



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 39th 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]
- Conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests [47]

/...

* 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.40
23 November 1976

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

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 10.50 a.m.

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

The CHAIRMAN: As I indicated at our meeting on Friday, we shall start discussing draft resolutions this morning.

Mr. NEAGU (Romania): In this my statement of today, I should like to make a few comments on the question of the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques which is the subject of draft resolutions tabled before this Committee.

At the very outset I would like to recall that Romania has welcomed and supported the idea of prohibiting the use of environmental modification techniques for military or any other hostile purposes, because it is our firm belief that no effort should be spared to adopt concrete measures to curb the arms race and to prevent the development of any type of weapons of mass destruction. The position of my country on the substance is well known. It was stated in detail at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), where the Romanian delegation took an active and constructive part in the negotiations, and the CCD report before us recorded this activity of my country.

I wish to stress that the CCD Member States and the eminent experts who participated in the informal meetings on this subject have worked hard, with seriousness and devotion, mindful of the importance of excluding the dangers of environmental warfare. It should be emphasized that the work done in the CCD was not in vain. On the basis of the texts submitted by the authors of the draft convention, USSR and USA, to whom my delegation expresses its gratitude and sincere thanks, an important progress was achieved in bringing closer the various views expressed. We should duly take into account the specific circumstance that the draft convention relates to a complex and new field, insufficiently explored and in which knowledge is not widely available. In fact, only a limited number of countries could, at this stage, engage in environmental modification activities.

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

Having said that, we should recall here that, as General Assembly resolution 1722 (XVI) recognized, all States, no matter their size, stage of development or the type of weapons they possess, have a deep interest in all disarmament negotiations. This implies, in conformity with the new trend in international relations, that all States have the right to bring their contribution to the solutions of disarmament problems. It is already widely recognized in this hall that draft disarmament agreements submitted to the General Assembly for endorsement should be the result of an intense process of real negotiations, with the participation of, and duly taking into account, the views and interest of all States, so that such agreement may obtain the widest possible adherence. In essence, this is the mechanism of consensus rule.

I would repeat once more what my country considers a postulate in the field of disarmament: the ultimate goal of disarmament negotiations should be general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control and, above all, nuclear disarmament. To this end, it is necessary that all States should have the opportunity to express their views; they should participate actively, on the basis of full equality, in all phases of negotiations and on the drafting of the treaty, so that it may embody the will of all peoples and give expression to their fundamental interests.

In light of this position of principle, which is shared by the overwhelming majority, I feel duty bound to state that the draft convention before us does not fully comply with the above-mentioned requirements. The main concerns expressed by Romania and a number of other States were not taken into account. I have in view, first of all, the requirement to make the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques a comprehensive one. This grave deficiency of the draft convention prevented my delegation and - as it is well known - the delegations of other States to give their consent for the existing text. In other words, as it was correctly pointed out by the distinguished secretary for Foreign Affairs of Mexico, His Excellency Mr. Alfonso Garcia Robles, "The delegations participating in the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament failed this year to agree on the text of the convention".

(A/C.1/31/PV.20, p. 57)

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

I want to draw the attention of the Committee on this aspect, because attempts were made to accredit the idea that, although strong objections were made in CCD against the convention, the draft may be considered agreed upon in CCD. The acceptance of this idea by the Committee would create a dangerous precedent, in conflict with the very foundation of the work in CCD - namely that decisions are taken by consensus. The complexity of the problem, the short time devoted by the CCD to the negotiations of this draft convention, its limited scope, are among the factors explaining why this Committee is not unanimous in welcoming without reservations the draft convention. Consequently, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.1, cannot be supported by a number of delegations, including my own. At the same time, we understand the motives behind the unwillingness of some countries to send back the draft convention to the CCD, as understandably suggested by the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/31/L.4. It is our firm conviction that negotiations should continue to achieve a comprehensive ban of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification technique. To this end we appreciate that the inclusion of a relevant provision which clearly expresses the will of the parties to continue, in good faith, negotiations aimed at achieving this objective, could be more than beneficial. In our informal consultations with a large number of delegations we have tried our best to promote this spirit.

We understand that all the parties involved wish to arrive at a generally acceptable solution. For this reason, we would appeal not to press the two draft resolutions before us now to a vote, and instead to continue, in good faith, with the sincere desire to accommodate all interests, the search for a viable solution acceptable to all of us. For our part, we will do our best, as we have done so far, to contribute to the attainment of this solution.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Indonesia, Vice-Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, to introduce the report of that Committee (A/31/29 and Corr.1) and the draft resolution contained therein relating to item 39 of the agenda concerning the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

Mr. JOEWONO (Indonesia): Since Ambassador Amerasinghe of Sri Lanka, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, has been elected to the important position of the President of the General Assembly at the present session, I am given the honour to address the First Committee in my capacity as acting Chairman of the Committee in order to introduce the Committee report (A/31/29).

Before dwelling on the content of the report, allow me to touch briefly upon the developments which have taken place in connexion with the consideration of the important question of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

Since the Indian Ocean was declared a zone of peace by General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) following a timely initiative by Prime Minister Bandaranaike of Sri Lanka in 1971, understanding and support for the objective of the Declaration have prevailed and increased in parallel with efforts for maintaining regional peace and security in the Indian Ocean among its littoral and hinterland States.

This development is reflected in the voting on the past five resolutions on the Indian Ocean from the twenty-sixth to the thirtieth sessions of the General Assembly. The number of supporting votes has increased from 61 for the first resolution 2832 (XXVI) in 1971 to 106 for the fifth resolution 3468 (XXX) in 1975, while the number of abstentions has decreased from 55 to 25. No single vote has been cast against any of these resolutions.

By resolution 3259 (XXIX), in 1974, the General Assembly requested the littoral and hinterland States to enter into consultations with a view to convening an Indian Ocean conference. The following year by resolution 3468 (XXX), the Assembly noted that, as a result of these consultations, an agreement in principle on the convening of such a conference had emerged among the regional States and requested them to continue their consultations with particular attention to the following six points: purposes of such a conference, date, venue, agenda, participation and level of participation. Therefore, in 1976, the Ad Hoc Committee continued its work and consultations and adopted the report which is now before the Committee.

As indicated in the report, the Ad Hoc Committee held two sessions of meetings in May and September this year and a number of informal meetings. The littoral and hinterland States continued informal consultations on the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean at a meeting on 11 May 1976.

(Mr. Joewono, Indonesia)

To facilitate such consultations, the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee requested, in a letter dated 10 February 1976, the littoral and hinterland States to communicate their views on the six points listed in paragraph 3 of resolution 3468 (XXX).

The Ad Hoc Committee considered views communicated in response to the letter together with those already expressed in previous years. They are found in the current report of the Ad Hoc Committee, in Part II.

In parallel with those consultations in the Ad Hoc Committee and among regional States, the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee addressed a letter dated 19 May 1976 to the great Powers and major maritime users of the Indian Ocean, except China and Japan which have been members of the Ad Hoc Committee, inviting them to participate in the consultations of the littoral and hinterland States. The replies to the letter indicated that a large number of great Powers and major maritime States still found it difficult to participate in such consultations on the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean. These replies are referred to in Part II of the report. However, during the general debate in the plenary some encouraging movement has been discerned.

In the final stage of its 1976 session, the Ad Hoc Committee considered the possibility of reaching agreement on a draft resolution to be recommended to the First Committee for its adoption. It is my pleasure to inform the First Committee that agreement was reached on a draft resolution which is contained in Part IV of the report.

In its preamble, the General Assembly would, inter alia, note the resolution adopted at the Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at Colombo; express concern over an escalation of the military presence of the great Powers in the Indian Ocean; and regret the lack of co-operation by certain great Powers and major maritime States. By the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would take note of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee; request the Ad Hoc Committee and the littoral and hinterland States to continue their consultations for the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean; renew its invitation to all States, in particular the great Powers and major maritime users, to co-operate with the Ad Hoc Committee; request the Ad Hoc Committee to continue its work; and request the Secretary-General to continue to render all necessary assistance to the Ad Hoc Committee.

(Mr. Joewono, Indonesia)

It is the earnest hope of the Ad Hoc Committee that this draft resolution will be found acceptable to the members of the First Committee and that a broad measure of consensus will be achieved in the matter.

Before concluding I would like to draw the attention of the distinguished members of the Committee to the Corrigendum issued to the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee, and in particular to item number two, which reflects the decision of the Committee to the effect that paragraphs 8 to 15 of the report should be indented. I should like, however, notwithstanding the circulation of the corrigendum, to express on behalf of the Committee its dissatisfaction that the format of the report as first issued is not in accordance with its decision.

Mr. SENANAYAKE (Sri Lanka): After listening to the comprehensive introductory statement by the Acting Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, Mr. Djoko Joewono of Indonesia, my delegation doubts whether there is anything that needs to be added to what has already been stated by the distinguished Acting Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee. However, since this item was first raised at the United Nations by the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka Mrs. Sivimavo Bandaranaike during the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, I seek your indulgence to intervene for the second time in the discussion in this Committee on the current debate on agenda items 34 to 50. I would, however, wish to assure you, Sir, that my intervention will be brief and will relate specifically to the resolution which the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean has unanimously recommended for adoption and which is contained in part IV of its report (document A/31/29).

In my statement to this Committee on 9 November, in the course of the general debate, I stated that one of the main concerns of the Ad Hoc Committee during the past two years has been the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean for which agreement in principle has emerged among the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean area. At the same time, I have been constrained to express the dissatisfaction of my delegation with the progress, or rather lack of it, that has been made either in the Ad Hoc Committee itself or in the larger Group of littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean area in advancing our work in this matter.

This is not to imply that nothing has so far been accomplished in this direction. I believe that there is general agreement that the ultimate aim of the Conference should be the adoption of an international convention which would give legal effect to the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. Further, there has been some discussion, as the Ad Hoc Committee's report would indicate, on the practical aspects of holding such a conference, such as venue, level of participation, etc. However, between the end result of the conference, on which I believe no serious disagreement exists, and the discussions on the practical aspects of holding it on which I feel agreement could be reached without much difficulty, there is a vast area of uncharted territory. It is, therefore, necessary that consultations should continue both in the Ad Hoc Committee as well as in the larger Group of littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean area

(Mr. Senanayake, Sri Lanka)

on such matters as the agenda for the conference, etc. To enable the Ad Hoc Committee and the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean to continue their consultations, my delegation would urge the adoption of the resolution unanimously recommended by the 18 members of the Ad Hoc Committee which, inter alia, "Requests the Ad Hoc Committee and the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean to continue their consultations with a view to formulating a programme of action leading to the convening of a Conference on the Indian Ocean". (A/31/29, p. 5)

At the same time, my delegation feels that such consultations would be of little or no effect unless the great Powers and major maritime users of the Indian Ocean co-operate with the Ad Hoc Committee. My delegation notes with regret that, but for some notable exceptions -- and here I would particularly like to express the appreciation of my delegation to China and Japan, who have actively participated in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee since its inception -- such co-operation has so far not been forthcoming. My delegation, therefore, appeals to those great Powers and major maritime users of the Indian Ocean who have so far not done so, to respond in a positive manner to the invitation contained in operative paragraph 4 of the draft declaration "to co-operate in a practical manner with the Ad Hoc Committee in the despatch of its functions".

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the next speaker I should like to inform the Committee that Ghana and Ireland have become co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.13 and Corr.1.

Mr. WYZNER (Poland): Over a fortnight ago, in a general statement concerning, inter alia, the elimination of chemical weapons, I informed the Committee that the Polish delegation, whose traditional interest in this particular field of disarmament is well known to my colleagues, had begun consultations with a number of interested delegations with a view to working out an appropriate draft resolution.

The text before you (document A/C.1/31/L.13 and Corr.1) has been elaborated precisely as a result of those consultations and the joint efforts made, which were facilitated by the spirit of mutual confidence and common purpose which prevailed.

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

That is why it gives me particular pleasure to introduce the draft resolution to the Committee on behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Sweden, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia, and Poland. I am very happy to welcome also among the sponsors the delegations of Ghana and Ireland, a fact which was brought to our attention a few moments ago.

Many speakers who have addressed the First Committee in the course of the general debate on disarmament have stressed the necessity for the complete prohibition and total elimination of all chemical weapons. There is certainly no need to go further into details of those remarkable arguments or to add to the highly accurate picture of the present state of negotiations which has emerged from our deliberations. May I, however, point to some new elements, which make the complete prohibition of all chemical weapons even more imperative and certainly one of the most urgent among the priority items on the agenda of the Geneva Disarmament Committee.

To begin with, there is a wealth of specialist technical information provided during the unofficial sessions of the CCD with the participation of experts, held from 5 to 8 July 1976. It is those efforts, undertaken with the assistance of highly qualified experts, which have led to growing understanding in identifying practical approaches towards the chemical warfare ban, including definition of the agents to be banned.

Secondly, in the search for the ways and means of overcoming the existing difficulties in the elimination of chemical warfare, a number of new ideas were advanced in the numerous working documents, proposals and suggestions, as well as in a new complete draft convention on the subject, which have been submitted to the CCD during its 1976 session. Along with the earlier submitted draft conventions, working documents and proposals, they certainly constitute valuable contributions sufficient for reaching appropriate agreement.

Third, the useful consultations between Soviet and United States experts on a possibility of the conclusion, as a first step, of an international convention on

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

the elimination of the most dangerous, lethal means of chemical warfare, held last summer in Geneva, and the stated intention of the two Powers to continue those consultations in the future, increase in the view of my delegation, the chances of early and meaningful progress on the ban of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

Fourth, the mounting awareness of world public opinion of the disastrous effects of the potential use of chemical weapons, the terrible weapon of mass destruction which resulted from the accidental release of toxic chemical agents, and the extensive and alarming havoc wrought upon unprepared population in certain parts of Europe help create a climate which brooks no further delay in the efforts to ban chemical weapons.

We believe that, as a result of those and other factors, including the progress made in formulating the draft convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, there exist all the conditions necessary to make 1977 the year for the decisive breakthrough in the achievement of our common goal: chemical disarmament.

In addressing myself now to some of the specific provisions of the draft resolution before the Committee, I should like to observe that, in fact, significant parts of the document are identical with, or parallel to, the wording of General Assembly resolution 3465 (XXX), which was adopted by consensus. I will therefore refrain from commenting on those parts of the draft resolution.

The leading and, indeed, the underlying notion of the document which I am privileged to introduce to you is the objective of reaching early agreement on the effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction, a measure which the co-sponsors believe would contribute to general and complete disarmament under effective international control. This objective has been expressed both in the preamble (fifth, sixth and fourteenth paragraphs) and in operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the draft resolution.

The members of the First Committee will note that operative paragraph 3, as corrected in Corrigendum 1 to the English version, contains a request addressed to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) to continue negotiations, taking into account the existing proposals, with a view to reaching such an early agreement, as a matter of high priority. This wording is similar to that adopted by the General Assembly last year. Though a number of co-sponsors, including my own delegation, would have preferred to include in paragraph 3 a wording conveying a greater sense of urgency, we have agreed, as a matter of compromise, to use the existing language so as to enable the resolution to win the widest possible support.

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

We also recognize the validity of the argument that there are already items on the CCD's agenda which, by virtue of earlier General Assembly resolutions, had been accorded the highest priority. We believe that the present formulation of the paragraph in question conveys the sense of urgency which prevails within this Committee with respect to the elimination of chemical weapons, once and for all.

It was only during the last session of the General Assembly, in the wake of the successful conclusion of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and of other significant events of a multilateral and bilateral character, that the interdependence between political détente and progress in the field of disarmament was reflected. We are convinced that also now, as is evident from the disarmament debate just concluded, this assertion is as valid as ever. We therefore say so in the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

I should like now, Mr. Chairman, to review briefly those parts of the document which did not appear in the earlier resolutions on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons adopted by the General Assembly. You will find them mainly in the preambular part.

The seventh paragraph adds a new dramatic element to the search for early agreement banning chemical weapons. It stresses the risk of continued development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons in the absence of such agreement.

The tenth preambular paragraph would have the Assembly note the comments addressed to the problem of chemical weapons as well as relevant documents presented to the current session, some of which -- as we all are aware -- contain fresh and important contributions to the consideration of item 36 of the agenda.

In the eleventh paragraph you will find a well-deserved recognition of intensified efforts made in the CCD which have led to some positive results in identifying practical approaches towards the prohibition of all chemical weapons and their destruction. I mentioned some of those efforts at the outset of my introduction. I shall refrain, therefore, from being repetitive.

Finally, the twelfth and thirteenth preambular paragraphs contain new and important indications of the Assembly's preoccupations which should be borne in mind by the negotiators when working out the text of a future agreement. These formulations seek to emphasize:

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

(a) the importance of developing methods for providing adequate assurance of compliance with effective measures for the prohibition of all chemical weapons, including methods of verifying the destruction of stockpiles of such weapons; and

(b) the view that the envisaged agreement should not impede the utilization of science and technology for the economic development of States.

The latter paragraph, in particular, was inserted in the draft in recognition of the legitimate demands of the developing countries, which insist that bans on military or hostile use of certain techniques or agents should in no case impede their utilization or application for peaceful purposes. An example of such an approach can also be found in article 3 of the draft convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, as well as in some earlier agreements.

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

To conclude this review of some of the provisions of the draft resolution, I should like to draw the Committee's attention to operative paragraph 4. Under this amalgamated paragraph, the General Assembly would invite all States that have not yet done so to accede to the Convention on the Prohibition of Bacteriological /Biological/ and Toxin Weapons and to the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and would call for strict observance by all States of the principles and objectives of those instruments.

The text of the document which I have ventured to present to my distinguished colleagues speaks for itself, for it is -- I believe -- a clear-cut exposé of the resolve of the General Assembly to attain chemical disarmament in the shortest possible time. And if it is so, it is largely due to the valuable contributions from many co-sponsors who in the process of the preparation of the final text have demonstrated their resourcefulness, good will and understanding. For this I should like to express to them all my delegation's deep appreciation. Particular mention, however, is due to my distinguished colleagues, Ambassador Jay of Canada, who was instrumental in negotiating much of the final text, and also to Ambassador Reshetniak of the Ukrainian SSR, who was one of the initiators of the draft resolution. Speaking now on behalf of all the co-sponsors whom I have listed a few moments ago, I have the honour to submit the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/31/L.13 with Corr.1 and commend it warmly for adoption by consensus of the First Committee, at the earliest convenience of the Chair.

Taking into account the looming dangers and indiscriminate effect which that terrible instrument of mass destruction could have upon millions of innocent victims, there can be no other way but to proscribe and eliminate chemical weapons for ever.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Poland for his statement in the course of which he introduced the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.13 and Corr.1 relating to item 36 of the agenda concerning chemical and bacteriological weapons.

Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal): It has been five years now since the General Assembly passed resolution 2832 (XXVI) declaring for all time the Indian Ocean to be a zone of peace. This very important resolution had called for an elimination of all military activities in the Indian Ocean zone conceived in the context of a great Power rivalry. Convinced that the continuing military and naval build-up in the area would endanger peace and tranquillity in the region and also that such action would one day have adverse effect on international peace and security, the initiators of the resolution had hoped to halt this trend by making this Declaration. The implementation of the principles of the Declaration would have eliminated all naval and military bases in the area and would also have for all practical purposes made the area out of bounds for installation of military and naval bases, depots and other related activities. A significant portion of that ocean area would have been off limits for activities conceived in the context of the great Power rivalry. The nations in and around the region could have gone along without having to worry about the increased threat and danger they have to face in the presence of all this military build-up but unfortunately, as with most other resolutions relating in one way or another with the objective of disarmament, this resolution concerning the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace has remained practically unheeded and utterly ineffective.

Proposals for the establishment of such zones of peace are, in the opinion of my delegation, motivated by a genuine desire to maintain peace and security within an area. My delegation has deep admiration for the initiative of Sri Lanka in this respect. Situated as she is in a very central and focal point in the Indian Ocean, it is but natural for her to be concerned about all military activities that take place in areas not very remote from her own shores. Sri Lanka's concern has now become the common concern of many countries in the region as well as the great majority of the Members of this Organization.

Nepal, as one of the hinterland States of the Indian Ocean region, had whole-heartedly supported the Declaration and will continue to extend its fullest support to the objectives it underlined. Likewise the desire of the Asian countries to establish a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in that part of Asia is an indication of the growing realization by more and more countries about the usefulness of establishing such zones of peace. Almost all developing

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

countries are engaged in the pursuit of greater economic development. Peace is a vital and an essential condition for development. Tension and rift do not create the proper atmosphere for development programmes and activities.

My delegation has made some of the preceding observations to emphasize the genuine desire on the part of proponents of such proposals to establish and maintain peace on a lasting and permanent basis. Therefore such proposals should deserve the most careful consideration of the world community.

Now coming back to the main issue before the Committee, I would like to make some remarks on the problems that we face. It is regrettable to note that, in utter disregard of the call for halting increasing military activities in the Indian Ocean, there has been an escalation in the military presence of the great Powers in the area. Except for one member, all the other permanent members of the Security Council have so far refused to co-operate in the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. The attitude of the other major countries is also not very encouraging so far. However, my delegation would like to express its appreciation of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee which has continued as best as it can in its deliberations in spite of non-co-operation from most of the major Powers. The Ad Hoc Committee has thus far done some very useful spadework with regard to the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean with a view to fully implementing the principles of the declaration. My delegation feels that such a conference should be held without much delay in order to discuss the ways and means of promoting the objectives and principles of the declaration. Along with the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, the major Powers as well as the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean should also participate in such a conference. Participation by the major Powers is essential in order to ensure the success of the conference. However, my delegation is of the view that the holding of the conference itself should not be deferred too long. If the major Powers do not show any change of attitude, at least in the initial stages, the conference can proceed even without the participation of all the major Powers or, if they choose, with their presence as observers only. To recapitulate, my delegation favours a conference on the Indian Ocean with the participation of all major Powers and therefore we should

A/C.1/31/PV.40
24-25

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

continue to persuade these Powers to participate in such a conference. If, however, these Powers refuse to be persuaded to participate, the conference should nevertheless be held within a reasonably short period of time, allowing for necessary and adequate preparation.

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

The main purpose of the conference will be to determine and establish practical measures in connexion with the implementation of the principles of the Declaration. To that end, the conference should discuss various questions relating to the over-all objectives of the Declaration; among other issues, questions like the delimitation of zones, definitions of the concept of foreign military bases and the context of great Power rivalry will have to be taken up. An assessment of the military presence of the great Powers in the area will also have to be made. The conference will also have to discuss measures to be taken to create a condition of security in the area. Effective measures to ensure the elimination of all military and naval bases and their deployment will have also to be devised.

My delegation is mentioning only some of the more important tasks the conference will have before it. This is in no way a comprehensive list; any suggestion on proposals intended to strengthen the Declaration would be acceptable to my delegation. We all know what the conference is going to be about; we should not spend much time in deciding about the detailed agenda items, as this could best be left to the Ad Hoc Committee, which could be transformed into a preparatory committee of the conference.

The Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace is one of the very few laudable proposals that have been motivated by a desire for genuine peace on the part of many countries, both within and outside the region. The narrow self-interest of some of the great Powers should not be allowed to prevail upon this desire of a great number of countries. Therefore, we should embark in the pursuit of the implementation and observance of the principles of this Declaration with greater vigour and enthusiasm. We should not give up our efforts in this direction. It is with this belief that my delegation has lent its full and whole-hearted support to the draft resolution contained in document A/31/29, and it is the hope of my delegation that, sooner rather than later, it will dawn upon all the major Powers that what we have been asking for and aiming at is not an outgrowth of uncontrolled enthusiasm, but a sign of genuine and deep concern to preserve peace and tranquillity in the Indian Ocean.

The CHAIRMAN: I have been requested to announce that Chad, Colombia and Ecuador have become sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.13 and Corr.1.

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.