that four of the five nuclear-weapon States have already become parties to Additional Protocol II. The operative part of the draft is intended primarily once again to urge the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics to sign and ratify Additional Protocol II and to include the item in the provisional agenda for the thirty-second session of the General Assembly.

I believe it appropriate to stress that for more than two years the Soviet Union has stood in a position of complete isolation in this matter. For the co-sponsors of the resolution, the reluctance of that nuclear-weapon State to heed the repeated appeals and urgings of the General Assembly is under any circumstances inexplicable simply because, as we have repeatedly recalled here, among the five so-called nuclear Powers it was precisely the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that had most frequently, and at times through its highest leaders, offered its unreserved support for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Mexico for his statement in the course of which he introduced the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.18.

Mr. HSU (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation would like to offer a few remarks on the question of the Indian Ocean peace zone.

Five years have elapsed since the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. During this period the proposal for the establishment of the Indian Ocean peace zone has been receiving support from an increasing number of countries and peoples. At the same time, one must not fail to see that foreign military presence and rivalry in the Indian Ocean region, far from being reduced, has been constantly on the increase, rendering the situation there even more turbulent. The responsibility for the failure thus far to realize the goal of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace rests squarely with the two super-Powers, the Soviet Union and the United States. While strategically Europe is the focus of their rivalry for world hegemony, the Indian Ocean is an essential flank in their rivalry. To this end, they are stepping up infiltration, intervention, subversion, control and aggression in this region.

Long regarding its seizure of command of the oceans as an important means for and direct target of its rivalry with the other super-Power for world hegemony, that super-Power which styles itself the natural ally of the third world attaches great importance to its seizure of the command of the Indian Ocean. It is trying by every possible means constantly to expand its permanent fleet there, grab the right to use coastal ports and establish overt and covert military bases there. While ceaselessly intensifying their military rivalry in the Indian Ocean region, the super-Powers are impeding and resisting by all means the efforts for the establishment of the Indian Ocean peace zone.

In order to protect its vested interests one super-Power has been ignoring the proposal for the establishment of the Indian Ocean peace zone. The other super-Power, over a long period, has placed all kinds of obstacles and refused to support the proposal for the establishment of the Indian Ocean peace zone. Recently, however, it ostensibly departed from its usual attitude by declaring its intention to alter its position. Yet a cursory analysis of its statement would suffice to show that its alleged intention to alter its position is entirely false and that its real motive is to continue to hang on there for continued expansion.



(Mr. Hsu, China)

The summit conference of the non-aligned countries explicitly called for the elimination of the bases of the super-Powers and the elimination of any manifestation of great Power military presence in the Indian Ocean. But that super-Power which bragged about its readiness to make its contribution flatly denied the existence of its military bases in the Indian Ocean region. Moreover, instead of making any mention about the elimination of foreign military presence in the Indian Ocean region, it talked only about its so-called readiness together with other great Powers to seek ways of reducing on a reciprocal basis the military activities in the Indian Ocean. In other words, it talked only about reducing and not cessation or elimination. That is to say, if other great Powers refuse to leave it definitely will not leave either. If it fails in seeking such ways with other great Powers it will have a pretext to hang on there and increase its military activities at any time. It also openly asserted its right to freedom of navigation and scientific research, which evidently would be used as a pretext for its increased infiltration and expansion. This shows that arduous struggles will have to be waged in order to do away with the super-Power military rivalry in the Indian Ocean region and realize the proposal of making it a peace zone. The proposal for the establishment of the Indian Ocean peace zone reflects the legitimate desire of the States in the Indian Ocean region to defend their national independence and State sovereignty against super-Power expansion and infiltration in the region and this proposal has received increasingly wide support and endorsement.

(Mr. Hsu, China)

Defying the pressure of the super-Powers, the Fifth Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries held this year condemned in its political declaration the great-Power military rivalry and creation of tension in the Indian Ocean. It pointed to the need to eliminate any manifestation of great-Power military presence in the Indian Ocean, and thus frustrated the scheme of a super-Power to whitewash its culpability. The Conference also called for the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean as soon as possible to facilitate the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. All these views and demands are entirely correct. The Chinese Government and people have always given active support to the Indian Ocean States in their struggle against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism and supported their just proposal for the establishment of the Indian Ocean peace zone. In our view, in order to realize the just proposal for the establishment of the Indian Ocean peace zone, it is imperative, first of all, to put an end to all the super-Power activities of military expansion and rivalry for hegemony in the region, and to demand the withdrawal of all their military presence there, including the dismantling of all their overt and covert military bases. Herein lies the crux of the matter.

At the same time, it is imperative for all the countries in the region, proceeding from the over-all interests of the security of the region, to do away with the intervention and meddling by the super-Powers, and countries, big or small, should establish and enhance relations among them in accordance with the principles of respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity and mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit and peaceful coexistence so as to promote their joint struggle against the two super-Powers' policies of aggression and war and to combat expansionism in all its forms. It is our earnest hope that, on the basis of the agreement reached at the last session of the United Nations General Assembly on the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean and the consultations carried on this year, all the countries in the region will make active efforts for the establishment of the Indian Ocean peace zone with the support of the countries and peoples of the world.

The Chinese delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean.

The CHAIRMAN: Distinguished representatives, you will recall that at yesterday's meeting I informed the Committee that we would proceed to a vote or decisions on a number of draft resolutions this morning. In particular, I mentioned the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/31/L.11 and A/C.1/31/L.13, and also the one in document A/31/29. In the meantime, an amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.11 has been tabled which is contained in document A/C.1/31/L.24. Subsequently, I have been approached by a number of delegations which asked me to postpone the voting or the action on that draft resolution for a few days so they could have more time to study the amendment. I propose, then, to postpone the vote on that draft resolution until Monday, 29 November.

Also, as far as the draft resolution pertaining to the Indian Ocean is concerned, I have been approached with a similar request by some delegations who said they were still awaiting instructions from their respective Governments. In this case too, I propose to the Committee that we postpone action on that draft resolution until Monday, 29 November.

On the other hand, as far as I know, the Committee is ready to take action on draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.13, pertaining to item 36 of the agenda concerning chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. I intend to put this draft resolution before the Committee now for a decision. A wish has been expressed by the sponsors that the draft resolution be adopted by consensus. I may inform the Committee that the draft resolution has been tabled by 34 delegations and was introduced last Monday by the representative of Poland.

May I take it that the Committee is prepared to adopt the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.13, pertaining to item 36 of the agenda concerning chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons by consensus?

Since I hear no objection, it is so decided, and I declare the draft resolution adopted by consensus.

The draft resolution (A/C.1/31/L.13) was adopted.

Mr. MISTRAL (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation was happy to take part in the consensus that has just been achieved on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.13 relating to chemical and bacteriological weapons. The French Government cannot but be pleased to note that the Conference of the Committee

(Mr. Mistral, France)

on Disarmament is at last emerging from its lethargy and seems now to be prepared to examine actively the principle of a prohibition to manufacture chemical weapons, which is an item that has been on its agenda since 1968.

The French Government, which is not taking part in the work of the Geneva body, is nevertheless following its developments and will, of course, study with the greatest care, any draft international convention that may be elaborated. We wish, as of now, to indicate that we would wish the scope of the envisaged convention to be as wide and as extensive as possible, and that the bans on manufacturing and stockpiling apply to all types of chemical weapons capable of being used on the battlefield. We also remain convinced that the organization of an effective verification and control system at the international level is one of the fundamental conditions for the efficacy of such bans.

I should like to add that the participation of my delegation in the consensus that has taken place in no way implies a change in the French position with respect to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Our position remains the same, and the reservation that I am making on this occasion will apply again should a similar situation arise in the course of the votes that are about to take place.

Mr. HSU (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese Government has already stated that with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.13, which has just been adopted, that if it had been put to the vote, the Chinese delegation would not have participated in that vote.

The CHAIRMAN: There are no more speakers on my list for this item, so I declare the consideration of item 36 of the agenda relating to chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons closed.

We shall now resume the discussion concerning other draft resolutions.

Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand): Having already spoken at some length on this question of a comprehensive test ban during the general debate, I need ask for only a few minutes of the Committee's time to introduce resolution L.15, which once again stresses the urgent need for an end to all nuclear weapon tests and calls for the highest priority to be given to the completion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

The draft resolution is co-sponsored by the delegations of Australia, Austria, Colombia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ireland, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Philippines, Sweden, Venezuela and by my delegation.

Most of these delegations were co-sponsors also of the corresponding resolution adopted under this item a year ago, and we are glad to welcome Austria, Ecuador and Ethiopia as new co-sponsors. It is worth re-emphasizing, as the representative of Australia did in introducing last year's resolution, that this group is broadly representative of non-nuclear weapon States in all regions of the world, of the developed and the developing countries, of the aligned and non-aligned.

It is inevitable that such a diverse group will have differences of approach and of emphasis on almost every disarmament question, not the least on what our approach to the problem of nuclear testing should be. Some co-sponsors might prefer stronger wording here, or a less emphatic formulation there. Some might like the resolution to refer to this or that development which they consider significant; others may take a different view.

But the co-sponsors have no difficulty in agreeing that the Assembly should speak out once again, with a strong and united voice, to express its conviction that nuclear weapons testing is an unacceptable activity, that the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty should be given the highest priority and that, in the meantime, there should be a moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons.

I should like to emphasize, as I did in introducing a similar resolution two years ago, that this resolution condemns no Government: what it condemns is the testing of nuclear weapons. It is absolutely fair and even-handed. It is directed against all weapons testing, in whatever environment it may be conducted. "Condemns" is, of course, strong language: but, in our view, no more than is justified by a situation in which the testing of nuclear weapons continues unabated despite the equally strong language which the General Assembly has used in the past.

(Mr. Templeton, New Zealand)

The draft resolution does not, in fact, differ in any fundamental respect from that adopted last year under this item. Regrettably, we are unable this year to welcome the fact that no atmospheric tests have taken place since the thirtieth session of the General Assembly. Even more regrettably, we must take note of the fact that all of the nuclear-weapon States have engaged in weapons testing during this period. We do take limited encouragement from the fact that two nuclear-weapon States have agreed, in pursuance of their obligations under the Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests, to a verifiable limitation of peaceful nuclear explosions with some provision for on-site inspection.

In this connexion, may I recall and re-emphasize operative paragraph 9 of resolution 3484A adopted at the thirtieth session, which stressed that the negotiations for a comprehensive test-ban treaty will likewise have to take into account the problem of nuclear explosions conducted for peaceful purposes, with a view to ensuring that such experiments do not contribute to the testing or refining of nuclear weapons.

My delegation's views on the question of verification were set out in some detail in our general debate statement. While my delegation does not consider that this problem constitutes a major obstacle to the early conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, we nevertheless acknowledge that the drafting of the treaty is a major exercise which will involve hard negotiation. It does not seem to us justifiable that testing should continue on an unrestricted basis while these negotiations are in progress. We therefore attach importance to the provision in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution calling for a quick agreement on a moratorium of limited duration, as an interim step towards the conclusion of a comprehensive treaty. The question of verification should not, in our view, delay such a suspension.

My delegation disagrees with the view that the negotiation of a comprehensive test-ban treaty can only begin in the presence and with the participation of all nuclear-weapon States. To set such a condition would create the strong possibility of indefinite delay. We believe that there is a special responsibility on the part of those States which are most advanced in the nuclear art, which have already found it possible to conclude bilateral agreements of limited scope, and

(Mr. Templeton, New Zealand)

which have accepted the obligation to seek to achieve the permanent discontinuance of all nuclear weapons tests, to initiate negotiations for a comprehensive treaty. The question of participation should not be made an excuse for procrastination. We therefore attach great importance to operative paragraph 4 of the draft.

In spite of the fact that the CCD has not so far heeded the urging of the Assembly that it give the highest priority to the conclusion of a comprehensive treaty, it is the view of my delegation that that body still offers the best available forum in which to begin the negotiations. But it must be clear to members of the CCD that unless it heeds the Assembly's call, which is repeated in operative paragraph 6 of the draft, the misgivings which have already been expressed about the lack of progress in that forum can only grow to the point where alternative approaches are bound to find increasing favour.

The resolution adopted under this item last year was supported by 106 members of this Assembly, with only two negative votes. It is my delegation's hope that this year the draft resolution, which I have had the honour to introduce, will attract an even wider measure of support. Still more do we hope that this time it will produce results.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of New Zealand for his statement, in the course of which he introduced the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.15.

Mr. HOSSEN (Mauritius): I have been instructed by my head of delegation, Ambassador Ramphul, to read the following statement on his behalf and to express his regrets for his inability to be here this morning.

"On behalf of my delegation I should like to support the resolution which has been sponsored by the delegations of Austria, Grenada, New Zealand, Philippines, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Tunisia and Venezuela contained in document A/C.1/31/L.11. It is more than essential that further organized and concentrated efforts should be made to implement the various resolutions of the United Nations regarding disarmament. In order to do that, it is essential that the Secretariat of the United Nations be strengthened and adequately equipped. In view of the fact that the overwhelming majority of the delegations are supporting the suggestion of convening a special session of the United Nations on disarmament, it would have been more appropriate and constructive if any expansion of the Secretariat had taken place after the special session. In the view of my delegation, the present recommendation for the expansion of the Secretariat is somewhat premature and haphazard. However, my delegation would go along and support the present resolution contained in document A/C.1/31/L.11 for strengthening the Secretariat, as it will no doubt be amended. While doing so, my delegation would like to emphasize the need for appointing qualified persons from the third world and developing countries to man the newly created posts in the Secretariat. In fact, last year it was my delegation which initiated the action to strengthen the Secretariat, and in particular the Disarmament Affairs Division, on the clear understanding that more countries in Africa would have the opportunity to have their nationals recruited for such positions. My delegation would therefore be interested to know how many Africans are now in the Disarmament Affairs Division and how many more have been recruited since last year. In view of this, my delegation feels strongly that the Director of the proposed



(Mr. Hossen, Mauritius)

Centre for Disarmament should be appointed from the developing countries, preferably from Africa. It is for this reason that we would like to be a co-sponsor of draft amendment A/C.1/31/L.24 as submitted by India and Nigeria. My delegation would therefore like its views, along with others, to be made known to the Fifth Committee so that the cause of developing countries, and in particular African countries, is no longer ignored or neglected."

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee takes note that Mauritius wishes to become a sponsor of the draft amendment submitted by India and Nigeria which appears in document A/C.1/31/L.24.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): I have asked for the floor to make two brief statements. The first one concerns general and complete disarmament.

Consistent with the statement to the General Assembly on 29 September 1976 by President Tolbert of Liberia calling for the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Liberian delegation is happy to co-sponsor draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.1 and calls upon our colleagues to give it their fullest support.

Speaking on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.1, I venture to say here that most members of the world community did not know that the scientists of the two super-Powers had projected capabilities for destruction which only nature had the power to produce. Viewing this whole situation, therefore, in its proper perspective, and taking into serious consideration the readiness of the two super-Powers, which actually hold the key to success in any disarmament agreement, to come to an agreement on this issue, this unquestionably constitutes, in the opinion of the Liberian delegation, a landmark in history. Therefore, my delegation is happy to be part of this history and accordingly gives notice that it will co-sponsor resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.1. I urge as many of my colleagues as possible to support this positive step.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

I do agree with some of my colleagues' concerns which have been expressed to me regarding article I of the proposed treaty. But let me say here that this should not pose a major problem, as, within the sovereign rights of any member State, the best interests of each State, depending on the circumstance, will always be exercised. I therefore again call seriously on my fellow representatives here to give this positive position a large majority vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee takes note that Liberia wishes to become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.1 and also of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.1.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): It was fashionable, even prophetic, in the 1950s to speak of the 1960s as the decade of Africa and the atom. It was the expectation then that the triple challenge of decolonization, development and disarmament would be met successfully within the decade and that the peaceful use of the atom would open up new vistas of hope and achievement for all mankind. Little did we know at the time that colonialism and racism in Africa would not die a natural death; that the prospects of development would be so crippled by the diversion of resources from peaceful purposes to armaments, particularly nuclear armaments; and that the consequences of the arms race would injure so detrimentally the economic and social life of all States.

My delegation recalls two important resolutions adopted by the Second Committee at the twenty-ninth and thirtieth sessions of the General Assembly. One resolution, 3345 (XXIX), related to the interrelationship between population, resources, environment and development. The other resolution, 3508 (XXX), pertained to long-term economic trends and projections. In addition, further resolutions have been adopted on the outcome of the Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) held at Lima in 1975 and the fourth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) held at Nairobi early this year.

In the light of our debate in this Committee, my delegation deeply regrets the absence of two factors in the consideration and adoption of these resolutions, which will most likely affect the pattern of economic and social development of the world for the remainder of the century and which will help in the establishment of a new international economic order. The first factor is the lack of proper and adequate co-ordination between the Second Committee and this Committee. Since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2685 (XXV), which determined the link between the Second United Nations Development Decade and the Disarmament Decade, the two Committees appear to have gone their separate ways. The obligation to see that resources released as a result of progress towards disarmament are devoted to economic aid and assistance for the developing countries has become a dead letter. The second factor is the lack of appropriate reference to the various studies on the costs and economic consequences of armaments and disarmament measures so as to underline the fact

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

that the link between the Disarmament Decade and the Second Development Decade is organic and indispensable. Consequently, there has been a tendency to understate the correlative fact that armaments is a major, if not the most dominant, burden because it is an essentially wasteful and unproductive constraint on world economic growth and co-operation.

In the recent study on The Future of the World Economy conducted under the direction of Nobel Prize winner, Professor Wassily Leontief of Harvard fame, the point was made that the rate of public consumption currently allocated to non-civilian purposes in many countries was too high. The report went on to quote the Far Eastern Economic Review of 23 January 1975 to prove that the total investment necessary to bring the average crop yield in Asia to half the maximum of four tons per hectare was about \$60 billion. It went on to estimate the increases in the foreign income of the developing countries which would flow from the implementation of commodity schemes under which the price of some agricultural goods, of which the developing countries are substantial net exporters, and of mineral resources other than oil would be raised starting in 1980. According to the Leontief report, the over-all effect would be an increase in the export earnings of the developing countries of about \$20 billion in 1980 and \$30 billion in 1990. In this connexion, it is common knowledge that the success or failure of the fourth session of UNCTAD at Nairobi depended on whether or not the rich, industrial countries would agree to support a common fund of only \$6 billion to regulate the commodity trade upon which the developing countries depend.

If I may resort to a different source to illustrate the same point, I would turn to the 1975 edition of the Yearbook of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, which so many eminent representatives have already quoted. According to this source, total world military expenditures in 1975 were estimated at \$280 billion. Including 1975, cumulative world military expenditure since the end of the Second World War amounts, at a conservative estimate, to some \$4,500 billion. Another rather interesting source of information is a booklet entitled Political Détente and the Arms Race, prepared by the Government of the German Democratic Republic. Table 4 of this booklet shows how military

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

expenditure could be used for civilian purposes. For instance, according to this publication, one nuclear aircraft carrier and escort vessels cost \$2,980 million -- or the equivalent of constructing an underground railway system in Washington, D.C., the capital of the United States. My fourth and last source of reference is World Military and Social Expenditures in 1976 by Mrs. Ruth Leger Sivard. By careful analysis of the rise in military expenditures in recent years, Mrs. Sivard demonstrated that a major contributory factor to the current inflation that is harassing the world economy is the unrelenting pressure of military expenditures, which have generated purchasing power without corresponding production of economically useful goods for the civilian market.

I do not intend to interpret my sources further, except to say that a pause or standstill in the diversion of human and material resources from peaceful economic and social pursuits to the unproductive and wasteful arms race at current levels would (i) meet many of the development needs of the developing countries; (ii) contribute towards bridging the gap between developed and developing countries; (iii) arrest the growing balance-of-payments deficit of developing countries, which increased from about \$12.2 billion in 1973 to over \$40 billion last year; (iv) ameliorate the structural crises that characterize the present economic relations within and between States; (v) reverse the unhealthy comparison between military budgets and official development aid, whereby the former is more than 30 times greater than the latter; (vi) facilitate the attainment by all nations of a better life for their peoples; (vii) lessen tension between States, thereby promoting international peace and security; and so on.

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

Draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.14, which I now have the honour of introducing on behalf of Austria, Ethiopia, Finland, India, Kenya, Mexico, Niger, Nigeria, Romania, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago and Yugoslavia, is non-controversial and self-evident. It seeks to reflect the concern that every speaker without exception has expressed during our debate over the increasing arms race -- particularly the race in nuclear arms -- and its economic and social consequences.

Hence its second preambular paragraph.

The third preambular paragraph is an expression in moderate terms of the indignation being felt by all, particularly the Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Group, who believe in the purposes and obligations of the Charter of the United Nations. The two concepts of a New International Economic Order and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States flow from the legitimate demands of the developing countries to secure under the Charter necessary changes in the terms and character of economic relations between the rich and poor nations of the world. We believe that the Second United Nations Development Decade and the Disarmament Decade would have contributed significantly to the requirements for change, if the arms race had not vitiated their crucial provisions.

The other preambular paragraph which I would like to draw attention to is the sixth. The CCD is the poorer because not all the nuclear-weapon States participate in its work. A way must be found to correct this absurd and abnormal aberration in terms of multilateral negotiation on disarmament.

The last preambular paragraph refers to the outcome of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 3470 (XXX).

The CCD devoted three plenary meetings to the Mid-term Review of the Disarmament Decade during its 1976 session. The views expressed by various delegations are in its report, paragraphs 227-246. The significance of the exercise lay in the fact that it was unprecedented and that it enabled the CCD to decide to comply during its 1977 session with General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV) proclaiming the Disarmament Decade.

Having spent much time on the preambular paragraphs, my task with respect to the operative paragraphs should be relatively easy. Firstly, because both the preambular and operative paragraphs are variations of the same themes. Secondly, the operative paragraphs mainly reaffirm what the General Assembly has adopted in the past.

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

I shall therefore refer to only two paragraphs. One is operative paragraph 5. We believe that without proper understanding and co-ordination of disarmament and development activities within the United Nations system, neither would receive the attention it richly deserves. Following the Romanian initiative of 1970 on "the economic and social consequences of the armament race and its extremely harmful effects on international peace and security" some useful studies have been made and these are shortly to be updated. Both the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council have also discussed the economic and social consequences of disarmament and the transfer to peaceful uses of the resources released by disarmament.

Lately, however, these discussions of the link between the Disarmament Decade and the Second United Nations Development Decade have been assuming an air of artificiality. I regret to note that this crucial issue was not even addressed by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) at its fourth session at Nairobi. The objective of operative paragraph 5 is to restore a balance of concern to these discussions and to emphasize the close and critical interrelationship between disarmament and development.

The last operative paragraph I should like to refer to is operative paragraph 7, which should not create any difficulties. The CCD has already decided to take action on this matter. The important thing is to bear in mind that if the CCD does adopt a comprehensive programme of work in the light of the objectives of the Disarmament Decade, it will enter into a new and productive phase. No one should deny it this prospect.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Nigeria for his statement in the course of which he introduced the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.14.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico): I have asked to speak to make a few comments on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.11 concerning the question of the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. The Mexican delegation

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

participated actively in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee and therefore feels that the contents of this resolution, submitted over a week ago by the distinguished representative of Sweden, Mrs. Thorsson, is the logical corollary of the decisions adopted by consensus in that Ad Hoc Committee. We furthermore believe that in the present wording it might well gain the general support of the entire First Committee. We consider that approval by the General Assembly of the proposals submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee in its report, document A/31/36, could be another step towards the strengthening of the role of our Organization in the field of disarmament. I should like specifically to refer to the recommendations made by the Committee to strengthen the resources of the United Nations Secretariat. It is, I believe, known that the Mexican delegation suggested that the United Nations Centre for Disarmament, the UNCD, whose establishment was proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee should be headed by a national of one of the third world countries. The reasons that led my delegation to make that proposal are even further strengthened in the light of an examination of the geographical distribution that the Political Affairs Department and Security Council Department have maintained in matters of disarmament.



(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

Last year the Mexican delegation co-sponsored the draft resolution which, when adopted, became resolution 3484 D (XXX), in which the Secretary-General was requested to take appropriate steps for the strengthening of the Disarmament Affairs Division, including the addition of staff necessary for the effective carrying out of its increased responsibilities. At that time we pointed out that the strengthening of the Disarmament Affairs Division offered an excellent opportunity to achieve what the Charter itself terms "as wide a geographical basis as possible" in respect of the staff of that Division. A year ago we pointed out that there were 11 officials in that Division, five of whom were from the group known as Western European and other States, three were nationals of socialist countries and only three came from countries of the third world, despite the fact that, as we all know, there are more than 100 States Members that belong to this last category, the third world.

We can only lament the fact that a year later, Africa, Asia and Latin America are still under-represented in that Division, since of the now 14 officials only four come from countries of that region. That imbalance is all the more marked when we consider, as I understand is the case, that of the eight highest posts in the Division, only one is occupied by a national of a country of the third world.

The Mexican delegation is convinced that the increase in the staff of the Division, which is recommended in draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.11, will give the Secretary-General another chance to endeavour to redress a situation which is of concern to the enormous majority of the Members of the United Nations.

I should like to avail myself of this opportunity very briefly to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.15, of which the Mexican delegation is one of the co-sponsors. It was formally submitted to us this morning by the representative of New Zealand, who, in his presentation, very cogently said:

"It is inevitable that such a diverse group will have differences of approach and of emphasis on almost every disarmament question, not the least on what our approach to the problem of nuclear testing should be. Some co-sponsors might prefer stronger wording here, or a less emphatic formulation there. Some might like the resolution to refer to this or that development which they consider significant; others may take a different view."

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

Since that statement does in fact reflect realities I merely wish to state, as I did last year, that the following two points must be borne in mind. First, we wish note to be taken of the interpretation we attribute to the sixth preambular paragraph, which states:

"Considering that conditions are favourable for these two nuclear-weapon States to step up their efforts to reach agreement on the means of verifying a comprehensive test ban agreement,".

This text is interpreted by the Mexican delegation as in no way affecting the validity of what the General Assembly approved in its resolutions 2934 C (XXVII) of 29 November 1972 and 3078 A (XXVIII) of 6 December 1973, whose respective operative paragraphs 2 stress that the General Assembly:

"Reaffirms its conviction that, whatever may be the differences on the question of verification, there is no valid reason for delaying the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban of the nature contemplated in the preamble to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water,".

The second point I wanted to bring out touches on operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of this document. Here again my delegation would like to stress that we feel that the tangible measures that could be adopted by the States mentioned in those paragraphs could be those which were defined clearly in the draft additional protocol that a number of third world delegations presented in May of 1975 to the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation, which can be found in this Committee's document A/C.1/1055 of 25 September 1975.

As we stated last year when we defined the scope of that draft additional protocol, it is obvious that these are not inflexible formulas or rigid measures, but formulas that we believe to be a practical, feasible and effective way of turning into reality the promises that have so often been voiced.

Mr. HAMZA (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): I have asked for the floor today in order to make a number of brief comments with respect to the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

(Mr. Hamza, Democratic Yemen)

In the course of the general debate in this Committee, we indicated that the debates at the fifth summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries which took place at Colombo in August of last year, were marked by very important new dimensions and views. To be sure, many have noted that the Declaration making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace has been discussed at length. This has been reflected in 13 paragraphs of the Political Declaration of the summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries, which has been circulated as an official document, in document A/31/197. This Declaration in some of its paragraphs calls on the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean to dismantle existing foreign military bases in the region which are or may be endangering the territorial integrity and peaceful and progressive development of other States in the region, or are being used to hamper self-determination for the peoples of the area.

The Conference called upon States to desist from membership in military alliances or pacts conceived in the context of great Power rivalry or which are detrimental to the interests of the peoples of the region. This is to be found in paragraphs 127 and 131 of the Colombo Declaration. Paragraph 13<sup>1</sup> reads as follows:

(Mr. Hamza, Democratic Yemen)

"In the context of the foregoing paragraphs, the concept of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace includes its natural extensions and the littoral and hinterland States."

Consequently, my delegation finds in all these texts an appropriate development of the concept of making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. These ideas add further elements which we are dealing with for the first time and while expressing our appreciation for this change of approach to the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, we would request the Ad Hoc Committee to reflect this change in its report and its recommendations, which are to be submitted at the next session of the General Assembly, because this would facilitate the holding of a conference on the Indian Ocean. While appreciating the efforts of the Ad Hoc Committee and its attention to this common desire, we would wish to refer to the recommendations contained in document A/31/29, which we will support in the course of the vote.

Mr. MELESCANU (Romania) (interpretation from French): My delegation being one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.14 on the Disarmament Decade introduced this morning by the representative of Nigeria, Ambassador Clark, our position on the text is perfectly clear.

Nevertheless, I should like to make a few remarks on the scope of the objectives of this draft, which is intended to promote the attainment of the goal of general disarmament, and particularly nuclear disarmament. General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV) of 16 December 1969 proclaiming the Disarmament Decade recognized the objective link between the establishment of a new international order and disarmament. The proclamation of the 1970s as a Disarmament Decade is, furthermore, linked to the second International Development Strategy; this link lies in the basic incompatibility between the new order and the arms race, since disarmament has been defined, quite correctly, as one of the essential components of the establishment of the new international economic order.

There is, first, a structural incompatibility between the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, and the new order, because arms provide the material support for the policy of force and Diktat that governed the old

(Mr. Melescanu, Romania)

relationships among nations, whereas the establishment of the new order requires that all elements of force be forever banished from international relations, which must instead be based on the principles of international law. Secondly, the arms race is contrary to the very essence of the new international order. The wasting of \$300 billion a year for non-productive purposes, the constant weakening of the economies of the developing countries because of the arms trade and the increased inflation in the developed countries because of the arms race, directly affect the prospects of eliminating the discrepancies and inequalities that currently exist in the world. It is in the light of these undeniable facts that the draft resolution calls for the intensification of the negotiations on disarmament and the allocation to development of the resources thus released.

From the analysis made five years after the proclamation of the Disarmament Decade, it is clear that military expenditures in the world have continued to spiral, a fact which has been ably stressed by a number of speakers, quoting supporting statistics. During this period, the negotiations on disarmament have produced no concrete results as regards general and complete disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament. We have not even been able to achieve any significant results in the application of partial disarmament measures, and we are therefore justified in feeling that, as far as the substance of the problem is concerned, the objectives of the Disarmament Decade have not been attained. This assessment of the actual situation which, we are convinced, is generally shared, has led the sponsors of this draft resolution to call upon all States to place at the centre of their preoccupations the adoption of effective measures for the cessation of the arms race, especially in the nuclear field. The reduction of military expenditures, particularly of the heavily armed great Powers, should be at the forefront of such efforts.

Another basic objective taken into account at the time of the adoption of resolution 2602 E (XXIV) was the concern to ensure that activities in this field, which have such an important bearing on peace and security in the world as well as on the economic and social development of all countries, should not be haphazard but should be carried out on the basis of a comprehensive disarmament programme to be formulated. This task was entrusted to the Conference of the Committee on

(Mr. Melescanu, Romania)

Disarmament (CCD). I should like to stress that a number of concrete ideas were submitted in this connexion, both in the discussions in Geneva and in New York. By way of illustration, I shall mention the disarmament programme submitted in 1970 to the CCD by the delegations of Mexico, Sweden and Yugoslavia and the suggestions made on that same matter by the delegations of the Netherlands and Italy. I should also like to recall the proposals concerning a comprehensive disarmament programme presented by Romania on 5 March 1970 in the CCD, and more recently in the General Assembly document circulated by my delegation at the previous session. The great number of proposals made regarding the aims and the principles that should be pursued and promoted by a disarmament programme proves the extent of the concerns expressed by States in matters of disarmament. But despite all this, the CCD has not succeeded in preparing such a document in the six years that have elapsed since the beginning of the Disarmament Decade. This second short-coming regarding the methods of approaching disarmament problems is also reflected in the draft resolution.

Proceeding from the consideration that disarmament problems do not affect merely a small number of Governments, but are of vital interest to all the States and peoples of the world, the draft resolution calls upon all non-governmental organizations and international institutions and organizations to further the goals of the Disarmament Decade, thereby inviting all peoples to contribute to halting the arms race and achieving real progress in nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Melescanu, Romania)

The final finding, which is equally important, is that the draft resolution recognizes the main role to be played in disarmament by the United Nations through informing world public opinion regarding the arms race and the disarmament measures which should be taken and those few that have been. As we have gathered from the comprehensive debate that has taken place in our debate this concern is obvious to all States and not only to the co-sponsors of this draft resolution. My delegation, therefore, associates itself with the appeal made by the representative of Nigeria, Ambassador Clark, that this draft resolution advocating effective measures to achieve the aims and targets of the Disarmament Decade be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I have no other speakers on my list. Before adjourning the meeting I should like to inform the Committee that Cameroon, Maldives and Uganda have become co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.1; that Ghana, Finland, Ireland and Rwanda have become co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.11; that Barbados has become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.13; that Papua New Guinea has become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.15; that Barbados has become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.18; that Mauritania and the Sudan have become co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.19; that Venezuela has become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.20; and, finally, that Ecuador has become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.21.

I have one more announcement to make, namely, that there will be an informal meeting of the parties to the sea-bed treaty concerning the Review Conference this afternoon at 3.45, here in Conference room 4.

I should like to inform the Committee that we shall have no meeting this afternoon due to the lack of speakers. We shall have no meetings tomorrow. Our next meeting will be on Friday morning at 10.30.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.