



**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 31st MEETING**

**Chairman: Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire)**

**CONTENTS**

**STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE, AS NECESSARY (continued)**

**Statements were made by:**

Mr. Al-Ketani (Iraq)  
Mr. Tinca (Romania)  
Mr. Nazarkin (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)  
Mr. Comissario (Mozambique)  
Mr. Mansouri (League of Arab States)  
Mr. Adem (Sudan)  
Mr. Zapotocky (Czechoslovakia)  
Mr. Azikiwe (Nigeria)  
Mr. Ramos Bustos (Honduras)  
Mr. Van Schaik (Netherlands)  
Mr. Garcia Robles (Mexico)

\* 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 DC2/340, 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 meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 40 to 69 (continued)

STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE, AS NECESSARY

Mr. Al-KETAL (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic) : I have the honour of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.16, which is sponsored by Jordan and Iraq.

The Conference on Disarmament was established to provide an opportunity for all Member States of the United Nations to contribute effectively and positively to negotiations on disarmament and encourage all endeavours to bring about an atmosphere favourable to positive practical steps towards general and complete disarmament. Obviously, therefore, all countries have a vital interest in the success of that Conference. The rules of procedure of the Conference on Disarmament affirm this fact and refer very clearly to the right of States not members of the Conference but able and willing to contribute to its work to present to it relevant documents and studies. That is why it is stated in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, the first devoted to disarmament, that. "All States have the right to participate in disarmament negotiations" (resolution S-10/2, para. 28). Furthermore, in paragraph 120 of the Final Document, all Member States of the United Nations are urged to participate in an active and effective manner in negotiations on disarmament.

In addition, articles 32 to 36 of the rules of procedure of the Conference on Disarmament adopted by the members of that Conference grant non-member States the right to contribute to the preparatory work of the Conference in connection with important questions.

The Conference on Disarmament deals with issues that are very sensitive and significant, because they are related to the safety and security both of the world in general and of individual countries. Therefore, logic dictates that all the

(Mr. Al-Ketal, Iraq)

resolutions and recommendations of the Conference on Disarmament must relate to substantive matters and should be adopted by all countries, particularly those which have huge arsenals of weapons and the technical and economic ability necessary to continue to develop such weapons and increase the stockpiles and destructive capability of those weapons. The consensus provision in the rules of procedure of the Conference took account of this reality to provide a practical chance of all its substantive recommendations and resolutions being implemented.

The consensus provision in the rules of procedure was not meant to confer a right of veto that could be exercised by a State member of the Conference in order to prevent the participation of other countries in the work of the Conference, as this might make it difficult to find solutions to the major, sensitive issues dealt with by the Conference. The consensus rule was not meant to confer on a member State the right to transform the Conference into a closed club, where a member could defend its own interests or exploit the Conference for propaganda purposes far removed from the ultimate noble goals of the Conference.

With a view to redressing this situation, draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.16 urges States not to abuse the consensus rule so as to prevent States not members from exercising their right to participate in the work of the Conference on Disarmament. That work is of interest to all countries without exception.

The General Assembly, in the preamble to the draft resolution, after taking note of the Secretary-General's report (A/42/552), recalls the General Assembly resolutions on this subject adopted in 1984, 1985 and 1986 and notes that those resolutions have not yet led to these matters being dealt with adequately in the Conference on Disarmament. It is also recalled in the preamble that the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly affirmed that all States have the duty to contribute to the efforts in the field of disarmament.

(Mr. Al-Ketel, Iraq)

Finally, in the preamble, the firm conviction is expressed that all countries have a vital interest in the success of the negotiations on disarmament.

The three operative paragraphs are very clear and need no explanation. They read as follows:

- "1. Reiterates once more the right of all States not members of the Conference on Disarmament to participate in the work of the plenary sessions of the Conference on substantive questions;
- "2. Urges States members of the Conference on Disarmament not to misuse the rules of procedure of the Conference so as to prevent States not members from exercising their right to participate in the work of the Conference;
- "3. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its forty-third session on the progress made in the implementation of the present resolution."

We believe that all countries have a vital interest in the negotiations on disarmament. They also have an interest in making use of the contribution of other countries in this very important and complex area. Therefore, we are fully confident that the draft resolution now before the Committee will gain wide support. We hope also that it will also achieve a consensus and find a positive echo in the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. TINCA (Romania): Today I should like to offer some comments on agenda item 60, entitled "Reduction of military budgets", and introduce draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.56.

It is a truth conceded by practically all - except those that derive the greatest profit from arms production - that the arms race has the most negative effects on international peace and security, on the financial and economic world situation and, in general, on all aspects of social life.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

Considering the state of poverty that exists in many countries, spending a trillion dollars on weapons contrasted almost shamefully with the impressive efforts those countries are making to cope with difficulties brought about by underdevelopment and by what has already become a chronic increase in their external debt and with the clearly expressed determination of peoples to devote their human and material resources to their economic and social development programmes.

Although attempts are made to justify the policy of increasing military budgets by referring to the need for national security and defence, weapons of the nuclear age cannot lead to lasting peace and security; they cannot help to strengthen confidence, which seems to be a panacea for solving international problems; and they cannot in any way contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security.

The seriousness of the problem of military expenditures and the urgency with which we must act to end this waste of resources were highlighted in the debates that took place at the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.

In its Final Document, the Conference states:

“The world can either continue to pursue the arms race with characteristic vigour or move consciously and with deliberate speed towards a more stable and balanced social and economic development within a more sustainable international economic and political order; it cannot do both.”

(A/CONF.130/39, Final Document, para. 4)

With a view to fostering development and international security the Conference emphasized, in the Action Programme which it adopted by consensus, the commitment of the participating States to consider further the adoption of measures to reduce

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

the level and magnitude of military expenditures. In addition to being an approach to disarmament, that would be a means of reallocating additional resources for social and economic development, particularly for the developing countries.

Within the framework of its general position on disarmament problems, and above all on nuclear disarmament, Romania attaches very special importance to the reduction of military budgets. Throughout the years my country's concrete proposals on this subject have been submitted to the United Nations as well as to other bodies and meetings that deal with disarmament issues.

Romania has more than once decided to freeze or reduce its defence expenditures and to allocate the resources released in that way to economic and social development.

Deeply convinced of the importance of initiating a dialogue between countries parties to the Warsaw Treaty and members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) with a view to putting an end to the arms race, building confidence and embarking upon disarmament, my country has stated that the two military blocs should begin negotiations on the reduction of their military expenditures. We have also appealed to the Soviet Union and the United States of America - because those two major Powers are responsible for most of the world's military expenditures - to undertake negotiations with a view to freezing and reducing their military budgets.

Last year Romania once again appealed to the European countries, the United States and Canada to reduce their conventional weapons, troops and military expenditures unilaterally and in order to give that appeal concrete meaning and to demonstrate its desire to proceed from words to deeds my country decided to make a 5 per cent reduction in its arms, armed forces and military expenditures and to consult its people about that reduction by means of a national referendum.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

Attainment of agreement on measures to freeze and reduce military expenditures is certainly not easy. There are difficulties to be overcome and a sustained effort must be made in order to bring the positions of States - in particular the States with the largest military budgets - closer together.

It is precisely with the view to overcoming those difficulties that Romania and Sweden have embarked upon a process of identifying and elaborating principles that should guide the future activities of States with regard to a freeze and a reduction of military expenditures and have begun consideration of a whole series of technical aspects implied in the measures for reducing military budgets.

That process has taken place within the Disarmament Commission in successive groups of experts. The purpose of those efforts has been to create common ground for building confidence and clarifying ideas and concepts - in sum, to facilitate the beginning and development of concrete negotiations on the reduction of military expenditures.

In 1986 the Disarmament Commission reached a very advanced stage in the elaboration of those principles. There is practically general agreement on all the principles except one, on which alternative proposals have been submitted by various States.

Those principles reflect general agreement among States on fundamental questions relating to the reduction of military expenditures. They are contained in the reports of the Disarmament Commission. There is no point in submitting the details here as we have already done so at previous meetings of the Committee. Perhaps we should, however, emphasize that those principles embody the understanding of States that agreements on the reduction of military budgets should facilitate a real reduction in the military forces and armaments of the States parties and should be concluded as soon as possible; that pending the conclusion of

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

those agreements all States, and particularly those that are most heavily armed, should endeavour to reduce their military expenditures; that the reduction of military expenditures should take place gradually, on the basis of verification acceptable to all, so that no State or group of States may achieve an advantage over others and so that the right of all States to undiminished security and sovereignty and to the adoption of necessary measures of self-defence should in no way be impaired.

Last year the General Assembly requested the Disarmament Commission to continue the consideration of the item entitled "Reduction of military budgets" and in that context to conclude in 1987 its work on the outstanding paragraph of the principle. Although the Disarmament Commission made significant progress on some important elements of the outstanding paragraph, it was not possible to achieve a consensus on the formulation of that paragraph.

At the present session of the General Assembly, my delegation, having in mind the recent developments in the area of transparency and comparability which are the subject of the outstanding paragraph, has engaged in consultations with other interested delegations with a view to achieving a consensus formulation of the remaining principle.

For various reasons it appears that such a formulation is not yet possible. Instead, the prevailing view is that we should continue the exercise once more in the Disarmament Commission next year. That is the purpose of the draft resolution I have the pleasure to introduce now, on behalf of the delegations of Bangladesh, Indonesia, Ireland, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Senegal and Sweden. The draft resolution (A/C.1/42/L.56) is basically similar to the resolutions adopted by consensus by the General Assembly in the past.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

In the draft resolution the General Assembly declares again its conviction that it is possible to achieve international agreements on the reduction of military budgets without prejudice to the right of all States to unimpaired security, self-defence and sovereignty.

The Disarmament Commission is requested to continue consideration of the item entitled "Reduction of military budgets" and, in that context, to conclude, at its 1988 substantive session, its work on the last outstanding paragraph of the principles that should govern further actions of States in the field of freezing and reduction of military budgets and to submit its report and recommendations to the General Assembly not later than at its forty-third session.

The General Assembly draws anew the attention of the Member States to the fact that the identification and elaboration of the principles that should govern further actions of States in freezing and reducing military budgets could contribute to harmonizing the views of States and creating confidence among them conducive to achieving international agreements on the reduction of military budgets.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

Al.1 States, in particular the most heavily armed States, are urged to reinforce their preparedness to co-operate constructively in reaching agreements to freeze, reduce or otherwise restrain military expenditures.

It is our hope that the draft resolution which I have just introduced will have the necessary support so that it can be adopted without a vote.

Those were the views my delegation wanted to express on agenda item 60. We cannot conclude without stressing once again my country's special concern regarding the abnormal race in weapons expenditures and its continued interest in the adoption of real - even unilateral - measures with regard to the freezing and reduction of military budgets.

It is our strong conviction that putting an end to the waste of human and material resources in the irrational and historically wrong process of arms production is a sure way of strengthening the security of States and building confidence. Above all, it would be a practical way to alleviate the economic and financial difficulties that all countries, developed and developing alike, face in one way or another.

Mr. NAZARKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We welcome the fact that the First Committee is paying considerable attention to questions related to increasing confidence in the political-military field through openness and glasnost and the dissemination of information to 811 States and the public about the progress made in seeking ways to ensure the security of all people. The Soviet Union believes that openness in the political and military fields will help to remove the sources of suspicion, to create an atmosphere of openness and predictability, and to promote genuine disarmament. It is our belief that openness is attained primarily through concrete actions. We perceive a direct relationship between increasing confidence and greater openness in military activities and military spending.

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

An important factor in confidence-building and a real measure of openness can be found in comparing military doctrines and reaching an international accord on a "defensive strategy" and "military sufficiency", which would stipulate that the structure of a State's armed forces would be sufficient to repel possible aggression but not for engaging in offensive operations.

Today, it is no longer possible to approach the resolution of crucial international problems without the actual involvement of the public. To ensure such involvement, the public must have full and objective information about all aspects of international politics. Providing objective information to the public can undoubtedly be facilitated by the World Disarmament Campaign that is being conducted under the auspices of the United Nations.

An important means of involving the public in dealing with disarmament-related matters is to grant people the right to hold anti-war rallies and demonstrations and to express views freely, publicly, and openly. It is important that such rights should not merely be proclaimed but actually guaranteed and consolidated through legislative acts.

We believe that openness and confidence would be further promoted by an exchange of views on principles, ways and means of attaining this goal. Acting on this belief, the Soviet delegation, together with several other delegations of socialist countries, has submitted draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.42, according to which all member States would be invited to transmit to the Secretary-General their views in this regard.

We regard openness and glasnost as a way of finding a common language for co-operation among nations. Contrary to the very nature of openness are attempts to use it for political gamesmanship and for fomenting political and ideological confrontation. The Soviet Union stands ready for a constructive and business-like exchange of views on all aspects of the problems of openness.

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

Our policy of openness and glasnost in international politics has its roots in the Great October Socialist Revolution, the seventieth anniversary of which we are commemorating this year. The first foreign policy act of the Soviet State was the Decree on Peace, which ushered in a new phase in international relations. It was the first time that the question of renouncing secret diplomacy and involving the broad masses in resolving vital political issues was raised.

Our policy of openness comes from Lenin's concept of peaceful coexistence, which provides for greater confidence and the promotion of co-operation among States. Given the existence of the nuclear and space age, peaceful coexistence has, in point of fact, become absolutely necessary for the survival of all mankind. The April 1985 plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union became a milestone in the evolution of this concept.

Notwithstanding its diversity and heterogeneity, the world in which we live is an integral whole - it is interrelated and interdependent. In this world, the most important and crucial issues cannot be resolved without the participation of all countries and the pooling of efforts. It is precisely this goal that is being served by the United Nations.

We are strongly in favour of increasing the authority of the United Nations and of making thorough and meaningful use of the powers vested in it and its organs by the international community. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries are doing their utmost to ensure that the United Nations, this universal machinery, has full power to make a collective effort to seek a balance of interests of all States and to discharge effectively its peacemaking functions. This was proclaimed, among other things, by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail S. Gorbachev, in his statement of 2 November. We deem it important, in particular, to enhance the effectiveness of the

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

United Nations in the sphere of disarmament. This is the purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.33, which was submitted by Czechoslovakia and the Ukrainian SSR and is fully supported by the Soviet delegation.

The Conference on Disarmament has an important place in the efforts to create a non-nuclear and non-violent world, a world in which participating States of all continents, differing socio-economic systems, members of political-military alliances, non-aligned and neutral countries, nuclear and non-nuclear Powers, can work together on a basis of equality. The Special Document adopted at the Prague Meeting of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of States parties to the Warsaw Treaty sets forth our general thinking about ways and means of increasing the effectiveness of the Conference on Disarmament.

Providing the United Nations with information about what is being done to attain international security at the bilateral level should also contribute to increasing the effectiveness of the role of the United Nations.

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

The Soviet delegation has already reported the outcome of the Soviet-United States meetings in Washington and Moscow. Today, we would like to inform the First Committee of the results of the talks which were held a few days ago during the second visit of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Shevardnadze, to Washington.

The main outcome of the Washington talks was an agreement to hold a summit meeting in the United States starting on 7 December 1987. The summit will encompass the entire range of issues pertaining to relations between the two countries such as arms reductions, human rights and humanitarian questions, the settlement of regional conflicts and problems of bilateral relations. The two sides have agreed that very substantial preparatory work should be undertaken to ensure the maximum effectiveness of the meeting.

The two sides also reached agreement on a plan of action to promote further the Soviet-United States dialogue; they decided to finalize, as soon as possible, an agreement on a treaty completely eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles belonging to the Soviet Union and the United States which would be signed during the summit meeting.

In itself, the conclusion of that agreement will be extremely important, for it will be the first time a whole class of nuclear weapons has been eliminated, the first time a real step has been taken towards the destruction of nuclear arsenals and the possibility of moving in this direction without detriment to anyone has been demonstrated in practice. That is undoubtedly an important success to the credit of the new thinking and the outcome of our readiness to search for mutually acceptable solutions while strictly safeguarding the principle of equal security. The question of this agreement had essentially already been resolved, at Reykjavik during the second Soviet-United States summit meeting.

(Mr. Nazar kin, USSR)

In Washington, both sides agreed that during their meeting in the United States, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the President of the United States would outline an agenda for further contacts between the leaders of the two countries and would deal with the question of preparing instructions for their delegations with respect to a future treaty, a 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive arms in the Soviet Union and the United States and an agreement on compliance with the Treaty on limiting anti-ballistic missile systems and non-withdrawal from it over the agreed period of time.

Thus, what is involved here in essence is laying the foundation for a future agreement on a 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive arms coupled with observance of the anti-ballistic-missile Treaty over an agreed period of time. Moreover, it is our view that that Treaty should be honoured in the form in which it was signed and ratified. There are serious disagreements between us and the United States Administration with regard to the period for non-withdrawal from the Treaty which, as the Committee is aware, is of unlimited duration. As regards obligations of non-withdrawal from the Treaty, however, the American side has mentioned a seven-year period while we maintain the principles of Reykjavik, where it was agreed that there should be a 10-year period of non-withdrawal from the Treaty. This problem will require further discussion and harmonization. What is most important for us is to abide by the anti-ballistic missile Treaty, which represents the foundation for strategic stability accompanied by a 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive arms. This means that systems banned under the Treaty should not be developed.

It has been provided that in the early half of 1988 a summit meeting will be held in the Soviet Union at which the sides will attempt to make progress on all

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR) ..

aspect8 of Soviet-American relations. We believe that during the visit of the President of the United States to Moscow there will be good prospects for the signing of an agreement on a 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive arms.

At this critical time, the world expects more from the third and fourth Soviet-United States summits than merely an official acknowledgement of decisions agreed upon a year ago and more than merely a continuation of the discussion. The growing danger that weapons may be perfected to a point at which they become uncontrollable urges us to waste no time.

That is why the Soviet Union will work unremittingly at these meetings for a palpable breakthrough, for concrete results in reducing strategic offensive armaments and barring weapons from outer space - the key to removing the nuclear threat.

Thus, in a nutshell, our concept and our firm orientation towards peace have found their reflection in actions in our general conduct in the international arena, in the very style underlying foreign policy and diplomatic work which is imbued with a desire for dialogue - an honest and frank dialogue that takes account of mutual concerns and the conclusions of world science, without any attempts to outplay or deceive anyone. We say with confidence that the new political thinking is not merely a declaration or an appeal, but a philosophy of action or, if you like, a philosophy of life. It continues to evolve together with the objective processes of the world, and it is already working.

Mr. COMISSAHIO (Mozambique): On behalf of the Mozambican delegation I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of the First Committee. It is for us a matter of honour and pride to see a representative of Zaire, an African and non-aligned country with which Mozambique maintains strong

(Mr. Comissario, Mozambique)

ties of friendship, co-operation and solidarity, presiding over the work of this Committee. It is our conviction that under your guidance our deliberations will be crowned with success.

I wish to extend our congratulations to the other members of the Bureau. We hope that the accumulated and combined experience of the Bureau will lead us onto the path of better understanding among nations, thus strengthening international peace and stability. We pledge our full support.

May I also express our appreciation for the very able manner in which your predecessor, Ambassador Zachmann of the German Democratic Republic, discharged his responsibilities last year as the Chairman of the First Committee.

The aspirations of mankind that led to the creation of the United Nations have not been fulfilled. That is precisely the reason for its continued existence, until the age when it has lived up to the challenge assigned to it: the maintenance of peace and security in the world.

That is the primary purpose of our Organization, as enshrined in the Charter of San Francisco. It is in this context that we attach great importance to the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. As a consequence, each Member of the Organization has an interest in the negotiations on disarmament, be they multilateral, regional or bilateral, because it is our common future that is at stake. It is well known that the planet we inhabit is saturated with conventional and nuclear weapons that can destroy it several times over.

(Mr. Comissario, Mozambique)

This is why we are in agreement with the generally accepted principle that security should be sought at lower levels of armament and not in the building up of the arms race. In our nuclear era, all States must strive for the attainment of collective security.

All nations, nuclear or non-nuclear, big or small, poor or rich, therefore have the legitimate right to make their best contributions in the disarmament process. Efforts based on political will must be developed by all of us in order to build a world free of nuclear weapons. One of the objectives at which these efforts must be aimed is the elimination of hotbeds of tension in the framework of regional disarmament.

In southern Africa, the nuclear capability of racist South Africa is a major cause of concern, as it can at any time be utilized by the apartheid régime for blackmail and to impose its hegemonist design on neighbouring countries. Moreover, one must not forget that when we speak of racist South Africa we speak of a régime that perpetuates its abhorrent and inhuman policy of apartheid inside South Africa, illegally occupies Namibia and oppresses its people, and wages war against the front-line States by direct aggression and invasion and through the armed bandits who sow death and human suffering and destroy social and economic infrastructures.

For many years now the issue of South Africa's nuclear capability has been brought to the attention of the international community, in particular this Committee. Last year, as in previous years, we adopted by an overwhelming majority of 139 votes in favour, resolution 41/55 B, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa".

It is our conviction that our Committee is duty-bound to pursue these efforts. We should like all countries which oppose apartheid and abhor racism to

(Mr. Comissario, Mozambique)

join us in this year's draft resolution. We should like to see the virtuous declarations against apartheid be matched by practical action. We must, therefore, pull together our efforts so that we can ensure that effective, concrete measures are taken to stop the further development of South Africa's nuclear capability, and that those States which collaborate with South Africa abandon that policy of complicity.

The possession of nuclear-weapon capability by South Africa constitutes a threat to peace and security in Africa and in the world at large. It is a flagrant violation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, adopted in 1964 by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, which considers the African continent and its surrounding areas to be a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Still in our region, it is with deep concern that we follow the situation in the Indian Ocean region. It is now 16 years since the United Nations adopted resolution 2832 (XXVI) declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. The importance of this Declaration has already been amply and exhaustively demonstrated. But, contrary to the letter and spirit of the Declaration, we continue to witness the reinforcement of old foreign military bases, the installation of new ones and the introduction of nuclear weapons in the region.

Mozambique, as a littoral Country, strongly demands the withdrawal and dismantling of those military bases. We also call on all Member States to collaborate with the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean so as to enable it to fulfil its mandate and pave the way for the convening of the International Conference on the Indian Ocean.

Mozambique was one of the 150 countries that participated in the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which was held here in New York from 26 August to 11 September 1987. We consider the outcome of

(Mr. Comissario, Mozambique)

the Conference to be a positive step towards meeting the need to raise the awareness of the international community regarding this relationship.

The Final Document, which was adopted by consensus, rightly stressed that

“The relationship between disarmament and development in part derives from the fact that the continuing global arms race and development compete for the same finite resources at both the national and international levels. The allocation of massive resources for armaments impedes the pursuit of development to its optimal levels.” (A/CONF.130/39, Final Document, para. 10)

While welcoming the outcome of the Conference, we look forward to seeing the translation into action of the common determination reflected in the Final Document and the action programme, especially the conclusion related to ways and means of releasing additional resources through disarmament measures for development purpose, in particular in favour of developing countries.

Speaking of the Conference on Disarmament, the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament issues, we have read its report (A/42/27) very carefully. Our attention was particularly drawn to the section on chemical weapons. We are glad to read in the report and to hear in this Committee that progress is being made towards a treaty banning chemical weapons. Mozambique encourages all States members of the Conference on Disarmament in their endeavours to complete as soon as possible a draft convention on the subject.

We are, however, concerned at the lack of progress on the completion of a draft comprehensive test-ban treaty, to which we attach high priority. We understand that such a convention would have the effect of putting an end to the development of nuclear weapons. Pending the signing of a treaty on this subject, we are in favour of a moratorium on nuclear testing by all nuclear-weapon States, especially the two super-Powers. We think that to this end, the six-nation initiative on peace and disarmament can play a valuable role. We urge the States

(Mr. Comissar 10, Mozambique)

concerned to explore all avenues so that negotiations on this matter may begin on a bilateral level and in a multilateral context within the framework of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament.

During the general debate many delegations have expressed their optimism and emphasized the progress being made in negotiations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Mozambique, as a peace-loving country, shares this optimism and joins other delegations in welcoming the agreement in principle between the two super-Powers on the total elimination of an entire category of nuclear weapons: land-based medium-range and short-range missiles. This is a historic event in the disarmament process. Further, we welcome the summit meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev due to take place in the United States beginning on 7 December 1987.

(Mr. Comissario, Mozambique)

We consider this agreement that is to be signed and the prospect of a 50 per cent reduction in United States and USSR strategic offensive arms an important step forward in the world efforts for general and complete disarmament, Mozambique, a non-aligned and non-nuclear State, strongly encourages this dialogue between the two super-Powers and expresses the hope that it will bear fruit.

As the President of Mozambique, Mr. Chissano, said in his address to the General Assembly at its forty-second session, on 1 October 1987:

"We hope that the commendable efforts made and the flexibility demonstrated by the two parties will continue. We look forward to seeing the redoubling of the political will of all those whose contribution is relevant to the success of this endeavour." (A/42/PV.20 and Corr.1, p. 26)

It is an aspiration of all peoples to have a world free of nuclear weapons, without the threat of a nuclear holocaust. We want the end of the arms race on Earth and its effective prevention in outer space, which should be considered a common heritage of mankind and used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

Against the background of the present positive international relations, we believe that the forthcoming third United Nations special session devoted to disarmament will be able to adopt a comprehensive programme on disarmament, thus making a valuable contribution to the materialization of international peace and security. My delegation looks forward to participating constructively in that conference.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): In accordance with General Assembly resolution 477 (V), of 1 November 1953, I now call on the Deputy Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States.

Mr. MANSOURI (League of Arab States) (interpretation from Arabic): Sit, at the outset I should like to congratulate you on your assumption of the chairmanship of the First Committee. We are sure that the work of the Committee will be successful under your guidance, thanks to your wide experience in the field of disarmament.

The States and peoples of the Arab world, just exactly as all the peoples of the developing and developed countries, look forward to the achievement of concrete and significant progress towards universal and complete disarmament and an end to the arms race. All the peoples of the world are looking forward with cautious optimism to the forthcoming meetings between the leaders of the two super-Powers, and the peoples of the world hope to see an agreement concluded between the two Super-Powers. The peoples of the world look forward to the elimination of two types of nuclear weapons from the super-Power arsenals, namely, short-range and medium-range nuclear missiles. We also believe that concrete progress is required in the area of nuclear-test bans. The special significance of such agreements stems from the fact that they would give strong impetus to the long search for solution;; and the quest for ways and means whereby a wide range of military and political problems may be tackled in such a way as to create a favourable international climate for positive co-operation in many vital areas, especially confidence-building and averting international and regional military conflicts.

There is no doubt that, at the present time, clear and firm principles must be adopted for confidence-building among all nations on the basis of international law and norms and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. Such principles would encourage the creation of a favourable environment for the development of new concepts of collective security that would be based on mutual confidence rather than on military might. Thus it would be possible to avoid confrontation, nuclear

(Mr. Mansouri, League of Arab States)

and otherwise, through the strengthening of the fabric of international co-operation in the interests of survival.

The General Secretariat of the League of Arab States wish to express the hope that the next month's summit meeting in Washington will be a success. We hope that those important negotiations will lead to the elimination of medium-range and short-range nuclear missiles. We hope that agreement in that respect will initiate a process that would lead to the gradual reduction and final elimination of all nuclear weapons.

The General Secretariat of the League of Arab States also wish to express concern at the increasing tendency to extend the arms race to outer space, which we regard as part of the common heritage of all mankind. Hence, it should be used solely for peaceful and scientific purposes and in a manner that would benefit all countries rather than create a grievous loss to all through militarization.

The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which was held in New York a few weeks ago, adopted its Final Document by consensus. It includes a clear action programme, which should be examined in depth by the General Assembly by means of a periodic review of all the aspects of that relationship. It also envisages an appraisal of all the resources that must be channelled for development purposes and the action that should be taken on the international and national levels especially through the promotion of national security, reduction of international tension and the danger of war, the observance of the principles of good-neighbourliness and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

The International Conference demonstrated clearly the validity of the concept of the system of universal peace and security, which has been attracting a great deal of international support. The Conference also emphasized the close link

(Mr. Mansouri, League of Arab States)

between disarmament and development, the interrelationship between the strengthening and promotion of international security and the eradication of hunger and the removal from one planet of all forms of backwardness through social and economic development, the protection of the environment and the achievement of universal disarmament.

(Mr. Mansour i, League  
of Arab States)

It is for the sake of these universal objectives that the League of Arab States, with the full co-operation of its members and in consultation with the other governmental organisations that have observer status in the General Assembly, seek to support disarmament programmes and disarmament fellowships. It is in this spirit that we urge the sponsors of the draft resolution on disarmament fellowships to discuss among themselves the possibility of making those programmes and fellowships accessible to representatives of the aforementioned governmental organizations in order that they may acquire the much-needed expertise that would enable them to enlighten public opinion in their respective regions and gain support for the United Nations and the international community in the drive to achieve the goal of disarmament. The League of Arab States also hopes that the third special session devoted to disarmament will be convened next year and that it will adopt effective measures and formulate appropriate and effective international programmes with the full participation of all States, international and regional organizations and representatives of all the peoples of the world that aspire to the goal of universal disarmament.

At the preceding session of the General Assembly, we referred in this Committee to reliable information that proved Israel's acquisition of nuclear weapons and its continued production and development of such weapons. The Israeli authorities, taking advantage of the fact that Israel's nuclear installations are not under the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), are still pursuing their policy of nuclear blackmail vis-à-vis the countries of the region and adjacent territories. We also called for prompt action to forestall the grave consequences of Israel's introduction of nuclear arms into the Middle East and its refusal to place its nuclear facilities under international safeguards.

(Mr. Manaour 1, League  
of Arab States)

Furthermore, we drew attention to the prevarication and constant equivocation of Israeli officials in this regard. All this, of course, is meant to be a sort of smoke-screen. However, the fact remains that Israel has adamantly refused to commit itself to the non-proliferation system.

The Middle East region was declared a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session. However, this Committee has continued to debate this question session after session and has adopted numerous resolutions, all of which call for concrete action that may lead to the actual declaration of the Middle East as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. In the teeth of all those resolutions and in complete disregard of all those attempts, Israel, as is its wont vis-à-vis this international forum, has continued to obstruct the implementation of every resolution and frustrate every attempt by categorically refusing to abide by international norms and legality and refusing to allow qualitative and quantitative verification of its nuclear-weapon stockpiles. It is evident that such verification is an essential prerequisite of any serious attempt to define the way and means whereby such a denuclearized zone may be declared in the Middle East.

The situation in the Middle East is quite similar to that in southern Africa. The obstacles created by the racist régime to prevent the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa are well known. The Zionist entity has acquired nuclear weapons and is now manufacturing and developing such weapons, while it prevents the Arab States of the Middle East, just as South Africa prevents the countries of southern Africa, from achieving their development goals and their economic and social advancement.

The Zionist leaders have found it expedient to make the Arab States aware of the fact that Tel Aviv does indeed possess nuclear weapons. This imperialist

(Mr. Mansour i, League  
of Arab States)

manifestation of hegemonism should alert any observer to the novel dimension the Zionist entity has introduced into the concept of deterrence. The aim, of course, is not to ensure world peace or maintain peace in the Middle East but to pursue Israeli aggression against the Arab States and the Arab peoples of Palestine and Lebanon - that is, against the entire Arab nation. This is a policy of aggression that Israel has been consistently pursuing for four decades. It is a policy of intimidation based on the imbalance of power in favour of one side. It threatens the security of the Arab States.

While the Arab States continue to honour and carry out the obligations and responsibilities of membership in the United Nations, Israel does nothing of the sort. The Arab States, however, continue to work within the framework of international legality and have always declared their wish to live in peace. This was made abundantly clear by the peaceful Fez initiative adopted by the Arab Summit Conference in 1982 that was an initiative based on international legality. It contained the outline of a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement of the Middle East problem. The Arab countries want peace in the area in order that they may devote their resources to every aspect of social and economic development.

However, the posture of Israel, its continued rejection of the peace initiative and its continued occupation of Arab territory constitute a major obstacle to progress in this direction. Not content with this, Israel seeks to undermine the development of the Arab countries. The most glaring example of that was its armed attack on the nuclear facility devoted to peaceful uses in Iraq.

Not content with the obstruction of every peace initiative and the undermining of development, Israel has introduced nuclear blackmail into the Middle East, and indeed, into the African continent, where it continues its nuclear collaboration

(Mr. Manaour i, League  
of Arab States)

with the racist South African régime. This collaboration poses a serious threat to African States, especially the front-line countries. It is no wonder that the Pretoria régime shares Israel's refusal to sign the non-proliferation Treaty.

Regardless of all this, the League of Arab States, its members, and indeed the entire world look forward to the day when peace, security and stability will prevail everywhere. The peoples of the world attach great importance to the forthcoming meeting between the leaders of the two super-Powers and look forward to the conclusion of agreements which will avert, the danger of nuclear war and spare humanity its dire consequences.

We believe that the principal responsibility for maintaining international peace and security lies with the members of the Security Council, especially its permanent members. The provisions of the Charter make it imperative for those Member States to work in earnest to achieve the noble goals of our Organization, foremost among which is the obligation to avert another world war. This could be achieved by establishing a collective security system in a manner that would ensure stability and economic prosperity for all the peoples of the world.

Mt. ADAM (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic) : In this brief statement I shall comment on agenda items 57, 64 and 69. These items are of especial importance to my delegation and my statement will complement the statement I made to this Committee on 21 October.

Sudan bases its policy on the firm conviction that the arms race in outer space must be averted so that outer space will continue to be free of weapons. Accordingly, we do not join others who believe that the arms race should be organized there and that current preparations should be based on various scientific and political theories. We believe in the simple fact that an increase in the defensive capability of all States and of the superiority of States in that area will naturally give them more confidence, which will lead those States to contemplate the possibility of attack. Furthermore, increasing the defensive capability of States will lead others to develop larger and more capabilities of offence. Thus, the present trend towards establishing defence systems in outer space would contribute to the deterioration of already bad international relations and would jeopardize the possibility of strengthening the climate of trust between the super-Powers - a climate conducive to a cessation of the arms race. In addition, it would lead the world to a new qualitative arms race which would, in turn, lead to an increase in the offensive nuclear capability of the two super-Powers and consequently to an increase in the possibility of nuclear war.

We believe that the establishment of such a defence system in non-nuclear outer space would draw attention away from our basic conviction, which is that we must put an end to the nuclear arms race on Earth because such a race is at a very dangerous stage and threatens the world.

We support the scientific approach of the two super-Powers directed towards

(Mr. Adam, Sudan)

eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles in Europe and their efforts to conclude agreements and broader conventions in order to halt the nuclear arms race and free the world from that possibility.

The outlook would be better if both super-Powers could agree to a global international convention on the cessation of all types of nuclear tests in all environments and if both super-Powers were to adhere more strictly to the provisions of all conventions currently in force on the non-proliferation of all nuclear weapons. Current attempts to give a broader interpretation to the letter and spirit of the anti-ballistic missile Treaty would lead to further progress on offensive weapons in outer space and would curtail the possibility of tests leading to their deployment.

For all the above-mentioned reasons we support the agreement concluded on 15 April 1987 between the super-Powers to co-operate peacefully on matters concerning outer space and we express the hope that any positive results that might ensue from that agreement will prompt them to renounce the militarization of outer space.

Frankly speaking, the militarization of outer space would mean that the world had reached a point of no return in that race. We therefore support multilateral conventions on outer space currently in force and are in favour of bridging the present gaps in the legal system in order to supplement and expand the scope of the present system. Furthermore, we appeal to the Ad Hoc Committee to pursue its work further, to prepare concrete measures to prevent a nuclear arms race in outer space in a general and comprehensive manner. The continuance of the arms race on Earth and in outer space will never give the world the security it desires regardless of the efforts made by statesmen in trying to justify their theories of nuclear deterrence and the balance of forces.

(Mr. Adam, Sudan)

As in the past, Sudan supports the draft resolution entitled "Prevention Of an arms race in outer space" (A/C.1/42/L.43) Submitted on 27 October 1987. We are convinced that the reasons we have given are valid and we hope the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus.

I now turn to agenda item 64 entitled "Third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament". At its first special session devoted to disarmament, the General Assembly adopted a Final Document which has become the main pillar in the consideration of disarmament issues both within and outside the United Nations. At its second special session devoted to disarmament the General Assembly proclaimed the World Disarmament Campaign and also reaffirmed the importance of the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament. It reaffirmed the need to strengthen the role of the United Nations in all areas of disarmament.

We recall very well the difficulties encountered by the Preparatory Committee at its meeting this year because it had decided that its decisions should be taken by consensus. We trust that that will not jeopardize the basic principle at the forthcoming third special session devoted to disarmament and that at that session the General Assembly will attain its noble objective of searching for viable means to implement the obligations contained in the Final Document of the first special Session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

My delegation joins in expressing the view that high priority should be given to nuclear disarmament and to calling attention to the dangers of nuclear war as the central themes of the work of the forthcoming special session. Sudan attaches especial importance to the following issues to be discussed during the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament: maintaining and

(Mr. Adam, Sudan)

strengthening the spirit of the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament and not weakening it) strengthening the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, since the Organization is the only international body responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security;

(Mr. Adam, Sudan)

the need for respecting and accepting the principles of observance and of verification as two essential conditions for the success of all international negotiations on the reduction of conventional and nuclear weapons; the forthcoming special session should examine the results of the first two special sessions in order to assess successes and failures and in order to complete what remains outstanding after those first two sessions; to review the relationship between disarmament and development as an effective means of reducing and slowing down the unbridled arms race in accordance with the last paragraph of the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.

For all the above reasons, we support the draft resolution on the convening of that session, contained in document A/C.1/42/L.6.

With respect to agenda item 69, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", it is our view that the International Conference which was held recently at United Nations Headquarters concluded that it was necessary to improve the international environment at present in order better to ensure progress in the economic and social spheres and to prepare new formulas of the concept of security which are not related to further military build-ups - in other words, to strengthen international co-operation for the good of mankind in economic and social terms, particularly in developing countries.

The third special session devoted to disarmament will deal with this question, but we believe that there is a need to emphasize another matter which is of concern to developing countries, namely, finding an acceptable formula for putting the resources released by disarmament to good use in development programmes, and we think that that session could give serious consideration to the establishment of an appropriate international instrument to distribute those available resources; in other words, the forthcoming special session should decide on that instrument.

(Mr. Adam, Sudan)

Sudan supports the draft resolution in document A/C.1/42/L.74 of 27 October 1987, and we express the hope that it will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. ZAPOTOCKY (Czechoslovakia): As the general debate on disarmament in the First Committee is coming to a close, new highly important events closely linked with our efforts are taking place and shaping the whole international agenda.

Predominant is the further development of the dialogue between the USSR and the United States of America. The joint announcement that the leaders of the two countries will meet at Washington beginning on 7 December of this year and sign a treaty on the total elimination of United States and Soviet intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles is a true milestone on the path to disarmament. The conclusion of that treaty, together with the thorough consideration of a future treaty on 50-per cent reductions in United States and Soviet strategic offensive arms and on the observance of and non-withdrawal from the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems for an agreed period, could become a real basis for the process of nuclear disarmament and the beginning of a new era both for the two nuclear-weapon States and for the world.

These developments should also give a powerful impetus to a further intensification of the constructive and meaningful deliberations on the entire range of disarmament issues now before the First Committee.

An important event directly related to our present work took place last week at Prague, the capital of Czechoslovakia, which hosted the session of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Treaty member States on 28 and 29 October.

The significance of the session was intensified by the fact that it was held at a time when the Soviet-American dialogue entered a new and significant stage, at

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

a time when real perspectives were heralded for the conclusion of a Soviet-American treaty that would eliminate medium-range and operational-tactical missiles. Thus, for the first time in history, the idea of nuclear disarmament has reached the point when its implementation is just about to begin. The participants in the Prague session welcomed the fact that the Moscow meeting between the Soviet Foreign Minister and the United States Secretary of State was useful and productive, that some serious barriers, which had arisen at Geneva, were overcome during that meeting and that the regulations of the treaty also concerning Perching LA missiles were definitively formulated. The Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Treaty countries expressed full support for the conclusion of the Soviet-American treaty on the elimination of medium-range and operational-tactical missiles, for the initiatives concerning the cuts in the number of strategic offensive weapons and for the prevention of an arms race in outer space. In this connection, the States participating in the session supported the new Soviet initiatives aimed at bringing closer together the standpoints of the two parties regarding a 50 per cent reduction in the number of strategic offensive weapons, subject to strict observance of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, with the proviso that neither party shall withdraw from the Treaty for at least 10 years, and during which the proposal was made to declare a moratorium on all activities linked with the production, testing and deployment of medium-range missiles and operational-tactical missiles.

The Ministers underlined that it is extremely important that no action be taken that might complicate the materialization of the present arrangements regarding the Soviet-American talks. In this connection, it is causing serious concern that certain representatives in the West have come forward with appeals

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

that the forthcoming liquidation of United States missiles in Europe be "compensated for" by the creation of new military structures.

As it transpires from the communiqué adopted at the Prague session, the agenda included an all-round and deep consideration of the current situation in the world and an analysis of the urgent tasks of the struggle for peace. As far as the situation in Europe and the world is concerned, the Ministers stated that it is of a complicated and controversial character.

On the one hand, there are hopeful and encouraging prospects, yet the developments justifiably raising apprehension have continued. It is, above all, necessary to stop the continuing arms race if the international climate is to be improved. It is necessary to solve the contradictions through a dialogue, to develop co-operation between countries with different social systems. The session of the Committee of Foreign Ministers came to the conclusion that a radical turn to its improvement is possible and attainable. The session suggested concrete and real ways toward the achievement of this aim.

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

The point is particularly to form a comprehensive system of international peace and security. This is the only real way of securing peace and averting the danger of war in the present-day world, which is so full of risks. It is necessary also to remove the threat represented by nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and to cease the dangerous arms race in other fields.

A comprehensive system of international peace and security must be ensured in the political, military, economic, ecological and humanitarian fields, as only in this way will it become a complex and really effective system. In this respect the Prague session of the committee of Foreign Ministers underlined the significance of human rights and supported the proposal of the Soviet Union for the convening in Moscow of an all-European conference concerning these problems.

It was pointed out that it was important that the issue of establishing through the collective efforts of all United Nations Member States, a system of comprehensive security be considered in a constructive manner at this the forty-second session of the General Assembly. Being of the opinion that such a system should fulfil its function on the basis and within the framework of the United Nations Charter, the Ministers advocated the enhancement of the role of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Secretary-General of the United Nations and expressed the view that all States should give them the greatest possible support, work for the greater effectiveness of the activities of the United Nations and its institutions and strive to enable them to augment their contribution to the solution of international issues. They expressed their hope that the General Assembly would give a new impetus to fruitful international dialogue on those issues and upgrade its content in both value and profundity.

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

It is our firm belief that this year's deliberations in the First Committee on a system of comprehensive security will lead to practical steps towards the gradual implementation of that concept, as well as to the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in all spheres of international security.

Some of the highly topical items on the agenda of the First Committee are related to regional approaches to disarmament and to confidence-building. The Prague session paid special attention to the implementation of such measures in Europe.

The States participating in the session deem it a priority to achieve a substantial reduction of armed forces and armaments in Europe. That is the objective underlying the joint programme charted by them in Budapest in June 1986. In this connection the Ministers emphasized the need to accelerate the formulation of a mandate for future talks within which the security interests of all the parties would be taken into account. The States participating in the session reaffirmed their proposal to hold a meeting of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, at which a decision would be adopted on the opening of far-reaching talks with a view to limiting substantially the armed forces and tactical nuclear and conventional weapons in Europe and reducing military expenditures accordingly, adjusting the differences in levels through adequate limitations and averting the danger of a surprise attack.

It would be of major importance for the strengthening of confidence in Europe if the proposal of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty to hold consultations on military doctrines, which is addressed to the member States of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and which was put forward in Berlin in May 1987, were implemented.

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovak is)

Also, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free and chemical-weapon-free zones in the Balkans, in Central Europe and in the north of Europe would contribute to the amelioration of the situation in the continent and be greatly conducive to freeing the world from those kinds of weapons of mass destruction. In this connection the participants underscored the need to give effect to the respective proposals of the German Democratic Republic and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the Socialist Republic of Romania and the People's Republic of Bulgaria, as well as to implement the plan for arms limitation and the building of confidence in Central Europe put forward by the Polish People's Republic.

The Ministers voiced the opinion that the States situated along the borderline between the two politico-military groupings should adopt concrete measures to reduce the level of military confrontation and strengthen confidence, including reciprocal removal of the most dangerous types of offensive weapons.

They also supported the recent proposal of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for overall radical reduction of the level of military confrontation in the north of Europe and in the Arctic, the transformation of that region into a zone of peace and co-operation, and the holding of talks to that end among the States concerned.

The Warsaw Treaty member States are thus proponents of an indivisible Europe, a Europe of peace and co-operation, of the building of an all-European house in which an atmosphere of good-neighbourly relations and trust, coexistence and mutual understanding would prevail.

Of direct relevance to the work of our Committee are the conclusions of the Prague meeting concerning the issue of the verification of and compliance with arms-control and disarmament agreements. The States participating in the session highlighted the need to work out, at both the national and the international level,

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovak in)

a strict and effective verification system, including on-site inspection. such a system of verification would provide A reliable guarantee of strict compliance with all. disarmament agreements and ensure with cartainty that the obligations ensuing *therefrom* would not be violated in any circumstances. The verification system must cover all aspects of disarmament.,

It was fur thermore stated that the all ied socialist States, standing up for a comprehensive approach to disarmament issues, deemed it extremely important that the third special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament give a positive impetus to all. the ongoing talks on various disarmament problems, that it be conducive to under standing on concrete measures in this sphere, that it be or ien ted towards real progress towards a safe, nuclear-weapon-free world and that it make a contribution to the establishment of a po' t t i c a l atmosphere based on confidence, openness and calculab i l i t y in international affairs.

The Warsaw Treaty member States consider that it is urgent now as never before that al.1 States substantially augment their efforts with a view to taking effective steps in the sphere of disarmament. That objective must be pursued also through the intensification of the work of the respective international forums, especially the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. A special document en t i t l e d "Towards increasing the effectiveness of the Conference on Disarmement in Geneva" was adopted at the Prague session.

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

The States participating in the session propose to devote their efforts at the present stage of the work of the Conference on Disarmament to the solution of the following crucial issues:

First, the completion of the drafting of the Convention on the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. The States members of the Warsaw Treaty consider that there is every prerequisite for its successful completion in the near future and are ready to continue constructive co-operation with their partners in negotiations with a view to overcoming the remaining obstacles so as to make it possible to proceed promptly to the general and complete elimination of chemical weapons and of the industrial basis of their production.

Secondly, the progress towards complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. The States members of the Warsaw Treaty regard the halting of nuclear-weapon tests and their general and complete prohibition as measures of primary importance in the effort to halt the arms race. They suggest setting up a special group of scientists-experts, who would prepare without delay practical proposals for a system of verification of nuclear testing. The drafting of such an agreement within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament and the comprehensive Soviet-American talks on limitation and, ultimately, complete prohibition of nuclear tests will be complementary to each other in the pursuit of a single objective. They are ready to consider in a constructive manner any other proposals and ideas aimed at a speedy solution of this issue.

Thirdly, the States members of the Warsaw Treaty believe that a solid foundation has been built at the Conference on Disarmament for practical and effective work in matters relating to the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The socialist countries have put forward concrete proposals to that end.

The States participants in the Prague session underlined the need to activate the work of the Conference also in the other crucial directions, taking into

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

account the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly which reflect the will of the overwhelming majority of States of the world.

We propose that all aspects of the work of the Conference on Disarmament be considered from all angles at the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament with a view to increasing the effectiveness of the Conference.

In this connection, the following practical measures could be considered and agreed upon.

First, putting the work of the Conference on a more intensive footing by making it work throughout the year with two or three breaks. The auxiliary organs of the Conference, in accordance with its general mandate, should work not on a year-by-year basis, but until their work is completed.

Secondly, providing for a more active involvement of experts and scientific centres existing in various countries in the work on the problems facing the Conference. This might be done in various ways, especially by establishing a consultative council within the Conference.

Thirdly, on the basis of agreement among the parties to the Conference, holding ministerial sessions in times of critical importance, including occasions when difficulties of a substantial nature arise in the course of the deliberations. Sessions attended by ministers would give a positive impetus to the progress of those significant talks.

We consider it useful to enable all countries that are not members of the Conference on Disarmament to contribute to its work. It is our opinion that in the future the Conference might become a permanent universal organ of disarmament negotiations.

The States members of the Warsaw Treaty declare that they are ready to participate in a constructive manner in the consideration and implementation of all

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

concrete proposals aimed at activating the Conference on Disarmament and increasing its effectiveness, regardless of their source.

In conclusion, I should like to underscore our firm belief that the ideas and proposals put forward in Prague by the States members of the Warsaw Treaty correspond to the common desire of all States Members of the United Nations to make genuine progress in the fields of both disarmament and international security and will give yet another fresh impetus to our joint efforts.

Mr. AZIKIWE (Nigeria) : Having spoken earlier in the Committee, my delegation would now like to devote this statement to the question of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under agenda item 56.

This is an item to which the Nigerian Government attaches great importance, not only because of its relevance to the non-nuclear-weapon States, which represent the majority of mankind, but also to the entire international community as a means of enhancing international peace and security. Over the years, this item has been most extensively debated in this Committee, in the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament and in other disarmament forums. Yet for various inexplicable reasons, it has surprisingly not been accorded the priority consideration it deserves. Compared with many other items, this question has, indeed, held great promise for reaching an agreement - if only it had been approached with objectivity and a sense of urgency. This is borne out by the widespread support, in principle, both by the nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States for the conclusion of an international convention on this item. In addition, there is the overwhelming global satisfaction that over two thirds of the States Members of the United Nations have renounced, through international legally-binding instruments, under the non-proliferation Treaty, the nuclear option, which should provide a reciprocal platform for the negative security assurances.

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

**In our opinion, it is only fair that those who have made this supreme sacrifice and have entrusted their security voluntarily to fragile international discipline and the humanism of other States should be given legally-binding assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, pending nuclear disarmament.**

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

My delegation does not want to start enumerating to the Committee the dangers of nuclear weapons, since they are well known. However, the continued retention of nuclear weapons by the nuclear-weapon States and their refusal to provide effective assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of such weapons can only encourage others to believe in the efficacy of nuclear weapons.

Nigeria acknowledges that the unilateral declarations made by the five nuclear-weapon States on this item are useful. However, as we are all aware, those declarations have no legal effect. They lack mandatory power and could be repudiated by any of one of them unilaterally. Above all, unilateral declarations can and should never be accepted as substitutes for legally binding international instruments. If unilateral declarations were sufficient it would not be necessary to negotiate international agreements on any disarmament items.

My delegation is fully aware of the divergent military situations of the non-nuclear-weapon States and the difficulties confronting the Conference on Disarmament in its efforts to find a solution to the question on the basis of a common formula. We believe, however, that if a common formula proves impossible - which seems to be the case - other alternative approaches should be explored.

It is within this context that Nigeria will be proposing a new approach on this question in which non-nuclear-weapon States will be classified into categories in accordance with their peculiar security situations, with agreement; to be negotiated in respect of each of the categories. My delegation will, at the appropriate time, elaborate on this new approach. My delegation is convinced that this new approach, when unveiled, will provide the needed breakthrough for early agreement on this item. Of course, we will have the necessary consultations and will be willing to listen to views and suggestions on ways of making this an ideal proposal acceptable to all.

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

Nigeria feels that all nuclear-weapon States should show greater commitment and understanding on this issue, otherwise the impression will be created that the nuclear-weapon States seek only to perpetuate their present military superiority and deny others the right to political dignity, legitimate freedom and undiminished security. My delegation believes that the nuclear-weapon States have a responsibility to assure non-nuclear-weapon States of their commitment by attending to these legitimate concerns. Unless this is clearly demonstrated, those which have adhered to the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons cannot be expected to feel vindicated, and those which have not accepted the Treaty will be justified in moving even further away from its objectives. The impression that there are two categories of States - one endowed with a sense of responsibility in managing nuclear weapons, while the other cannot be trusted and must be prevented from acquiring nuclear weapons - should be eradicated, as it is indeed demeaning, false and most unacceptable. My delegation hopes that with the new approach to be proposed in due course by Nigeria it will be possible for the nuclear-weapon States to participate actively in the relevant negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament to facilitate the conclusion of the much-needed effective international convention on the issue.

In this connection, let me emphasize that the conclusion of agreements on negative security assurances should not be made conditional upon the implementation of other collateral measures. All other measures should be treated separately and in their own right. Nigeria believes that States which have not renounced the nuclear option in a legally binding international instrument also should be eligible for negative security assurances, despite the questions being raised about the level that some of them have actually reached in developing their nuclear capability.

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

My delegation hopes that, when this matter comes up for consideration in the appropriate forum subsequent negotiations will enable us to overcome the remaining obstacles, to pave the way for an early international convention.

Mr. RAMOS BUJSTOS (Honduras) (interpretation from Spanish) : With regard to agenda item 63, "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly, the delegation of Honduras would like to review activities of the Secretary-General on Sub-item (a) in accordance with the mandate given him in resolution 39/63 F, of 12 December 1984, on regional disarmament. Such activities, which are designed to promote and encourage disarmament in various regions of the world, include a particular effort and approach to expand the framework for the search for specific solutions that will help to maintain and strengthen world peace and security. We also support the efforts of the Disarmament Commission to co-operate in the attainment of that objective.

Despite the urgent and legitimate efforts and the appeals of the international community to reach agreements that will overcome tension and create a climate of confidence and security in the various regions in conflict, the arms race continues to increase to unimaginable levels of terms of both the qualitative improvement and the accumulation of nuclear and conventional weapons. The theatre of confrontation has expanded and there is a state of instability and deterioration of social, economic and political conditions in those areas which has given rise to critical situations which are a serious threat to international peace and security.

Faced with these facts, the action of the United Nations has unfortunately not been adequate. Efforts made in certain situations have not been fruitful. In this context, we note with concern that decisions adopted by the Security Council, in its search for viable solutions to such conflicts have been rejected. This

(Mr. Ramos Bustos, Honduras)

frustrates the purposes and principles in the Charter and jeopardizes the ability of the Organization to act.

However, in the midst of the crisis that besets us, there are in some regions where there are serious conflicts new winds of change which increase our hope of agreements being reached that will encourage the parties to find a way to halt the arms race and thus achieve stable and permanent peace.

Such a situation exists in Central America, an area which is subject to a series of circumstantial problems which have brought about a climate of mistrust and instability, and in which the limits of security have been exceeded, to the detriment of the fragile environment of detente which prevails.

(Mr. Ramoe Bustos, Honduras)

As a result of that situation, since 1983 the Government of Honduras has urgently appealed for a regional peace agreement entailing a serious consideration of disarmament. Ever since then it has been a fundamental purpose of Honduras' foreign policy - and this has guided its behaviour throughout the negotiation process in Central America with the Contadora and the Support Groups - thoroughly to analyse arms issues with a view to reaching agreements that will lead to the halting of the arms race in the area. That would encompass not only arms limitations but also the reduction of military forces to the level absolutely necessary for defence of sovereignty and territorial integrity and maintenance of public order. We consider this agreement should be subject to effective international control and verification as a fundamental stage in the peace process.

We are therefore pleased that among the procedures to establish firm and lasting peace in Central America that were adopted in the city of Guatemala by the Central American Presidents and are unanimously supported by the international community, account was taken of Honduran initiatives, including that of proceeding in the future to the conclusion of agreements on security with the active mediation of the Contadora Group. This stage is still pending, and my Government stands ready to work towards agreement to guarantee peace, democracy, development and security in Central America.

Finally, we welcome the establishment of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America, and earnestly hope that its activities will further promote the efforts of our peoples in this area to improve a climate of peace and security in our region.

Mr. VAN SCHAİK (Netherlands) : I am speaking on a draft resolution under agenda item 66 (b) , on the report of the Conference on Disarmament. On behalf of the sponsors, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany , Iceland, Italy , Japan, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom of Great. Britain and

(Mr. Van Schaik, Netherlande)

Northern Ireland and my own delegation, I wish to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.61 on the report of the Conference on Disarmament. The delegations that have sponsored this draft resolution sincerely hope that it will be accepted by consensus. It is in our view of great importance that the work that is being undertaken in the Conference will in this way find recognition by the General Assembly.

It is not the intention of sponsors to express an opinion on OK to give an evaluation of the work that has been undertaken. In other draft resolutions, notably the separate draft resolutions on the different subjects being considered in the Conference on Disarmament, countries have an opportunity to formulate recommendations on policies to be pursued and orientations to be given to the work. This draft resolution merely seeks to reflect the state of affairs, to confirm that discussions and negotiations have reached a certain state, as is reflected in the report.

A lot of hard, constructive work has been undertaken in the Conference on Disarmament, which finds its expression in the report. The report also summarizes differences of view, carefully worded in language on which agreement has been reached in Geneva. In the view of the sponsors, the Conference deserves its report to meet with consensus in the Assembly, as it met with consensus among 40 Member States two months ago in Geneva.

We would welcome any procedural suggestions that would improve the text and meet that purpose. We call upon all delegations to help dispel any possible impression of conflicting positions between Geneva and New York, of a division between what has been agreed upon in Geneva and what subsequently will be recommended by the Assembly. We sincerely believe that such a result will be possible only if consensus is reached on a draft resolution of a procedural nature such as that we have submitted.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish) : It is my honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.52, on agenda item 48, "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/45 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)".

The draft resolution is sponsored by the delegations of the following countries: Bahamas, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela and Mexico.

The first paragraph contains an impressive list of resolutions adopted by the Assembly concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) , since it is no mere coincidence that this year, 1987, we commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the opening of that Treaty for signature.

The second preambular paragraph draws attention to the fact that within the zone of application of that Treaty, to which 25 sovereign States already are parties, there are some territories which, in spite of not being sovereign political entities, are nevertheless in a position to receive the benefits deriving from the Treaty through its Additional Protocol I, to which the four States that de jure or de facto are internationally responsible for them, those territories may become parties. The draft resolution adds that it is not fair that the peoples of some of those territories are deprived of such benefits without being given the opportunity to express their opinion in this connection.

It also recalls that three of the States to which the Additional Protocol I is opened - the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the United States of America - became parties to the said Protocol in 1969, 1971 and 1981, respectively.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The draft resolution concludes with three operative paragraphs, in the last of which, as is usual in such cases, a request is made for the inclusion of this item in the provisional agenda of the General Assembly at its forty-third session. In the two preceding paragraphs, which faithfully reflect the feelings of Latin America, the General Assembly

“Deplores that the signature of Additional Protocol I by France, which took place on 2 March 1979, has not yet been followed by the corresponding ratification, notwithstanding the time already elapsed and the pressing invitations which the General Assembly had addressed to it” ; and

“Once more urges France not to delay any further such ratification, which has been requested so many times and which appears all the more advisable, since France is the only one of the four States to which the Protocol is open that is not yet party to it”.

I believe it relevant, by way of an epilogue, to recall a few points that should be borne in mind in this connection. They are as follows.

In the current year we are commemorating the twentieth anniversary of the opening to signature of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and its two Additional Protocols. There are already 25 states parties to that Treaty. Additional Protocol II, as is well known, has entered into force for the five nuclear-weapon States to which it is open. Additional Protocol I, as is stated in the penultimate paragraph of the draft resolution I am introducing, has already entered into force for three of the four States to which it is open. France is the only one of those States that has not yet become a party to that instrument, despite having signed it on 2 March 1979, that is, more than eight years ago. As the United Nations has stated on several occasions, it would not be fair for the peoples of the territories situated within the zone of application of the Treaty of Tlatelolco for which

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

States to which Additional Protocol I is open, to use the terms of the Treaty, "de jure or de facto are internationally responsible" to be deprived of the benefits deriving from the Treaty "without being given the opportunity to express their opinion in this connection".

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I shall now call on those representative who have requested permission to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I should like to remind members of the Committee of the procedure we have agreed on in this connection.

Mr. ASHRAFI-GHAHVEHCHI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Since terms such as "misuse of the rules of procedure" and "misusing the Conference on Disarmament for propaganda" have been aimed at my country, I should like to make some comments here.

In fact we are living today in a world of paradox. The Iraqi representative in his intervention asked that the Conference on Disarmament change its rules of procedure so that his country would be able to take part in the work of the Conference. If the shoe fits one foot, it must fit the other. When we presented our draft resolution on chemical weapons to the meeting of non-aligned countries last week, to be submitted as the Movement's draft resolution to the Committee, ironically enough only one delegation - which happened to be the delegation that expressed strong opposition to the rules of procedure - misused the rules of procedure and prevented the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries from adopting it.

I really do not know how the Iraqi delegation can justify its double-standard approach towards consensus. Maybe it is so enthusiastic about attending the deliberations of the Conference on Disarmament because it wishes to teach the members how to use chemical weapons without the slightest pang of conscience.

Mr. AL-KETAL (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic) : I am indeed surprised that the representative of Iran assumes that my statement this morning was addressed to him in particular, though I did not mention any State by name. My statement was only in general terms.

I am also surprised at his statement about his draft resolution regarding chemical weapons and his claim that Iran submitted that draft to the Movement of Non-aligned Countries and Iraq was the only State which prevented the unanimous adoption of Iran's draft resolution. The non-aligned States are represented in this chamber. They are fully aware that nothing of the sort took place and we were not present at that meeting.

Also we are fully aware that the non-aligned countries recognize that a large number of the members of the Non-Aligned Movement do not support that draft resolution at all, since it does not reflect a sincere interest in a prohibition of the use of chemical weapons, which are being used by Iran in the current war. It is a selective choice of one component and one aspect of a larger issue regarding the war. Iran's insistence on perpetuating and prolonging the war and its refusal to accept the mandate of the Security Council to resolve an international dispute is the core of the problem.

#### PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : We have concluded the second stage of our work, devoted to statements on specific disarmament agenda items as well as the continuation of the general debate.

In accordance with our programme of work and the Committee's time-table, tomorrow the Committee will take up the third stage of its work, that is, the consideration of and decisions on draft resolutions dealing with disarmament agenda items.

(The Chairman)

In the light of consultations I have held with other members of the Committee as well as consultations with delegations and groups thereof, I shall briefly outline the next phase of our work, **particularly** for the next three days of this **week.**

**(The Chairman)**

The Committee meetings planned for Wednesday, 4 November, and Friday, 6 November, will be taken up with the introduction and discussion of draft resolutions on disarmament.

In this context, now that the Committee has concluded the second stages of its work, I should like to urge all delegations that wish to introduce draft resolutions or to make comments on those drafts to inscribe their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible.

In view of the large number of draft resolutions before us, it would be desirable to leave some of our time open for the holding of consultations. Consequently, I propose that no meeting of the Committee should be held on Thursday, 5 November, so as to enable delegations to hold the necessary consultations and possibly to receive instructions from their respective capitals.

Starting on Monday, 9 November, the Committee will take decisions on draft resolutions on the various agenda items.

As I stated yesterday, it is my intention tomorrow to present to members a document containing the Chairman's suggestions regarding the programme which groups together various agenda items, on the basis of which the Committee will take action on the draft resolutions and draft decisions before it.

I should like to ask the Committee whether there are any objections to the proposals that I have just made. As there are none, I shall assume that these proposals are acceptable to the Committee.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.