



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 20th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. **ZACHMANN** (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Penazka (Czechoslovakia)
Mr. Issraelyan (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
Mr. **Icaza Gallard** (Nicaragua)
Mr. Samudio (Panama)
Mr. **Rossides** (Cyprus)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room EX 2 750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

The meetina was called to order at 18.55 a.m.

STATEMENT BY **THE** CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: On this auspicious Occasion, United Nations Day, the forty-first anniversary of the founding of the United Nation, I should like to extend my congratulations and best wishes to all Members. In his **message** on **this** important day the Secretary-General stressed, inter alia, the fact that

"More **than** ever before, there is need for **the** just and peaceful settlement of regional disputes, the joint effort to reduce armaments, overcome underdevelopment, combat threats to **the** civility of international life and advance human rights for which the United Nations provides an organised structure." (SG/SM/3925, p. 1)

It is opportune at this moment to rededicate our common efforts to contribute to the attainment of the noble goals and objectives enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

AGENDA ITEMS 46 to 65 and 144 (continued)

STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE

The CHAIRMAN: In keeping with the programme of work **and** timetable, **this** morning the Committee will proceed to its second phase of work, namely, statements on specific disarmament agenda items and continuation of the general debate, as necessary.

Mr. PENAZKA (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): The Czechoslovak delegation would like to express its views today on a number of particularly timely auestions, items on our agenda, and we wish especially to **stress the** importance that we attach to regional measures for limiting **the arms** race and bringing about disarmament.

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

We should like to highlight once again the overall constructive and businesslike nature of the general debate in our Committee. Many important ideas have been expressed in the course of our debate and now, valuable proposals have been put forward. The results from Reykjavik have made an important impression in that they have created a qualitatively new situation in the approach to key Problem of nuclear disarmament. All this, in our view, creates a very good point of departure for taking an entirely new approach to the practical solution of urgent issues and the adoption of concrete measures.

(Mr. Penaxka, Czechoslovakia)

We can achieve this end if, by our **concerted efforts** and with understanding of our joint **responsibility**, we draw on the positive capital accumulated in the first **stage** of our work.

One of **the** characteristic features of the **discussion** this year **was** the formation of a new, practical approach to disarmament as the essential **basis** for the **security** of all **St'tes**. That fundamental idea was accurately and concisely reflected in the **statement** of Ambassador **Olu Adeniji** of Nigeria, when he said:

"We are convinced that the safe route to the **preservation** of global . . . security **is** through nuclear disarmament effectively verified to **allay** the fear of **cheating**." (A/C.1/41/PV.7, p. 28)

Many other representatives spoke in the same spirit. We welcome this trend in the **discussion**, which wholly **vindicates** the idea of establishing a comprehensive system of international peace and security built particularly on concrete **disarmament measures**, the reduction of military expenditures and other political and military guarantees of **peace**.

We **also** believe that a major contribution to consolidating the basis of **universal peace** and **security** would be made by limiting armaments and lowering the level of military confrontation in those parts **of** the world where it **is reaching** dangerous **heights**. As a European country situated at the interface of the two major military-political groupings, Czechoslovakia naturally attaches paramount importance to **the** adoption of such measures in Europe. **Progress** in efforts in **Europe** to limit the arms race **would** undoubtedly promote **progress** towards the **global solution** of these problems. Here we see the common responsibility of the **countries members** of the Warsaw Treaty **Organization** of the North Atlantic Treaty **Organization** (**NATO**) to **ensure** a peaceful future.

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

A **solid basis** for progress has been laid by the constructive results of the first **stage** of the Stockholm Conference. The **agreements** reached **will** undoubtedly help to strengthen confidence and security and reduce the threat of war in **Europe**, and hence lead **to** an overall improvement in the international climate. All the **countries** in the all-European dialogue took part in **reaching** those **important decisions**, which **testifies** to the dialogue's vitality and promise. The Foreign **Ministers** of the **parties** to the **Warsaw** Treaty, meeting in Bucharest in the **middle** of **this** month, made it absolutely clear that **precisely** at this time we **must** give **fresh momentum** to the **Helsinki** process in the form of **practical steps** to reduce the danger of military confrontation and, particularly, to **eliminate** nuclear and chemical weapons from the continent. **This is** one of the most important areas for the **work** of the forthcoming Vienna **meeting** of the participants in the all-European process, which **begins** on 4 November.

We consider the creation of a chemical-weapon free **zone** in Central Europe and the **Balkans** a matter of great **urgency**. Now that nearly all of **us** welcome the **progress** in work toward a **convention** on the **comprehensive** prohibition of chemical weapons, we **must** take fully into account the **fact** that the **prospects** for concluding the convention might be **destroyed** if plans were put **into** effect to deploy binary chemical weapons in Europe. The very fact that that possibility **is** coming **closer** to reality is creating a **serious obstacle** to the **conclusion** of a **convention** on chemical **weapons**. In our view, that **obstacle** can and **must** be removed and **we** propose that it be done **swiftly** and **simply**. The creation of a chemical-weapon-free **zone** embracing the territory of Czechoslovakia, the **German Democratic Republic**, the **Federal Republic of Germany** and **possibly** other **European States** **would** have a two-fold effect: it **would** be an important measure for building **trust** and **stability** in the European context and it would provide a powerful momentum to efforts to

(Mr. Ponaxka, Czechoslovakia)

bring about a **comprehensive** prohibition of **that** weapon. Of **course**, we are putting forward the idea of the **zone** not as a **pre-condition** of a **comprehensive** solution, but **exclusively as a measure** to **promote** the attainment of that end.

We are **unequivocally** in favour of **a substantial** reduction in armed **forces** and conventional **armaments** in **Europe**, and we **understand** that the high-priority problem of nuclear **disarmament** must be resolved within the context of a general reduction of the military potential of States, reducing them to a level of **reasonable adequacy**. The **parties to the Warsaw Treaty**, at the meeting of their Political Consultative Committee in **Budapest** in **June** this year, put forward a **large-scale** Programme for the reduction of armed **forces** and conventional armaments from the Atlantic to the Ural under **strict** international control.

Our approach to consolidating **security** and **disarmament** in Europe also includes the **complete** elimination on a reciprocal basis of Soviet and United States **European-based medium-range missiles**. In addition, **Soviet** long-range tactical **missiles** would be eliminated from the territories of the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia. Thus, we are putting forward a whole **series** of concrete and **responsible proposals** to **consolidate peace, security and disarmament** in **Europe**. This is entirely in keeping with the **decisions** of the **first special session** of the General Assembly on **disarmament**, which **stressed** that efforts to that end must be continued with the **utmost** energy. It would be very **useful** if the NATO countries **responded** to **those proposals** in a **clearer and more** practical way than they have so far.

An **important** category of **items** on the **Committee's** agenda is that concerning the **creation** of nuclear-weapon zones in various parts of the **world**. **Czechoslovakia** has **consistently supported** the creation of **such zones** on a democratic basis and with the consent of **all** the States of the region concerned. We regard this as an important contribution to **strengthening** international peace and **security** and as a

(Mr. Penaxka, **Czechoslovakia**)

useful **measure** for preventing the **spread** of nuclear **weapons**, which **would** promote efforts to curb the **arms** race.

We continue to favour the idea of **creating** a nuclear-weapon-free corridor in Central **Europe**, and we **support** initiatives to that end. The **Czechoslovak Socialist Republic** **views** the recent joint initiative of the **Socialist Unity** Party of the **German Democratic Republic** and the Social **Democratic** Party of the Federal **Republic of Germany** **to** create a nuclear-weapon-free corridor in Central **Europe** **as** an **important** step towards the elimination of **that weapon** from our continent. **As** I said earlier, **Czechoslovakia** **is** ready to **join** in establishing that corridor and to take part in negotiations to **this** end.

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

We would **also** like to see the **creation of** nuclear-weapon-free zones in other **parts of Europe**, such as the Balkans and the north of our continent.

An **important** step towards **strengthening security** would be the creation of such a **zone** in the Korean peninsula, **as proposed** by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and also in South-East **Asia**. We **welcome** the decision of the States of the South Pacific Forum to conclude the Raratonga Treaty to create a nuclear-free zone **in** that region **and** believe that it should be guaranteed by all nuclear Powers. We also find useful the new **Brazilian** proposals for the creation of a zone of peace **and** co-operation in the South Atlantic **and** its declaration **as** a nuclear-free **zone**.

Reports about South Africa's nuclear preparation continue to **arouse** alarm. This goes hand in hand with the growing aggressiveness of the racist **régime** **against** neighbouring African States and the indigenous population of that country and of the occupied Territory of Namibia. Pretoria's nuclear ambitions make even **more** dangerous the already explosive situation in southern Africa.

We profoundly regret that once **again** this year the Disarmament **Commission** was unable, for reasons which are clear to everyone, to agree on the **necessary** conclusions and **recommendations**. In essence that has been encouraged by the South African **régime's** policy of force and co-operation with it in, among **others**, the nuclear field. **Czechoslovakia is** firmly in favour of the full **implementation of** the Declaration on the **Denuclearization** of Africa and supports the adoption of binding and effective measures to halt Pretoria's nuclear designs.

We take a similar position on the question of **Israel's** nuclear **weapons**, which **will** create a new extremely dangerous destabilizing factor **and** heighten tension in **the** Middle East.

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

The important **question** of creating a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean in **implementation** of the **United Nations** Declaration adopted 15 years ago is **making** very slow **progress**. We regret the delays in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and **express** our support for the efforts of **States** in the area which want to see the **Colombo** Conference on this subject held as soon as **possible**, with the participation of the **permanent** members of the **Security Council**.

We would like to refer to the new constructive proposals which have appeared this year, designed to reduce the activities of naval **forces** in the Pacific Ocean and the creation of a **zone** of stable **peace** and co-operation in the Mediterranean.

We take a favourable view of a series of substantial conclusions and **recommendations** adopted by the Disarmament **Commission** with regard to the problem of curbing the naval arms race and the extension of confidence-building **measures** to the **seas** and **oceans**. We hope that they will become a **point** of departure for practical negotiations on these **subjects**, on both the **global** and **regional** levels.

In expressing our views on the urgent disarmament problems, narrowing down the sphere of military preparations and the prevention of nuclear war, we have always borne in mind the need for stepping up collective **efforts**, strengthening co-operation among States and the thrust towards achieving **concrete** decisions. **Here lies** precisely the irreplaceable role of the **United Nations**. We support all **rational proposals** aimed at strengthening that role, enhancing the **effectiveness** of United Nations machinery in the disarmament field, and respect for and compliance with its resolutions.

Our delegation has already stressed in the debate the great importance that **we** attach to the task of **comprehensively** strengthening the **legal** basis for the process of limiting the arms race and disarmament. We do so in the belief that, at a moment of particular **responsibility** when the **question** of **concluding** new **important**

(Mr. **Panazka, Czechoslovakia**)

agreements has become a high priority and a genuinely historical possibility has emerged for making a breakthrough towards reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons and preventing the arms race in outer space, it is unpardonable to discard what has already been achieved. Above all, there must be unswerving compliance by States with existing treaties and agreements in this sphere and total certainty that such compliance will be forthcoming. Here we see a very important element of trust so essential for making progress in the disarmament process in the circumstances of the nuclear space age.

Motivated by those considerations, we are presenting for discussion in the First Committee a draft resolution on the subject in document A/C.1/41/L.2 which, in our view, deals with the major aspects of this problem. We are sure that adoption by the General Assembly of a broad, constructive and just multilateral approach to the question of observance and compliance will be a step towards consolidating the ground work for the disarmament process. In this spirit we are ready - and I stress this - to co-operate with other delegations.

We also believe that United Nations participation in efforts to resolve disarmament questions should be broadened, so as not to curb but rather to encourage the use of all the Organization's existing possibilities and resources in the interests of progress. The multifaceted nature of the disarmament problem requires nothing less. In this regard, we should like to express our appreciation of the thorough report by the United Nations Secretary-General in document A/41/491, which testifies to serious work and valuable contributions by the specialized agencies and other organizations and programmes within the United Nations system to the task of limiting the arms race and disarmament within the spheres of their competence. In our view, this positive experience should be used in the future.

(Mr. Penazka , Czechoslovakia)

⁴In conclusion, I **express** my conviction that the **work** of the First **Committee** will be **responsible** and purposeful and that its results will **reflect** the **readiness** of **States** to take action for **purposes** of disarmament. We are determined to take **such** action.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from **Russian**): **In** my statement today the Soviet delegation intends to *refer* to the activities of the Conference on **Disarmament** in **1986**. Nearly all delegations have in one way or another referred to the work of that multilateral forum, more often than not expressing disappointment and frustration at the results of that work. At the same time, for a correct **assessment** of the work of the Conference on Disarmament during 1986 black and white alone are not enough to colour the picture.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

On the whole, a proper picture of the world today, which is reflected in a concentrated form both in the United Nations and at the Conference on Disarmament, is made up of approaches and trends that are parallel - sometimes convergent - and which frequently intersect at different levels and on different planes.

The indivisibility of this world and, at the same time, the complexity of the challenges facing it, never make themselves felt so strongly anywhere as in bodies of multilateral diplomacy.

The general debate on disarmament issues has been going on for two weeks now. The recurrent theme of virtually all the statements we have heard is the need to remove the danger of a nuclear conflict which is looming over mankind, as well as the need to proceed to real disarmament. Disarmament has now become - if I may put it in this way - the challenge of challenges facing mankind, a global problem of paramount importance today. What concerns mankind most of all and alarms it most about its future in the continuing arms race. Consequently, all States of the world - large or small, nuclear or non-nuclear, socialist or capitalist, members of military alliances or non-aligned and neutral - have a vital stake in solving this problem.

If we are to prevent mankind from drifting towards the nuclear abyss, we must set in motion the entire existing system of negotiations and ensure the greatest possible efficiency of all disarmament machinery, both bilateral and multilateral.

Special responsibility for producing effective measures to avert nuclear war and to limit nuclear armaments rests with the Soviet Union and the United States. The USSR is well aware of that. This has been demonstrated by the bold and radical proposals covering the entire range of disarmament, which have been put forward by the Soviet Union during the past year and, most recently, in Reykjavik.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

In his **speech** on Soviet television on 22 **October**, **Mikhail Gorbachev** said:

"The **Soviet Union** **has** invented maximum good will in its **proposals**. **Ever ything** that **has** been said to rationalize and develop them **remains valid**."

Yet it would be a **m'stake to assume** that other **States** can stand **aloof** from **active** involvement in the **elaboration** of concrete measures **designed** to **limit weapons**, including nuclear weapons. **To look at** the solution of the vitally important **problem** of preventing a nuclear **catasrophe** through the prism of **Soviet-American** talks **is** clearly to underestimate **their** own responsibility and **their own possibilities**. **Let** each political leader, invested with high **authority**, ask himself **to is** question: what specific contribution **has his country** made to the preservation of **human civilization** and the elaboration of practical **measures** to limit **armaments**.

Perhaps there are **some people** who are **satisfied** with a situation where a **significant number** of **States** - representing the **overwhelming majority** of **mankind** - would be excluded from active participation in **solving** the issues of war and peace, nuclear **disarmament** and the **prevention** of an **arms race** in outer space. **We strongly oppose** such an **approach**. **Today**, no one - I repeat, no one - has **the** right to be a mere **spectator** of **what is** going on in our very **troubled** world.

This is precisely the **stand** of the **Soviet Union** in **evaluating** the **place** and role of multilateral **diplomacy** in the disarmament process. **In this**, we have been guided by the principles of **Leninist foreign policy**, which advanced the **concept** of **global arms reductions** as far back as the Genoa **conference** of 1922 and fought for its **implementation** in Geneva in 1927 within the preparatory **commission** of the **Disarmament Conference** **established** by the League of Nations. **Today**, we **continue** to operate **on** the **basis** of those **pr inciples**.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

Within the negotiating mechanism today, a special place belongs to the Conference on Disarmament, which, according to the definition contained in the relevant United Nations documents, is the single multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament. We wish to stress that it is multilateral and therefore has considerable negotiating and legal potential for dealing with the problems before it.

The Soviet Union attaches great importance to the Conference on Disarmament. In his message to the Conference last February, Mikhail Gorbachev noted:

"The Soviet Union views its participation in the Conference on Disarmament with a full sense of responsibility deriving from the realization that disarmament is the main road leading to the establishment of a new and just international order and to the building of a new world. It is disarmament which, by releasing vast material and intellectual resources, will make it possible to reallocate them for the purposes of creation, economic development and prosperity."

In assessing the role of the Conference on Disarmament as a forum of multilateral diplomacy, one cannot fail to see that its possibilities, in terms of achieving real agreements to limit the race in all types of arms, are far from being fully utilized as yet.

The positive political capital accumulated by the Conference on Disarmament in the 1960s and 1970s shows that whenever its members have worked from a basis of realism and recognition of the community and indivisibility of the world, this particular body has proved itself capable of serving the interests of peace. Good will, a desire for co-operation and a constructive approach by different States have enabled the Conference to reach reasonable compromises and to produce useful solutions for arms limitation and disarmament.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

Unfortunately, in the past 10 years the Conference has perceptibly slowed down its performance in terms of finding concrete solutions to disarmament problems. The cause of its inadequate effectiveness and malfunctions in its work does not lie in the imperfection of Conference machinery but rather in the lack of political will on the part of some of its participants.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

It should be **said** very frankly that during this period, particularly in the **1980s**, the **United States** ignored the Conference on Disarmament **as** a negotiating **body**. **The** only item on its agenda on which the **United States** finally agreed to enter into negotiations, even then only after long **delays** and **procrastination**, was the prohibition of chemical **weapons**.

Why is it that the Conference on Disarmament **is** not negotiating on the prohibition of nuclear testing, nuclear disarmament, the prevention of nuclear **war**, **the** preparation of a convention on **strengthening** the security of non-nuclear **States** **and** the prevention of an arms race in outer space? The answer in every **case is because** the **United States is** opposed to it, despite the relevant **resolutions** of the United Nations General Assembly, and the tenacious **desire** and willingness of socialist, non-aligned, neutral and - we wish to say it explicitly - many Western **countries**, to engage in such negotiations.

The other day, at a meeting of **this** Committee, the United **States** representative, Ambassador Okun, made a statement which was devoted to multilateral **aspects** of the disarmament problem. If we dismiss the anti-Soviet baloney which **is** the traditional rotten ingredient of all American **statements**, it becomes clear that the **United States** still intends to oppose the participation of the **States** of the world in negotiations on major disarmament **problems**.

Let **us** take, for instance, **the** question of the prohibition of nuclear tests. Having spoken **once** more against conducting multilateral negotiations with a view to **concluding a** treaty on the banning of nuclear **tests**, the **United States** representative **stated**, in a way that amounted almost to an ultimatum, that the **Conference** on Disarmament must agree, without any further delay, to the mandate **of** the relevant Committee on the basis of the Western proposal, even though - as we know and I am **sure** Mr. Okun also knows - this proposal **does** not enjoy the support

(Mr. Iseraelyan, USSR)

of the overwhelming majority of the member States of the **Conference**, or indeed of the **United Nations as a whole**.

As to the other top priority **problem - the prevention of an arms race in outer space - here**, too, contrary to the **negotiating** mandate of the Conference on Disarmament, Mr. Okun **magnanimously** permitted the Conference to continue with the **d/**discussion of this **question**, but not to conduct actual negotiations. As for the participation of **the States** of the world community in the negotiations on nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear **war**, the **United States representative** did not even find it necessary to mention it.

So this, in brief, **is** the main **cause** of the "infertility", **so to speak**, of the Conference on Disarmament in recent **years**. At **the** same time, it cannot be asserted that during all these years, when **the** Conference has been **getting** nowhere, **nothing** has **altered**. The **winds** of change have begun to **blow** also **towards** the **Palais** des Nations where the **Conference** on Disarmament holds its **meetings**; they have injected a breath of fresh air into the routine **course** of its work. **The latest proposals**, advanced by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries **this** year, have resulted in a new outlook, **compared** with the traditional concepts of and approaches to **such** notions **as** international and national security.

In a situation where the **examination** in political maturity which must be taken by all mankind **asks** the **question**, "to be or not to be" **as** regards **civilization** on Earth, many **participants** in the Conference on Disarmament have **understood** that urgent and vigorous actions are **required** to **save** mankind from a nuclear catastrophe. They have called for a **decisive** renunciation of old stereotypes of thinking, which have come into conflict with reality, and with notions of security and **ways** and means of ensuring it.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

The session of the **Conference** on Disarmament that ended recently brought to light some specific **signs** and promising shoots of new approaches to disarmament **issues**. Where do we see these **positive changes**? There **has been** a dramatic increase in the interest and **activities** of States, above all the non-aligned States, in **questions pertaining** to nuclear disarmament and the prevention of an arms race in space. States have **become** immeasurably more aware of the jeopardy in which the **world** now finds itself; **they** now feel a stronger **need** for immediate solutions and, what is most **important, recognize** that the removal of the nuclear threat is a realistic **possibility**. This has **been reflected** in the decisions adopted at various important **international** forums, in distant **Harare**, and in the Mexican city of Ixtapa. It **has also been** demonstrated by the results of meetings of **socialist** countries in **Budapest** and **Bucharest**. The wide-ranging decisions adopted at those forums also have a direct impact on the state of affairs at the Conference on Disarmament.

The result has been not merely a greater interest on the part of a great number of countries in nuclear and space problems, but also the presenting of specific proposals and **initiatives, both** at planetary meetings and in **special committees** of the Conference on **Disarmament**. A significant number of specific position papers, proposals and working documents on the main **issues** included in the agenda of the Conference have **been submitted** by a wide range of countries. For example, the issues of nuclear **disarmament** were addressed by non-aligned countries and China, the **question** of banning space-strike weapons was dealt with in the **proposals** and drafts worked out by the **delegations of** Bulgaria, Venezuela and Sri Lanka; and there were also some **interesting** proposals on banning nuclear **explosions**, particularly by the **delegation** of Sweden. In fact it may fairly be said that over the entire range of problems concerning nuclear disarmament and the prevention of an arms race in outer space there was a **more** substantive **discussion**

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

this year, **which** can be regarded as an **introduction** to **negotiation**, as it were, a kind of negotiating overture. One cannot help but **express satisfaction** at the results of the work of the seismic experts group.

There are also grounds for believing that willingness to reach more practical agreements at the Conference emerged in most tangible form in **the** course **of** negotiations on the banning of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

However, these seedlings are still weak; they **are just a sign of changes** for the better. We also **have** another criterion for **assessing** the **results** of the Conference - that is, the verification of the sincerity of the **statements** by the delegations in favour of strengthening security and peace.

Matching declarations by concrete deed **is** one of the **essential** component⁸ of the new political thinking. The people of our planet, as has already been **said**, are weary of empty rhetoric. **And** since **time immemorial**, intention⁸ have been judged not by words, but by deeds. The great Goethe, paraphrasing the word⁸ of the Bible, said through Faust that, in the beginning, there **was** the deed.

Willingness to eliminate nuclear, chemical and other type⁸ of weapons of **mass** destruction **is** being professed by virtually everyone, including countries **which** are either torpedoing **negotiations** on these **subjects** or are objecting to negotiations on these matters within the context of the Conference on Disarmament. **But** when **it** comes to concrete **steps**, the picture change⁸ drastically. The **situation** looks particularly absurd - I cannot find any other word for it - when **some** western countries submitted for consideration at the Conference on Disarmament working papers on specific items on **its** agenda, including **some quite** interesting ones, and then essentially **blocked** the possibility of **consideration** of them **within** the framework of the negotiation⁸ of relevant **disarmament problems**. **It is incredible** but true. So what is revealed here **is** a pattern of thinking lagging **dangerously** behind a pattern of action; there **is** a kind of gap between **words** and deeds.

We propose that this gap, this abyss be closed at one fell **swoop**. **Those** who oppose negotiations favour a series of **timorous** attempt⁸ **in** the form of consideration, study and so forth. Reference⁸ have already been made here to the words of Lloyd George who was **quoted** as saying that one can only leap over the abyss in a single jump, not in two or three. This is exactly what we **suggest**: to

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

begin **work**, at last, on concrete agreements on the problems of **arms** limitation and disarmament which confront **us**.

It is altogether inadmissible for the Conference on Disarmament not to conduct negotiations on such issues as **banning** nuclear **tests**, limiting the **nuclear-weapon** race and nuclear disarmament, preventing nuclear war and an arms race in outer space. Those who **oppose** negotiation⁸ are attempting to drive these problems into the background of the Conference. However, our **experience** make⁸ it **quite clear** that these problems are the very focal point of **world** political **issues**. The entire range of problems of nuclear disarmament and prevention of an arms race **in** outer space must lie, as I am sure they will, at the very heart of all the activities at the Conference. To indulge in wishful thinking that these **questions** can be solved somewhere outside the framework of the Conference on **Disarmament** is a failure to understand the universal nature of the problems of nuclear disarmament.

There is one more point I **should** like to make. As you know, 40 States are members of the Conference on Disarmament. However, their activities are not **equal**. Year after year a number of States participating in the Conference on **Disarmament** as observers make a much greater contribution to the work being **done** than **some** of its **members**.

We welcome the wish on the part of any State to promote progress in **negotiations** on disarmament, regardless of its Official status. The doors of the Conference should be open to them. The work of the **Conference is**, so to speak, replete with various organisational and procedural discussions and arguments. At times the Conference spends more time settling these **questions** than conducting negotiations on **matters** of substance.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

The Soviet Union and other **socialist countries resolutely oppose this squandering** of the time of **the** Conference, **especially** in the **present situation**, where urgent and effective action is needed. We call for **flexibility** and constructivism in resolving organizational and procedural **questions**, and for giving them the modest place that they deserve.

Let me **summarize** what I have said. An ever-greater number of States of the Conference on **Disarmament** are **pinning** their **increasing hopes** for a nuclear-free world on **active** trends, which are taking **shape** in international life, under the influence of the new, bold and large-scale proposals **designed** to remove the threat of nuclear war and to eliminate nuclear and other types of weapons of **mass** destruction from the face of the Earth **before** the end of the century. It is precisely this circumstance that largely explains a certain **positive** shift in the work of the Conference on **Disarmament** in 1986.

To exploit **its** potential **capabilities**, the Conference on **Disarmament** should concentrate on holding productive negotiations, and it is **required** to do by the Final Document of the **first** special session of the United **Nations** General Assembly on disarmament, as well as the annual **injunctions, orders** and **instructions** by States Members of the **Organization**, which are laid down in decisions adopted by the General Assembly.

Successful work of the negotiating machinery will become possible if all States participating in the Conference express clearly and **explicitly** their **will** and readiness to work for and adopt concrete measures in the field of disarmament. We hope that **next year** the Conference on Disarmament **will succeed** in achieving progress in all the items on **its** agenda.

Mr. ICAZA GALLARD (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): My

Delegation wishes to congratulate you, Sir, on having been elected Chairman of this Committee of the Assembly which is responsible for security and disarmament items. We are certain that your ability, impartiality and diplomatic experience guarantee the success of the work of this Committee. We also extend our congratulations to the other officers of the Committee.

The current session of the General Assembly began under a promising sign, based on the Reykjavik summit meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev. The work of the First Committee, dealing with security and disarmament item, has unfortunately not been able to derive benefit from the results which were about to be reached at that meeting. The logic of security through nuclear and strategic predominance once again prevailed. However, we should not like to think nor have we the right to, that all is lost. The dialogue must continue between the two super-Powers, and the voice of people calling for the elimination of the threat of nuclear weapons and the releasing for purposes of development and co-operation of the enormous resources now devoted to the arms build-up should make itself heard more loudly,

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

As stated in the General Assembly repeatedly, and in the Declaration of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at their recent meeting in Harare, Zimbabwe, the super-Powers in their discussions must at all times take into account not only their national interests but also the vital interests of all the peoples of the world. This is the only approach that can make the nuclear-weapon States see reason and the only factor that could become an element of persuasion more powerful than all the existing nuclear arsenals.

It is because of this conviction that my country has consistently supported the efforts of the Governments of Argentina, Mexico, India, Greece, Sweden and Tanzania to promote peace and disarmament. The purpose of this initiative is to make known the vital interests of the peoples of four continents and contribute through practical realistic and specific initiatives to the process leading to the complete elimination from the face of the Earth of all nuclear weapons. We therefore feel that the proposals made by this group of countries in the Mexico Declaration, adopted in Ixtapa on 7 August this year, which includes 4 specific proposals on verification measures with the aim of putting an end to nuclear-weapon tests, deserve thorough consideration by the super-Powers. This specific coherent and scientific proposal once again shows that the problems related to verification cannot and should not be used as an excuse to continue to prolong negotiations on a treaty on the permanent prohibition of all nuclear tests by all States in all environments, which is a matter of the highest priority.

While it is true that, as stated in the Ixtapa Declaration,

"no issue is more urgent and crucial today than of bringing to an end all nuclear tests" (A/41/518, p. 4),

it is important, especially at this time, to highlight and reiterate the demand in that Declaration that an arms race in outer space be prevented, that the

(Hr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

development of anti-satellite weapons be halted and that existing treaties safeguarding the peaceful uses of outer space and limiting anti-ballistic missile systems be respected.

We believe it necessary to repeat our well-known position on this matter. Space is the heritage of all mankind. Any strategic defence system - or star wars, as it has come to be known - constitutes the beginning of the militarization of outer space and further escalation of the arms race. Space must be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. Developing countries lacking in human, material and scientific resources have a right to participate in such peaceful exploration and share in and benefit from knowledge derived therefrom. A means of ensuring that such activities will be used to bring not destruction and death but development and progress to all peoples.

Therefore, the Conference on Disarmament must undertake without delay negotiation leading to the conclusion of an agreement or agreements, as the case may be, to prevent the extension of the arms race in all its aspects to outer space and thus promote possibilities for co-operation in the sphere of the peaceful use of outer space. Furthermore, the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, can demonstrate their willingness to compromise by making a genuine effort towards achievement of the objective set forth in the joint statement issued in Geneva on 21 November 1985, namely, "to prevent an arms race in space and to terminate it on earth" (A/40/1070, p. 3).

We have noted recently growing concern regarding the question of conventional disarmament. This concern is legitimate since approximately 80 per cent of annual military expenditure world wide goes on conventional weapons and armed forces. However, we view with similar concern the tendency to consider conventional disarmament in the wrong context and from the wrong perspective. That is why I

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

consider it important to recall that the study on conventional disarmament, prepared by a Group of Experts appointed by the Secretary-General under resolution 36/97 A of the General Assembly, and issued last year, states inter alia:

"Progress towards conventional disarmament cannot proceed very far in the absence of substantial progress in nuclear disarmament. Conventional disarmament in isolation would perpetuate existing asymmetries in the security of States in favour of those States which possess nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction. In certain areas limitations and reductions in conventional weapons and armed forces without accompanying reductions or elimination of nuclear capabilities in the region would leave non-nuclear-weapon States at a disadvantage. The conventional disarmament Process should not jeopardize the security of any State and it should be aimed at achieving general and complete disarmament." (A/39/348, para. 39)

This is in keeping with the priorities established for disarmament negotiations in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, which was adopted by consensus by the Assembly at its first special session devoted to disarmament and formally reaffirmed at its twelfth special session. Those priorities are the following: nuclear weapons; other weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons; conventional weapons, including any which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects; and reductions of armed forces.

The item on conventional disarmament is unjustly and incorrectly taken out of the context of general and complete disarmament and discussed from the standpoint of expenditure on conventional weapons by developing countries. We must not lose sight of the fact that by far the highest percentage of military expenditure on conventional weapons and armed forces world-wide is by those States with the

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

biggest military arsenals and other militarily important States. We must never forget that the cessation of the arms race is closely related to the strengthening of international security, mutual confidence between States and the willingness of States to settle their disputes by peaceful means. The study on conventional disarmament, to which I have already referred, also states:

"The interference of those States with the largest military arsenals can greatly deepen local conflicts and plunge regions into protracted turmoil. In regions which may be regarded as strategically or economically sensitive, such turmoil can be a source of considerable threat to international security."

(para5)

That is why the adoption of disarmament measures in the conventional field must be based, as affirmed in the Declaration of the summit meeting of the members of the Non-Aligned Movement in Harare, on

"full respect for the principles of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and the peaceful settlement of disputes in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations".

Strict respect for those principles is also at the root of disarmament efforts at the regional level. Similarly, regional disarmament must be approached in the right way. We agree that, far from being incompatible with world-wide activities, regional initiatives that may be taken in this area or that are already under way could supplement or contribute to them if they are carried out with the broadest possible objectives in view. In this context, we must therefore recall the need to take into account world-wide priorities and, once again, the special responsibility of the States with the biggest military arsenals with regard to the process of the reduction of conventional weapons.

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

My country strongly supports the security and disarmament efforts of the Contadora Group and its Support Group in the Central American **situation**. We are in favour of turning Central America into a zone of peace, free of all foreign military presence. Without clear concepts such as **these** we cannot deal with an item of particular importance **such** as that of the relationship between disarmament and development.

In 1981 alone, military expenditure world-wide reached \$600 billion. If we take into account the fact that the upward trend in the last four years **is** estimated to have been **3** per cent per year **in** volume, the level of expenditure by the end of the century, assuming the same **rate** of growth, will exceed the **\$1.02** trillion mark. Obviously, these military expenditures are the most important source of funds available for possible transfers throughout the world to benefit developing countries.

These levels of military expenditures are in contrast with the meagre results **of** the last Development Decade. The target which was set by the International Development Strategy was that developed countries should provide 0.7 per **cent** of their gross national product as **official** assistance to developing countries. **It** is estimated that official development assistance levels by developed countries have since 1970 been maintained at **half** that amount, and for the moment there is no indication that they will even come close to the target.

This **is** all part of an **international economic** situation which becomes increasingly critical, affecting mainly the **developing** countries, and places the political and social stability of the poor nations in serious jeopardy.

Possibilities for adopting concrete measures, after serious and constructive consideration of these problems, still exist in spite of the fact that the Paris international conference on the relationship between disarmament and development

(Mr. Icaza **Gallard**, Nicaragua)

was not held in July 1986 as scheduled. It should be convened in 1987 and not be further postponed.

The present international situation is marked by an alarming trend in favour of the use of force in international relations. Progress in disarmament is impossible in such a climate. Conflict situations must be resolved exclusively by peaceful means and non-resort to the threat or use of force must become a basic norm in International relations. As **recognized** in the Ixtapa Declaration to which I referred at the beginning of my **statement**:

"In recent times respect for international law has unfortunately reached one of its lowest points. The **rights** of the weakest nations are flouted with impunity. Treaties are violated at the whim of countries, particularly the strongest."

The principle of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, **recognized** today by the **International** Court of Justice as part of international customary law, must **be** respected, as also the right of all countries freely to choose the political, economic and social **system** most in keeping with the interests of their peoples. The principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes must also be respected. Lastly, we need to **respect** the Charter of the **United** Nations and to strengthen the mechanisms of the **Organization**, in particular the Security Council, and to eliminate abuses of the right of veto, so that the Council may play **its** primary role of monitoring and keeping international peace and security. Initiatives aimed at strengthening international security will therefore receive the enthusiastic support of our delegation.

Mr. SAMUDIO (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish) : Permit me first to express the **sorrow** of the people and **Government** of Panama over the irreparable **loss** of the leader of the **Mozambican people**, President **Samora Machel**. The death of that illustrious African leader **is a loss** not only for his **own nation** but for all peoples **who, like those of Mozambique,, love freedom and peace.**

Today, when we are celebrating United Nations Day throughout the wrld, we **consider** it appropriate to mention **those leader8** who gave their lives for peace and those who continue along the path **which** thone **illustrious** leaders first **trod**.

At the opening of the general debate in this **Committee** you, **Mr. Chairman**, said in describing the **task** ahead of the **First Committee** that:

"... the **world is** confronted with extremely difficult problems, including, first of all, the **problem** of averting the danger of nuclear war. preventing an **arms race** in Outer space and ending the **arms race** on earth". (A/C.1/41/PV.3, p. 2)

We are therefore **faced** with an important task, the success of which can only lead to an affirmation of the **supreme willingness** of tha vast majority of **the** human race for its survival and of the wisdom of their leaders, especially the leaders of the nuclear Powers who should give a positive response to mankind crying **out** with one voice for **the** elimination **once** and for all of the danger of a nuclear holocaust.

Questions relating **to** international security and disarmament have since the foundation of the United Nations led **to** many efforts and **initiatives**. While, as **has** already been stated, the attention that the drafters of the Charter attached to the role of disarmament in attaining the objectives of the **Organization** seems to have been limited in **scope**, it **is** also true that the final overriding goal **embodied** in that instrument was that of "saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war". That **transcendental** purpose **continues** to be as valid today as it **was**

(Mr. Sanudio, Panama)

41 years ago. We were pleased to note that the world leaders who gathered here at the opening of the general debate at this forty-first session of the **General Assembly** renewed their commitment to the principles and purposes of the **Charter**. Their statements and their **commitments towards** the international community **must** be reflected in the adoption of practical measures to halt and reverse the **arms race** and to begin a determined **move** towards general and complete disarmament.

We are shocked to **see** however, that in contradiction with those statements the international situation is deteriorating more rapidly because **of** the rivalry between the major Powers and a reactivation of their policies based on **spheres** of influence, **which** may well extend to all areas of the world. The planet becomes more insecure and unstable and the risk of a nuclear holocaust increases, but not satisfied with that, they try to justify the extension of their rivalry into outer space.

My delegation shares the view expressed by **many** delegations in the general debate that the **arms race**, in all **its** aspects, **is** at variance with efforts to build a stable and **secure** international **environment**, **just as** international tension, and a lack of frank and constructive dialogue between the nuclear-weapon **States** increase the danger **of** nuclear war.

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

My delegation is alarmed at the fact that, while large numbers of the people of the world are living in **extreme** poverty, the vertiginous **increase** in the economic, technical and human resources squandered on military activities **continues**. According to the 1986 yearbook of the Stockholm International Peace Research **Institute (SIPRI)**, during the first five years of this decade the world military expenditure grew by over **3** per cent, thus exceeding the expenditure for the last five years of the previous decade.

According to the same source, the countries that are members of the two major military alliances account for 75 per cent of the total world military expenditure. Therefore, those countries, particularly the two Powers that head those alliances, bear the main responsibility to reverse that trend through halting the arms race, putting confidence-building measures into effect and concluding agreements on the limitation and gradual reduction of armed forces ~~and~~ armaments, nuclear as well as conventional.

My delegation again expresses its firm support for actions and initiatives to reverse these trends and facilitate the reaching of bilateral and multilateral disarmament agreements, in the context of a process of general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

For that reason, last year we welcomed the agreement reached in Geneva on 8 January 1985 between the Government of the United States and the **Government** of the Soviet Union to start negotiations on various questions relating to space and nuclear weapons, strategic as well as intermediate-range and to find interrelated solutions to all these questions. We were also pleased to note **that** the purpose of those negotiations was to prepare effective agreements to prevent an arms race in space and to halt it on earth, and that their final aim was the complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere. **But** we must note with concern that our hopes for rapid and effective agreements remain unfulfilled.

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

The recent meeting at Reykjavik between President Reagan and General-Secretary Gorbachev - which is still being carefully analysed - demonstrated once again that mistrust between the Powers can hamper the concrete possibility of reaching specific arms reduction agreements - because of the fear, justified or unjustified, of possible future violations of such agreements.

We are, however, encouraged by the continued efforts to bring the diverging positions of the two countries closer together and by the fact that leading figures of the two Governments have expressed their commitment to maintaining the agreements in principle reached at Reykjavik.

My delegation believes that the fact that bilateral negotiations are held by the two Powers does not make it any less urgent to pursue multilateral disarmament efforts. In that connection, we firmly support all initiatives to strengthen the role of the United Nations system in the sphere of disarmament, in particular by improving the functioning of the Disarmament Commission, by recognizing the role of the Conference on Disarmament as a negotiating body, and by making the work of the First Committee more effective. In that connection, my delegation shares the view that while the main responsibility for preventing war, in particular nuclear war, and for halting the arms race must be shouldered by the nuclear-weapon States, it is no less true that the security interests of all the peoples of the world are involved in that process, and those interests must therefore be taken duly into account.

My country repeats its conviction that the final goal set by the international community continues to be general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control; that is set forth in the Final Document agreed upon at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

(Mr. J. Samudio, Panama)

Until that goal is attained, the immediate purpose of our work on disarmament and international security must be to guarantee the survival of mankind and eliminate the danger of war, especially nuclear war, to ensure that war ceases to be used as a means of settling disputes, and to rule out the use or the threat of the use of force in international relations. Very little progress has been made within the United Nations system towards the fulfilment of those goals.

The Disarmament Commission, as we see from its report hardly moved forward on its agenda items; indeed we can say that. - except for the "Draft guidelines on appropriate types of confidence-building measures and for their implementation" at the international or regional levels - no progress was made this year.

We have heard a similar assessment from authoritative participants in the Conference on Disarmament, which continue to make only minimal progress in its work, despite many appeals by the General Assembly.

In my delegation's view, we must without further delay engage in consultations and constructive deliberations on the situation obtaining in the Disarmament Commission. It must be given a clear and specific mandate that will enable it to do all the work it was established to do.

With regard to the Conference on Disarmament, we once again appeal to its member States, in particular the nuclear Powers and the militarily significant States, to show the wisdom to recognize the seriousness of the situation confronting the world today and to demonstrate the necessary flexibility and political will to begin promptly negotiations on the whole range of questions assigned to it.

The halting of all activities related to the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons is an extremely urgent measure that would promote a rapid start of negotiations that could lead to broad agreement on the complete

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. A measure of that kind would be a concrete indication of the political will of the nuclear Powers to halt the modernization of their nuclear arsenals and to begin a process of reduction and balanced and verifiable disarmament that would culminate in general and complete disarmament.

We enthusiastically support the initiative of the six Heads of State or Government of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and the United Republic of Tanzania designed to make a valuable contribution to the reaching of agreements among the nuclear-weapon States, and we firmly adhere to the "Mexico Declaration" issued on 7 August 1986 as well as the proposals contained in the "Document on verification measures" adopted on that occasion.

Panama regrets that, despite significant progress in the preparation of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, the Conference could not be held this year as scheduled; that certainly was contrary to the wishes of an overwhelming majority of Member States. My delegation hopes that the First Committee will give due consideration to this unusual situation regarding the holding of the Conference and will adopt firm measures to ensure that the Conference will be held in 1997, in conformity with the recommendation of the Preparatory Committee.

The establishment of zones of peace and co-operation is another initiative that deserves careful consideration by the Committee. My country, a member of the Ad hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, follows that Committee's work with particular interest, and is fully aware of the difficulties connected with the establishment of such zones. Nevertheless, we believe that impetus will be given to the efforts to prepare for the United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean if more flexible positions are adopted by the Powers that have interests in that region.

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

Panama, a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, bases its foreign policy in the sphere of international security and disarmament on the purposes and principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter and on the fundamental principles contained in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. It is part of my country's tradition to attach importance to the observance of the principle of refraining from the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of any State, as well as the principles of the inviolability of international borders and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

The international conduct of my country is consistent with this position. Together with other countries of the region, we are joining in the peace-making effort now widely known as the Contadora process, and we shall continue to pursue such efforts with all our might, overcoming whatever pressures may be brought to bear.

We have joined in both international and regional efforts to strengthen international security, promote confidence and encourage the process of disarmament.

In the regional context, we share with other countries in the region positions of principle concerning the serious situation which threatens us with a conflict of unforeseeable consequences. As the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Contadora Group and its Support Group stated in the Declaration entitled, "Peace Is Still Possible in Central America", issued in New York on 1 October this year:

"The crisis in Central America is increasingly serious, and the risk of war greater. Those who believe in a military solution are ignorant of the true nature of the problem. We wish to give a warning as to what is at stake: the extension of the conflict, the sharpening of confrontation, and war."

We have followed closely the keen interest expressed by the leaders of the main world Powers in holding talks on various regional conflicts. My country hopes that in defining their conduct with regard to the Central American case, those Powers will bear in mind both the specific situations which lead to the problems in the region, and the recommendations of Contadora and, in particular, the permanent basis for peace in Central America established in the Caraballeda message.

My country, which has no ambitions in the military or strategic fields, which has long been traditionally peace-loving, and has welcomed in its midst a population of something over 2 million people from all parts of the globe, wishes only to go on living in peace, to have it recognized that its geographical position

(Mr. Samudlo, Panama)

● hould be regarded as a peaceful line of communication for the use of all nations of the world.

In the Treaty Concerning the Permanent Neutrality and Operation of the Panama Canal, signed on 7 September 1977 with the United States, Panama, as the sovereign State over whose territory the Canal is built, in article II declares the neutrality of the Canal:

"... in order that both in time of peace and in time of war it shall remain secure and open to peaceful transit by the vessels of all nations on terms of entire equality, so that there will be no discrimination against any nation or its citizens or subjects, concerning the conditions or charges of transit, or for any other reason, so that the Canal, and there are the Isthmus of Panama shall not be the target of reprisals in any armed conflict between other nations of the world".

This system of neutrality, which is the foundation stone of the universal and peaceful nature of this inter-ocean waterway can, of course, only be completed by the co-operation and commitment in observing it of neighbouring countries, the main users of the Canal, the major military Powers, and all the countries of the world.

Thus, my delegation is grateful to these countries which have acceded to the Protocol to Treaty Concerning the Permanent Neutrality and Operation of the Panama Canal for their valuable support, and invites all members of the international community to join in our efforts to ensure the effective neutrality of this inter-ocean waterway and to make the Panama Canal a real instrument for serving peace and the development of world trade.

My delegation wishes to state emphatically that the temporary presence of military forces in the area adjacent to the Canal are there, as stated in article IV of the Treaty for the sole purpose of protecting and defending the Canals

"... to meet the danger resulting from an armed attack or other actions which threaten the security of the Panama Canal or of ships transiting it".

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

Therefore, any activity going beyond what was specifically agreed upon **must** be considered **as** a violation of the letter and spirit of the Treaty and **as** an illegal act **outside international law**.

It is now **commonplace** to hear the **leaders** of **different** countries and of **all persuasions** declare publicly that a nuclear **war** cannot be won and **must never be** fought. This **Committee** has an inescapable duty **to safeguard present** and future generation **against** any repetition of the holocaust of **Hiroshima** and **Nagasaki**.

MR. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): The **purpose** of my **statement** is to refer again to Article 26 of the Charter, which **specifically** provides that the Security Council **shall** deal with disarmament. It **uses** the word "**shall**". When the Charter **deals** about the General Assembly dealing with **disarmament**, it **says "may"**. It is mandatory **for** the Security Council **to** deal with disarmament.

Therefore, **resolution 40/151 A** was adopted overwhelmingly, calling on the **Security Council** to conform with the provisions of the Charter and deal with the **question** of disarmament, which it **has** never dealt with. A year **has passed** and **nothing has** happened, and therefore I wish to raise the question again **this** year. Article 26 remains there, and it **is very** important **that** it **should** be **complied** with.

The **Resolution requested** the Secretary-General to report on **this** matter to the **General Assembly**. I hope that the Secretary-General **has** made OK will make the **requested** report to the General Assembly with regard to the question of the Security Council becoming involved with the matter of disarmament. There are many **reasons** why it is very important that the Security Council should do **this**. If the General Assembly **adopts** a resolution on **disarmament** without unanimity - with **even** a single **negative** vote - it can **be** said that there was no consensus. But if the Security Council votes to act in accordance with the **Charter's requirements** regarding **disarmament**, a permanent member which is in **disagreement** can veto the **proposal**. A Security Council resolution on disarmament, which can be vetoed, **is**

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

thus a very different matter from a General Assembly resolution, which must be a consensus matter.

That is the problem raised in the resolution I proposed. I hope that the Secretary-General has made or will make a report that will strengthen the position that the Security Council must deal with disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

May I remind Members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, the number of interventions in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation at a given meeting should be limited to two per item. The first intervention in the exercise of the right of reply should be limited to 10 minutes and the second intervention should be limited to 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON (Fiji): That the representative of France chose to interpret my statement yesterday on French nuclear testing in the Pacific as a personal challenge is most regrettable. The statement of my delegation was in no way personally directed and I should like to make that quite clear. My delegation was merely responding to certain points which the French representative had made in his statement on 17 October.

The representative of France also stated that no one would be permitted to dictate to France, especially where its security interests were concerned. My delegation certainly would not want to give the impression of wanting to dictate to anyone, in the same way, as we assume that France does not try to dictate to us on what views we should hold on our own security and safety interests.

Finally, my delegation welcomes France's willingness to discuss the South Pacific nuclear-free-zone treaty. We hope that it will join other nuclear-weapon States and sign the protocols to the treaty.

Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to reply to charges made by the Zionist representative in this Committee and to recall that all the available information makes it clear that there is an organic link between the racist régimes in Pretoria and Tel Aviv. This link embraces all areas of co-operation - economic, political, military, information, and in particular in the nuclear field. Information is also available in documents published by the United Nations confirming the existence of that co-operation, which is aimed specifically against the Arab nation and the Arab peoples. The charges of the Zionist representative yesterday were designed to cover up that co-operation between the racist régimes. In the Fourth Committee, reference was made in a paragraph of a draft resolution to co-operation between the Zionist régime and the South African régime. With respect to that draft resolution, which was presented by the African Group, the representative of Israel requested a separate vote on that particular

(Mr. Mahmoud, Irao)

paragraph. If there were no such co-operation between the two racist entities, I wonder why the countries of the world would mention Israel by name and condemn its co-operation with the South African régime?

In due course, my delegation will speak on the subject of the nuclear capacity of the South African régime and its collaboration with the Zionist entity in that field. I should like to state here that the position of Iraa is one of principle - namely, a total embargo on the South African régime - and no charges will serve the purposes of the Zionist régime.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform members of the Committee that on Tuesday, 28 October 1986, at 10.30 a.m., the First Committee will hold a special meeting in observance of Disarmament Week. I should also like to inform members that on that same day the meeting of the United Nations Pledging Conference for the World Disarmament Campaign will be convened at 3 p.m. in this conference room.

The following delegations are inscribed on the list of speakers for Monday morning's meeting: Peru, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Bulgaria, Afghanistan, the German Democratic Republic and Romania.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.