



UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/C.1/PV.2085  
13 November 1975

ENGLISH

---

Thirtieth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND AND EIGHTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
On Wednesday, 12 November 1975, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon)  
Rapporteur: Mr. ARTEAGA ACOSTA (Venezuela)

- Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security /31/ (continued)
- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3254 (XXIX): report of the Secretary-General /34/ (continued)
- Napalm and other incendiary weapons and all aspects of their possible use: reports of the Secretary-General /35/ (continued)
- Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /36/ (continued)
- Urgent need for cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /37/ (continued)

/...

---

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be distributed as soon as possible.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent in quadruplicate within three working days to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, Room LX-2332, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 14 NOVEMBER 1975, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 19 NOVEMBER 1975.

The co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3258 (XXIX) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) /38/ (continued)
- Implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean /39/ (continued)
- World Disarmament Conference: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference /40/ (continued)
- General and complete disarmament /41/ (continued):
  - (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament
  - (b) Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency
- Mid-term review of the Disarmament Decade: report of the Secretary-General /42/ (continued)
- Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa /43/ (continued)
- Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /44/ (continued)
- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3262 (XXIX) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General /45/ (continued)
- Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General /46/ (continued)
- Prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other hostile purposes, which are incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /47/ (continued)
- Declaration and establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia: report of the Secretary-General /48/ (continued)
- Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific /120/ (continued)
- Conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests /122/ (continued)
- Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons /126/ (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 120, 122 and 126 (continued)

Mr. HULINSKY (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): My delegation is of the widely held view that in order to strengthen the positive trends of the current development in the international situation we must supplement them by military détente. It is well known that, thanks to the multilateral and bilateral agreements and treaties concluded in recent years, which embrace a broad range of questions from the easing of the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war up to the elimination or limitation of various types of weapons in different areas, to a certain extent it has been possible to put a brake on the arms race. There has been an easing of the danger of military confrontation between the two social and economic systems, the socialist and the capitalist, particularly with regard to the use of weapons of mass destruction. But unfortunately it cannot be said that the arms race in the world has entirely come to an end. Furthermore, in the United Nations as elsewhere, we can still hear, even from a permanent member of the Security Council, the idea expressed that nuclear war is at hand, that it is inevitable, almost that it is a good thing. In this regard the policy of hostility and the whipping up of tension and incitement to war, carried on in the hope of deriving chauvinistic advantage from causing chaos in the world, is a means of threatening the security of those countries whose Governments are the protagonists, the champions, of this policy. This kind of wild irresponsible policy has led in the past to incalculable loss of human lives and unlimited suffering for the peoples of the world. Such a policy properly deserves not only categorical condemnation but a very decisive rebuttal.

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

The results of the efforts aimed at disarmament which have been made in the 30 years since the Second World War, in spite of their undoubted significance and substance, cannot be viewed with unqualified optimism. They have certainly helped to improve the over-all international climate, but so far have not led to general and complete disarmament or to a cessation of the arms race.

While just a few years ago world expenditure on armaments amounted to about \$200 billion, today we are already talking in terms of \$300 billion, that is, an increase of 50 per cent. To an ever-increasing degree, armaments are swallowing up the material and human resources of all countries, both industrially developed and developing, nuclear and non-nuclear. This process can be halted only by the combined efforts of many States, primarily of all the major States.

One way is by compliance with resolution 3093 (XXVIII) on the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries with a view to meeting their economic needs. We do not, of course, see this reduction as a final end, but as a practical step towards the cessation of the arms race and the diverting to peaceful uses of at least some of the funds now being used for military purposes.

Although it was carried out by experts, the complicated research on certain aspects of military budgets which has gone on for two years -- the structures of those budgets, their standardization and so on -- has only delayed a solution of this question. We believe, therefore, that this year our attention here in this Committee should be focused primarily on taking political decisions to implement the fundamental purposes of the resolution adopted at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

Last August, the participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe expressed their common conviction that it was necessary to take effective measures towards general and complete disarmament.



(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

The Final Act of that Conference constitutes, in particular, further authoritative international recognition of the need for disarmament, which derives from the conviction that, given the present balance of forces in the world, peaceful coexistence of States with different social and economic systems is the only sensible international political alternative. Accordingly, disarmament is gradually becoming not only an urgent need but also a political principle, a moral and legal obligation of States.

Two new initiatives submitted by the Soviet Union at this session of the General Assembly are one way of taking a responsible approach to the performance of those tasks. In the statement by our Foreign Minister in the general debate at this session of the General Assembly, the Czechoslovak delegation has already expressed its support for the proposals on the conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and another on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. We have come to give further details in this Committee.

The two new Soviet proposals -- which are of undeniable value in their substance -- apply to those who are continually holding talks on disarmament and making it possible, by means of treaties on partial measures, to create a climate of trust which improves the prospects for swifter progress on the question of general and complete disarmament. The conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests would not only be a major contribution to the cause of peace but would also be a decisive step towards the total prohibition of those weapons for ever and towards the elimination of their stockpiles. Since such a treaty would primarily affect the assumption of equal obligations by nuclear States, we consider entirely legitimate the requirement that the treaty should be signed after consultation and with the participation of all States which possess nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons arose, as we know, against a background of the acceleration of the scientific and technological revolution of our day. Is there really any guarantee that the development of science and technology -- evidence of which we see every day -- will not entail the emergence of new

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

forms of weaponry even more destructive than nuclear weapons? Have we all not witnessed how qualitatively new systems or already well-known types of weapon have arisen, particularly weapons of mass destruction? The urgency of concluding an agreement that would put a halt to the arms race in that particular field of armaments cannot possibly give rise to doubts on the part of any peace-loving State.

An extremely important place in the efforts designed to strengthen genuine peace and eliminate the basis for thermonuclear is held by the talks between the USSR and the United States of America on their strategic weapons. In the past few years those talks have yielded positive results. The Soviet Union and the United States have concluded important agreements on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons, on the limitation of rocket defence systems and others, which have eased the danger of nuclear confrontation and limited nuclear armaments.

We attach particular importance to the 1973 agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States on the prevention of nuclear war. We believe also that a longer-term treaty will be implemented on the further limitation of strategic offensive weapons, the basis for which was laid at the summit meeting held at Vladivostok in November 1974.

After the successful conclusion of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe also found themselves on new ground. The direct participants in those talks included the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. However, the purpose of those talks, as we have seen from the very outset, was the conclusion by the participating States of a separate treaty on mutual obligations with regard to the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, without threatening the security and equality of rights and obligations of all parties to the proposed treaty. We attach great significance to the fact that the Vienna talks are not limited only to conventional forces and weapons but also involve a considerable reduction in the concentration of nuclear weapons in Central Europe.

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

One of the most important factors in the efforts towards the elimination of the threat of nuclear war and creating the necessary conditions for nuclear disarmament is the comprehensive and consistent strengthening of the régime applying to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The basis of that régime is the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which entered into force five years ago. During that period its viability, as well as its effectiveness and timeliness, has been convincingly demonstrated. So far the Treaty has contributed to preventing the further uncontrolled proliferation of nuclear weapons and, to a considerable degree, this has helped to stabilize international relations and to encourage talks on disarmament.

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

The effectiveness of the Treaty is shown also by the fact that in all this time it has not been violated by any of the parties. The Treaty has laid the foundation for the creation of an effective system of international control over compliance with it, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Moreover, it has created more favourable conditions for the comprehensive development of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

The path towards further strengthening the Treaty and ensuring its utmost effectiveness lies primarily in its maximum universalization. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is already one of the most universal international treaties in existence. Its full-fledged parties now number almost 100, and a number of other States have signed it. The effectiveness of the Treaty has been enhanced also by the fact that the five States members of EURATOM have become parties to it this year. But there are a number of States that are still not parties to the Treaty, and they include nuclear Powers or Powers able to produce their own nuclear weapons. We welcome the fact that the opinion that it is extremely important for those Powers to associate themselves with the Treaty was expressed at the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons that was held in Geneva in May this year.

We believe that the most important result of the Review Conference was that the force of the major articles of the Treaty -- that is, articles I and II -- was confirmed almost unanimously. Those articles constitute the basis for the entire system of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The importance of the articles on international control was also confirmed, and there was a favourable assessment of the work of the IAEA in this field. We support the recommendations of the Review Conference that the effectiveness of the application of IAEA safeguards should be increased even further and that the parties to the Treaty that have not yet done so should conclude as soon as possible safeguards agreements with the IAEA. The interest in improving the safeguards system and achieving greater effectiveness within the system of IAEA control has been confirmed also by proposals mentioned at this session of the General Assembly by the delegations of the United States and the United Kingdom.

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

My country is among those which have from the very outset been co-operating closely with the IAEA in the field of the application of safeguards and international controls. In that regard I should like to announce that Czechoslovakia has this year associated itself with the specifications of article III, paragraph 2 of the Non-Proliferation Treaty -- agreed within the framework of the IAEA -- which lays down the conditions for the export of nuclear material and equipment. The obligation to export fissionable material and special equipment only under IAEA safeguards should in our view, in accordance with the Final Declaration of the Geneva Review Conference, cover the export of all nuclear material and equipment without exception.

We agree with the view that the further comprehensive development of co-operation by States in the area of the peaceful use of nuclear energy on a mutually advantageous and non-discriminatory basis is the road towards the total implementation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. We believe that the most appropriate body to ensure and co-ordinate such co-operation in all areas is precisely the IAEA. We note with satisfaction that this view has won wide support and is expressed also in the Final Declaration of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

In the area of multilateral disarmament talks, this year the Geneva Committee on Disarmament again demonstrated the part it has played for so long by submitting the report on its work contained in document A/10027. One of the most important results of the Committee's work this year was the successful discussion of the Soviet initiative taken at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly -- that is, the proposal on the prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health. The Committee on Disarmament, with the participation of experts, did a great deal to help to identify the various aspects of and increase knowledge about this complex and urgent problem. In particular, it was possible to make a more narrow identification of the ways and means

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

of influencing the environment and the fields in which these ways and means might be used for military purposes. Hence, the delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States were able, even before the end of the summer session of the Committee on Disarmament, to submit identical draft conventions on this subject. The Czechoslovak delegation believes that the present session of the General Assembly should recommend to the Committee on Disarmament that next year it should work out a final draft text of a convention and present it to the thirty-first session of the General Assembly for consideration.

An important item on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament -- and it has been on that agenda for almost 10 years -- is the item on the prohibition and elimination of chemical means of waging war. In the view of the Czechoslovak delegation the final decision should be designed to ensure the conclusion of a treaty on the total prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction. That this approach is the correct one is confirmed by the fact that it was on that basis that the question of bacteriological weapons was successfully solved. Article IX of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, which came into force this year, obliges the parties to the Convention to continue negotiations with a view to reaching agreement on the total prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons. For that reason too we associate ourselves with the appeals that have been made to the States which have not yet done so to adhere as soon as possible to the Convention on the prohibition of bacteriological weapons.

Until the problem of the total prohibition of chemical weapons has been solved, the 1925 Geneva Protocol remains in force. That Protocol prohibits the use of chemical and bacteriological methods of warfare. We welcome the ratification of the Protocol this year by the United States, and we entirely agree that all the other States that have not yet done so should accede to or ratify the Protocol.

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

A good basis for a businesslike discussion of the question of prohibiting chemical weapons is to be found in the proposals presented to the Committee on Disarmament in the past three years. The first is the draft convention submitted by a group of socialist countries in 1972. There is also the memorandum submitted in 1973 by the non-aligned countries in the Committee. Finally, there is the draft convention submitted last year by Japan. A number of other working documents have been submitted on various aspects of this question, and talks have been held among experts. In essence, agreement has been reached on the stage-by-stage approach, which could overcome divergent views on the question of control. We should like to see the continuing talks between the Soviet Union and the United States on the preparation of their joint initiative directed towards the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the most dangerous means of waging chemical warfare, as a first step towards the total prohibition of chemical weapons. We hope that this could yield concrete results.

Another of the tasks of the Committee on Disarmament this year was to discuss simultaneously questions involved in the general prohibition of nuclear weapon testing and the consequences of peaceful nuclear explosions on the control over armaments.



(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

In this connexion, we should like once again to stress that the question of peaceful nuclear explosions should not be a reason for delaying the adoption of such an important and urgent measure as the conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon testing. Such an approach could serve only the interests of those nuclear Powers which, now, that their arguments about the inadequacy of control by national means have already been dismissed, are looking for new arguments to explain their reluctance to halt all their nuclear tests. The conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon testing, in our view, would precisely constitute conditions such that the question of peaceful nuclear explosions could be successfully resolved in the interests of all countries.

It is extremely important in this regard for the régime governing peaceful nuclear explosions to remain a constituent part of the régime governing the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as a whole. Its conclusion should, therefore, lie in the implementation of article V of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, so that an appropriate international organ, by means of which the non-nuclear States could derive advantage from peaceful nuclear explosions, would be the International Atomic Energy Agency.

From this it follows that an equal approach to the advantages to be derived from peaceful nuclear explosions should in no way lead to an expansion of capability to carry out nuclear explosions or the manufacture of nuclear explosive devices. This requirement is particularly justified because, as it has been so often stressed, the technology of the production of military and peaceful nuclear charges in essence is identical, and therefore no distinctions can be drawn. In spite of the fact that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, in the discussion of these questions this year, did not come to any concrete conclusions, we take a positive view of the fact that many delegations took precisely this approach to a solution of the question.

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

A similar situation is provided for also in the draft treaty on the complete and total prohibition of nuclear-weapon testing presented at this session by the Soviet Union -- and this is one of the reasons why my delegation co-sponsored it. The positive elements in the work of the Committee on Disarmament this year was, among other things, the detailed investigation of the question of nuclear-free zones (A/10027/Add.1), prepared upon the basis of resolution 3261 F (XXIX) of the General Assembly last year.

The Ad Hoc Group of Qualified Governmental Experts, set up under aegis of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, was able to cope, in a relatively short period of time, with this very vast and complex problem and produced a document which is an undeniable contribution to the prospects of solving the problem of nuclear-free zones.

We share the view of the Chairman of this Group, Professor Keijo Korhonen, of Finland, that:

"the study helps to identify the problems without creating new ones."

(A/C.1/PV.2073, p. 43-45)

We also agree with his view that:

"It is necessary to identify not only the points of consensus but also the matters of disagreement in order to design practical ways and means for progress in the future." (Ibid.)

Czechoslovakia, whose expert took part in this research work, has always supported the idea of creating nuclear-weapon-free zones and sees in them an effective means of strengthening the security of States in those zones and, at the same time, international security as a whole. Treaties on nuclear-weapon-free zones would at the same time be a useful addition to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and would do a great deal to promote the strengthening of the whole non-proliferation régime.

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

We believe that a basis for the bringing about of nuclear-free zones should be the principles contained in part III of the paper on which an agreement was achieved in the Committee. This is primarily a reliable guarantee that the zone would be and would remain entirely free of nuclear weapons, that the initiative to create such a zone should come from the States in the region, that participation should be voluntary, that the treaty on the zone should contain an effective system of control to ensure full compliance of the obligations under the treaty and that it should have no time-limit.

We also believe in the approach whereby nuclear-free zones should be created in accordance with the general process of the strengthening of international security, as a matter of principle and as something which should not be allowed to violate existing security measures, particularly the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, including provisions affecting the carrying out of peaceful nuclear explosions.

If States in the atom-free zones are parties to international pacts, such membership should not be allowed to justify any exceptions from the obligations they have assumed flowing from the treaties on the zones. The revisions of treaties on nuclear-free zones should be in keeping with the universally acknowledged rules of international law both with regard to the determination of the frontiers of the zone and also with regard to respect for the principle of freedom of navigation on the high seas and international straits, and the preservation of the free use of international air space.

At the same time, agreement must be reached on the idea that States in the zone should not use any nuclear explosive devices for purposes of manipulation in any way and that the treaty on a zone should prohibit the transit of nuclear weapons through its territory; this would include ships which are carrying such equipment.

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

We also believe that nuclear-weapon States required to guarantee the security of States in the atom-free zones should be able to participate in negotiations on the conclusion of the treaties in question. This would be entirely in keeping with the obligations they have assumed.

One of the questions which, for the fifth time, arises with particular urgency on the agenda at this session of the General Assembly is the question of convening a world disarmament conference as soon as possible. Much has already been done in terms of useful and necessary preparatory work. After complicated talks, an Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference was set up. It discussed various aspects of convening a conference and studied the views and recommendations of many Governments, on the basis of which it prepared some reports for this session of the General Assembly.

Along with the Soviet Union, two other nuclear Powers, namely Great Britain and France, have begun to take part in the work of that Committee. Throughout the course of the discussion of this question it has been constantly confirmed that the overwhelming majority of countries strongly support the convening of this world conference. Almost all the necessary conditions have already been created for us to turn now from preliminary talks and the discussion of the possibilities, desirability, purposes and other aspects of the world disarmament conference, to a start on concrete preparations for it.

The fact that it has not been possible so far to start concrete preparations on convening the conference is to a considerable degree the fault of the other two permanent members of the Security Council which have so far refused to participate in the common cause. To ensure the success of that cause at the conference, all the nuclear States must take part in it.

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

In spite of this fact we should like to express our particular gratitude to the Ad Hoc Committee which did such praiseworthy work this year, as reported in document A/10028, which is a confirmation of the fact that the question of the convening of a world disarmament conference is still in the forefront of the attention of the overwhelming majority of countries.

We see the major purpose of the conference primarily to be the discussion of all ways and means of achieving general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control, and priority in this should be given to questions of nuclear disarmament. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic believes that the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee should therefore be extended for another year. Czechoslovakia, as a member of the Committee, will do everything in its power to ensure that this mandate is expanded in the near future in connexion with the specific preparations for a world disarmament conference.

In conclusion, I should like to express our view with regard to a question which was touched upon in the statements of certain delegations of developing countries. I have in mind the convening of a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on disarmament questions.

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has a high regard for the profound interest of the non-aligned countries in solving the urgent problems of disarmament, an interest which was confirmed once again this year in their conference in Lima. Nevertheless, we believe that given the existing situation in the field of disarmament, a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on disarmament questions could not yield any positive results for a number of reasons of a formal or practical nature, concerning procedure, the considerable time limitations and so forth. On the contrary, progress in disarmament could be accelerated by a world disarmament conference, and by pressing for the convening of such a conference. Other proposals should not be allowed to interfere in any way with their goal. The present state of talks in the field of disarmament is a reflection of the contemporary balance of power in the world. Therefore, it is hardly likely that convening a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on disarmament or, for example, undertaking a reorganization of United Nations machinery for disarmament talks, or any

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

other such measures, could really change the existing political realities reflecting the interests of States in such a complex and sensitive area as control over armaments and disarmament. After all, a fundamental precondition for success in any disarmament talks is strict observance of the principle of unanimity, which cannot be achieved, however, at the expense of the security of any of the States participating in the talks. Given the existing situation, the most effective way of making progress, as we have already said in our previous statement in this Committee, is the path of patient discussion and the adoption of those partial measures which have already become ripe for decision. This, of course, does not mean that we do not want to achieve more in the future.

Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): The United Nations was born in a world exhausted by years of devastating warfare and with an overwhelming desire for assured peace, assured security, and assured stability. However, since the birth of the United Nations the two super-Powers have been engaged in a race to accumulate more destructive power for the declared purpose of preventing its use. The dangers implicit in such a situation have been recognized by the leaders of the two super-Powers. The element of irrationality in the posture of the super-Powers led President Kennedy to declare in 1961 that it puts "every man, woman and child under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident, miscalculation, or madness. The weapons of war", he continued, "must be abolished before they abolish us".

Notwithstanding such pronouncements, arsenals are increasing to a still higher level. The world is still sustained by an uncertain and unsatisfactory balance of terror. The logic behind this system is that a surprise attack by one side could not prevent retaliation by the other. Neither side, then, would rationally initiate an attack that would result in its own destruction.

The disarmament measures agreed to between the super-Powers in recent years are based on the fact that it is possible to limit the size of the deterrent because the arsenals of each side have enough power to destroy the other side many times over. Thus recent disarmament measures may be assessed as being economy measures and anti-pollution measures. The costs of modern

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

nuclear weaponry and the dangers of holocaust have no doubt induced the super-Powers to agree to some quantitative restrictions. It is naturally a source of great regret that no qualitative restrictions have been imposed on the development and improvement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. The partial test ban treaty may also be viewed as a measure to protect the atmosphere from radioactive waste without hampering the freedom of the nuclear Powers to conduct tests underground.

Thus the disarmament measures embodied in the SALT Agreement, which establish ceilings on the quantity of nuclear arms produced without imposing any constraints on the improvement of the quality of nuclear weapons allow the technological race, within the quantitative confines established, to continue unabated.

One can, therefore, safely say that in essence nothing has really changed. The world does not feel secure under the present stable deterrence system. Any superiority in the development of weapons by one side is soon threatened or surpassed by the other; thus the endless chain continues to grow. The process has only made men feel more insecure than ever. To call the present mutual deterrent situation peace and security would be a travesty.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics recently gave the following assessment of the disarmament situation. He said:

"Despite the fact that the agreements concluded in recent years do to some extent curb the arms race in certain areas, it has not yet proved possible to check the arms build up on the whole. The arms race, which consumes countless material and human resources and is detrimental to all States, is continuing. At the same time, the danger that scientific and technological achievements will be used to create new types of weapons of mass destruction is becoming increasingly real."

We believe that in general arms races arise as a result of political conflicts, are kept alive by them, and subside with them. Détente has surely succeeded in maintaining the military balance at a fixed level, or on a downward plane, rather than on an upward plane. So long as this state of



BHS/lc

A/C.1/PV.2085  
24-25

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

affairs persists, one is led to the inescapable conclusion that in the armaments field, technical changes have made the world an unimaginably more dangerous place to live in. Intercontinental ballistic missiles and satellite launching pads have become the new military reality, so that natural barriers of seas or mountains or conventionally trained and armed military forces have suddenly lost meaning as effective security devices.

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

The statement made by Mr. Malik, the Soviet representative, to this Committee on 30 October is of particular significance because it is made by the representative of one of the super-Powers. The approach in this statement, though promising, is rather limited. No mention is made of the need to prohibit the development and manufacture of existing weapons of mass destruction, although the existing arsenals are sufficient to bring about a universal holocaust which will wipe out every trace of our civilization from this earth.

However, the new draft treaty has the praiseworthy objective of preventing further waste of human, natural and technological resources on new systems of weapons of mass destruction. Thus the new draft treaty, which definitely has praiseworthy aims, falls within the existing pattern of disarmament, with a slight improvement in that for the first time a ban will be imposed on further qualitative improvements if they result in a totally new type of weapon. However, we cannot read this draft treaty as implying in any sense a ban on qualitative improvements of weapons of mass destruction which are already in existence. My delegation would like to take this occasion to commend the USSR for this new gesture, though we would have liked the new proposal to be wider in scope so as to include all weapons of mass destruction already in existence and not merely new types and new systems of such weapons.

My delegation has consistently advocated widening the scope of the partial test-ban Treaty so as to include underground tests. We therefore have no difficulty in supporting the broad objectives of the recent Soviet proposal to call on all nuclear-weapon States to enter into negotiations not later than 31 March 1976 with a view to reaching agreement on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. However, I must say once more that the negotiations should have been wider in scope so as to include an attempt to destroy the existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

My delegation has read with interest the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference. The report states that basic differences of opinion on many aspects of the convening of a world disarmament conference continues to exist among the nuclear-weapon States. Though the nuclear-weapon States have shown greater readiness during the past year to co-operate with the

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

Ad Hoc Committee, the basic difference of opinion among the nuclear weapon States continues to constitute a serious obstacle to convening the conference in the near future. In fact, continuance of these basic differences among the nuclear weapon States may stultify the work of the Ad Hoc Committee and convert it into an organ for reviewing comments made by States on the objectives of a world disarmament conference. My delegation sincerely hopes that the First Committee will succeed during the present session in giving the Ad Hoc Committee a new mandate which will give it more extensive powers and convert it into a preparatory committee capable of taking active measures for convening the conference itself.

We hope that the nuclear-weapon States which have serious misgivings about the conference will revise their attitude so as to give the conference a chance. It is not necessary to prejudge the work of the conference at this stage. The main merit of the conference is that it will serve as a forum for mobilizing world public opinion and bringing the pressure of the community of nations to bear on the work of disarmament bodies which in the past represented mainly the interests of big Powers.

Kuwait has repeatedly stated that all countries, big or small, have an equal stake in disarmament. Only a world disarmament conference can insure that further disarmament measures will be applied against the nuclear States themselves and that procedures of horizontal non-proliferation will be coupled with vertical non-proliferation as well. Naturally, we do not expect the conference to achieve miracles overnight. Who would deny, however, that the conference will initiate a healthy process and lay the foundations of a sound framework for the fulfilment of general and complete disarmament.

My country was among the first to welcome the initiatives for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the region of the Middle East. Last year we voted in favour of resolution 3263 (XXIX) which sought to make this concept a living reality. In our reply to the enquiry of the Secretary-General, my Government declared its willingness to proclaim solemnly its intention to refrain, on a reciprocal basis, from producing, testing, obtaining, acquiring or in any other way possessing nuclear weapons provided that all parties concerned, especially Israel, made a similar declaration. Naturally, this question is of

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

vital importance to my country. It can be a matter of life and death in view of reports that Israel already possesses nuclear weapons and is negotiating to obtain surface-to-surface missiles capable of reaching every city, town or village in the Middle East.

The reply of Israel to the enquiry addressed by the Secretary-General shows no inclination on its part to collaborate in establishing a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. The arguments can be very easily refuted. In fact this has already been most adequately done by Mr. Fahmy, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt, as shown in document A/10221/Add.2.

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

I should like to associate my Government with the statement of Mr. Fahmy, who summed up the attitude of Israel in these words:

"The situation has not undergone any change whatsoever, and could not possibly be changed by a diplomatic manoeuvre such as that contained in Israel's reply, which reflects the same Israeli method of misinterpretation and falsification of facts; nor will it be changed by the oft-repeated statement published by Israeli mass media and other media that Israel will not be the first to introduce nuclear weapons into the region. The situation will only be changed when:

"(a) Israel fully accedes to the non-proliferation Treaty;

"(b) Israel opens the Dimona reactor to international inspection;

"(c) Israel ceases its attempts to obtain sophisticated weapons with nuclear potential." (A/10221/Add.2, p. 2)

Nevertheless, my Government remains dedicated to the cause of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones, not only in the Middle East but in all parts of the world. It is significant to note that the concept of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones is increasingly gaining wider acceptance. My delegation takes note with satisfaction of the draft resolution sponsored by Fiji, New Zealand and Papua New Guinea for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific. I should like to state that my delegation endorses without any reservation every single call that may be made for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. To borrow a happy view propounded by Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico in his opening statement before this Committee, if the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones were to be implemented on a large scale, countries that possess nuclear weapons would become contaminated islands subject to a régime of quarantine. My delegation entirely endorses this view, application of which would virtually lead not only to a reversal of the process of horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons but may ultimately to vertical nuclear disarmament as well.

The attitude of my delegation towards the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of Peace is well known. Kuwait had from the outset supported the call for declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. In his statement before the present session of the General Assembly, my Minister for Foreign Affairs had this to say:

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

"The countries of the Indian Ocean have been affected in the past by the conflict between the big Powers and the division of the world into spheres of influence through the establishment of military bases and the conclusion of military pacts to promote the designs of the big Powers. I should like to proclaim ... my Government's support for the proposal to hold a conference in the near future to study the prospects of concluding an international agreement to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. I should, therefore, strongly object to all attempts being made to establish military bases in the islands of the Indian Ocean and any facilities that may be extended to the big Powers which may be of value to them in their political and military conflict. We believe that the conference cannot succeed without the support of the big Powers and the major maritime users of this ocean. A long time has elapsed during which it has been possible to study this matter in all its aspects and prepare the necessary studies; the time has now come to make progress towards concluding an agreement binding on all countries concerned."  
(A/PV.2368, p. 66)

Mr. NANDAN (Fiji): In analysing the general debate in the plenary of this Assembly, it will be noticed that speaker after speaker has expressed concern and disillusionment on the failure of the international community to reach effective agreements on disarmament questions. Speaking in the plenary on 8 October 1975, the Deputy Prime Minister of Fiji, Ratu Sir Panaia Ganilau, expressed his thoughts on this subject in the following words:

"The question of disarmament -- or, rather, the lack of progress in the field of disarmament -- is a matter of concern for all States, big and small, near and remote. With the unabated arms race and the stockpiling in ever increasing quantities of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, no corner of this globe can feel secure from the indiscriminate effects of modern warfare." (A/PV/2580, p. 36)

While some important agreements for the limitation and control of certain strategic arms have been achieved, agreement for the halting or limiting of the arms race in either nuclear or conventional weapons has not proved possible. Important as they may be as first steps, the recent limited agreements on strategic arms are nevertheless of doubtful practical value as they relate only to the

(Mr. Nandan, Fiji)

quantity of weapons in the stockpile and do not limit the ever improving destructive qualities of those weapons. The stockpiles of these weapons already have the capacity to destroy this planet several times over. It is a sad commentary on our times that, after 30 years of efforts on disarmament at the United Nations and elsewhere, the international community has failed to see even a faint ray of hope at the end of the long dark tunnel. Ironically, the realization of the twin goals of disarmament -- that is, a halt in the arms race and achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament -- appears to have slipped further away in the last 30 years, while the pace of the arms race has increased. Vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons is taking place at a faster pace, and the prospect of horizontal nuclear proliferation has increased as nuclear technology has been disseminated among nations.

The arms race in conventional weapons is proceeding at an astounding rate. Some of the conventional weapons being manufactured and distributed around the world consist of sophisticated weapons of mass destruction having a high destructive capacity. While there are no limits to the demand for such weapons, equally there are no limits to the supply of those weapons.

There are among us nations of all ideologies actively engaged in the transfer of arms to other nations.



(Mr. Nandan, Fiji)

These nations sound highly hypocritical when they moralize against war and speak of peaceful settlement of disputes, or when they profess to subscribe to the goals of disarmament while continuing to arm, not only themselves, but other nations also. It is no secret that all the major Powers are engaged in a pathological competition in foreign arms sales. They find their best markets in the most volatile and sensitive regions. So many arms have been poured into one sensitive region that the explosion of another war in the area is a distinct probability which would have catastrophic consequences.

The risk of war through the indiscriminate sales of weapons is real. There is urgent need for the control of this passion for arms sales. The problem of large-scale transfer of conventional weapons around the world deserves equal attention with our efforts for the control of the nuclear arms race and its proliferation.

The Secretary-General, in the introduction to his report to this Assembly, has noted that the current expenditure in the arms industry is reaching some \$300 billion. It is also known that some 80 to 90 per cent of this expenditure is made in the arms industries of the industrialized countries, mainly the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries. In spite of the considerable relaxation of tension in recent years, the technological arms race among the industrialized countries continues. Studies have shown that there is a continued upward trend in the expenditure for military purposes in those countries. This is in marked contrast, in both trend and size, to the aid being given by those industrialized nations to the developing world. The developed countries' total appropriations for military purposes are said to be some 20 times their appropriations for development aid.

On this shrunken planet of ours, where there is so much interdependence among nations, where nations of the developing world are struggling against odds to improve the quality of life of their people, where there is concern about the adequacy of the world's natural resources, where there has been no solution to the world's food problems, it is unacceptable that \$300 billion should be spent annually on military expenditure. It is a tremendous waste to employ hundreds of thousands of scientists and technologists on developing weapons when their expertise could be better devoted to civil technological advances which would help to provide a tolerable standard of living for all inhabitants of the earth.

(Mr. Nandan, Fiji)

Surely international security can be maintained with a far lower level of world military expenditure. Apart from its contribution to disarmament, there is tremendous potential for the use of the human and natural resources freed from military expenditure. That is why my delegation has favoured and supported proposals in this Committee and elsewhere which have the objective of reducing the military budgets of States, especially States permanent members of the Security Council, which have the largest arms industries and stockpiles.

At an earlier meeting, this Committee received from the CCD a report on a comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-free zones in all its aspects. We also heard with great interest the statement of Professor Keijo Korhonen, the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Qualified Governmental Experts for the Study of the Question of Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones. The report is an important compendium of views on the subject of nuclear-weapon-free zones. It is not only comprehensive and useful but also timely in the light of the widespread interest in regional efforts towards disarmament. Amongst its most important observations on the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones the report notes:

"The dominant factor in the development of interest in the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones has been the desire to secure the complete absence of nuclear weapons from various areas of the globe, where suitable conditions exist for the creation of such zones, to spare the nations concerned from the threat of nuclear attack or involvement in nuclear war, to make a positive contribution towards general and complete disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, and thereby to strengthen international peace and security." (A/10027/Add.1, part III, p. 38)

The above observations accord with the views of my Government, which are also shared by neighbouring Governments in the South Pacific region. It was precisely for the same purposes as are mentioned in the paragraph which I have just quoted that on 3 July of this year, after the meeting of their Heads of Government, the member countries of the South Pacific Forum, namely, Australia, the Cook Islands, Nauru, New Zealand, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Tonga, Western Samoa and Fiji, in a joint communiqué issued at Nukualofa, Tonga, gave expression to their common position as follows:

(Mr. Nandan, Fiji)

"The Forum reiterated its strong opposition to nuclear weapons tests in all environments and called for renewed international efforts towards a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty and general and complete disarmament. In particular, the Forum emphasized the importance of keeping the region free from the risk of nuclear contamination and of involvement in a nuclear conflict and commended the idea of establishing a nuclear free zone in the South Pacific as a means of achieving that aim."

Considering our way of life in the scattered island nations in the vast Pacific, the designation of our peoples as Pacific Islanders is most appropriate. Our people have a long tradition of living in peace with each other and in harmony with their environment. War and destruction are alien to our way of life. We neither participate, nor have we the ambition to participate in the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race. We are anxious to ensure that our territories and our region do not become unwittingly involved in a nuclear conflict.

Relatively speaking, ours is also a region which has traditionally been free from man-made environmental pollution, the most dangerous of which is nuclear pollution. Small oceanic developing countries like ours, whose people depend for sustenance on their land and the surrounding seas, enjoy the blessing of a comparatively pollution-free environment. The countries in the region are concerned to see that our environment is preserved free from man-made pollution and that our land and the surrounding seas are not contaminated, especially by nuclear pollution.

The idea of the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific, endorsed by the member countries of the South Pacific Forum, is a genuine attempt by them to take practical measures in order to preserve the peaceful way of life in the region and to ensure the continued existence of our pollution-free environment.

The South Pacific Forum, at its meeting last June, also agreed to seek a wider endorsement of the idea through the adoption of a resolution by the General Assembly and for a study to be undertaken of the feasibility of establishing such a zone.

(Mr. Nandan, Fiji)

Thus, consistent with an important principle contained in the CCD report on nuclear-weapon-free zones, that is, that initiatives to create nuclear-weapon-free zones should come from within the region concerned, the delegations of New Zealand, Papua New Guinea and Fiji have submitted a draft resolution on item 120 of our agenda. This draft resolution is contained in document A/C.1/L.719 and it seeks the Assembly's endorsement of the idea of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific. This draft resolution was ably introduced and explained to this Committee on 31 October by the permanent representative of New Zealand, Ambassador Malcolm Templeton. The proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific is at a very rudimentary stage. After having obtained the wider endorsement of the idea during this Assembly, it is the intention of the sponsors, as expressed in the draft resolution, to have the Assembly invite the countries concerned to hold consultations about the ways and means of realizing this objective, seeking especially the co-operation of the nuclear-weapon States for this purpose.

(Mr. Nandan, Fiji)

The sponsors realize that considerable work will have to be done in defining the extent of the zone, its precise nature and its characteristics. This it is felt, can best be done in consultation with the concerned States having regard to the views of others interested in the region.

What we are seeking at this time, and what we are asking the United Nations to do in this resolution, is to give us encouragement actively to pursue the idea of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in our region, as our contribution to the common pursuit of disarmament goals, thereby to lessen the risk of pollution and destruction from the deadly and terrible nuclear weapon.

Concern has been expressed as to the existing right of passage in the seas of the region. In this regard I can only refer this Committee to the statement of my Deputy Prime Minister in the Assembly on 8 October. He said:

"I should make it clear that it is not the intention of my Government to deprive any State, against its will, of its right to free and unimpeded passage in the high seas or the right of innocent passage in other waters. But we will vigorously oppose any emplacement or testing of nuclear weapons within territories in the South Pacific region." (A/PV.2380, p. 38-40)

That statement should serve to assure those who have expressed concern, privately or in statements in this Committee, over the existing right of passage through the area.

The idea of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific is not unique. The proposal follows in the footsteps of other zonal initiatives having the same objectives in other regions. To mention but a few: the Organization of African Unity's declaration on the denuclearization of Africa; the Treaty of Tlatelolco, establishing Latin America as a nuclear-weapon-free zone; the Treaty prohibiting nuclear explosions in Antarctica; the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace; and the proposal to establish South East Asia as a zone of peace and neutrality.

My delegation has always supported these regional initiatives, for we consider the creation of such zones at the initiative of the countries of the region concerned as important contributions towards the goal of general and complete disarmament.

As has already been stated, the proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific is also a regional initiative. We are indeed

(Mr. Nandan, Fiji)

grateful for the good reception and the expressions of support that the draft resolution of New Zealand, Papua New Guinea and Fiji has received in this Committee. On behalf of my delegation and the other sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.719, I should like to thank the previous speakers who made favourable references to it.

Finally, I should like to appeal to all members of this Committee to support this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

Mr. SIBAHI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): I have before me page 61 of the verbatim record of the 2082nd meeting, in Arabic, which was distributed to members in document A/C.1/PV.2082 dated 10 November 1975. From this record I note that the representative of Israel used his right of reply in connexion with my statement at the afternoon meeting of 10 November.

I should like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me this opportunity to exercise my right of reply to answer the representative of Israel.

I have read the revised verbatim record of Israel's reply. I was absent during it due to some urgent business.

First of all, my declaration was correct and very clear. What was said about Israel was directly connected with the items under discussion in this Committee.

Israel was described as having violated the Charter of the United Nations by occupying territories belonging to three Arab countries, a flagrant manifestation of contempt for the provisions of the Charter; Israel was described as having, in the course of the aggressive war of June 1967 and the war of liberation of October 1973, used napalm and chemical and bacteriological weapons; Israel was described as boasting that it possesses nuclear weapons and intends to use them at the appropriate time; it was stated that talks were under way with a view to supplying Israel with nuclear guided missiles, and that Israel had not signed the various treaties regarding nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Sibahi, Syrian Arab Republic)

All those statements which I made on the afternoon of 10 November were true. They were once more shown to be true in the statement made about an hour ago by Ambassador Bishara of Kuwait, when he referred to documents and statements taken from authoritative sources in the United Nations. As to the opportunity referred to by the representative of Israel in his reply, of arriving at a so-called peace settlement, and recognizing Israel as an equal sovereign Member of the United Nations, that seems to me to come within the context of the discussions on a just and permanent peace, considered by my country as a pre-condition to achieve true peace in the area to which my country belongs, and not the illusory peace behind which Israel is trying to hide every time it talks about peace and recognition, the recognition of Israel.

The representative of Israel knows full well that my country did have strong reservations about accepting the credentials of the representative of Israel when the Libyan representative spoke on behalf of the Arab Group at a morning meeting of the General Assembly at the beginning of the session. Israel, as we know, disregards the resolutions of the United Nations, and its membership is rejected within the United Nations from a legal standpoint because it has not implemented the conditions to which it was committed by the international community in 1948.

I do not think that I have to go into detail on that because I would not presume on the patience of my colleagues during this meeting. The representative of Israel described as an important obstacle the absence of a basic civilized attitude on the part of Syria towards Israel.

I should like to confirm, in the presence of the representative of Israel -- fortunately he is attending this meeting -- that this civilized attitude in Syria is very different from the attitude alleged by Israel, because the civilization and culture of the Arab Syrians come from our tolerance and our adherence to peace, justice, welfare, the liberation of mankind, providing freedom and fighting against racism, Nazism and Fascism.

The civilization of Israel emanates from aggression, murder, making people homeless, expansionism and settlerism. It should be enough for the Israeli representative that the General Assembly adopted a few days ago a resolution which equates Zionism with apartheid, racism and racial discrimination, in compliance with the will of the great majority of the Members of the international Organization.



(Mr. Sibahi, Syrian Arab Republic)

What has been alleged by the representative of Israel is that the Minister of Defence of Syria, speaking in the Syrian Parliament, praised the actions of Syrian soldiers during the 1973 war when they killed a number of Israeli prisoners, and so on. I reject what the Israeli representative has said, because a few months ago I was in Syria and I did not hear of this statement, in spite of the fact that I was following the proceedings of the People's Assembly. I always follow the work of the People's Assembly, and I should like to confirm that I have heard no such statement since the war of October 1973. All I have heard in this respect through the Syrian mass media and the press is that the Minister of Defence praised the Syrian forces in the war of October 1973, and I repeat this with pride to the members of this Committee. These allegations need proof. If the Israeli representative wishes to know how we treated Israeli prisoners during the 1973 war, I should like to refer him to the Syrian hospitals in which those prisoners were given all humane assistance by the doctors. Damascus Radio broadcast interviews with those prisoners in which they spoke of the services rendered to them in the hospitals by the Syrian authorities.

In spite of that, I should like to reiterate in the presence of the Israeli representative that the October 1973 war was a war of liberation, to free our occupied territories and to resanctify its soil, desecrated by Israel in the 1967 occupation, and to restore their national rights to the Palestinian people.

If the Israeli representative considers that liberating our territory and doing away with persecution and suppression contradicts humane principles and values, I should like to ask him in this respect what were the humane values of Israel when it expelled one and a half million Palestinian people from their homelands and threw them into camps, and when it carried out mass slaughter in Deir Yassin, Kobieh, Kalkilieh, Kafr Kasseem, Al Karamah and the King David Hotel? The Israeli representative has overlooked the humane values of the terrorist organizations, the Haganah, the Stern Gang, the Irgun Zwei Leumi, and what those organizations committed in the way of crimes that have marred the face of humanity during the twentieth century.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

Mr. ERELL (Israel): My delegation really appreciates very much the fact that the representative of Syria was good enough to come back to the Committee, and the effort he put into composing his long answer. It was also very good of him to repeat some of the statements he made the last time he spoke in this Committee. It was natural that he himself should testify that his own previous statements were correct; naturally, he would not say otherwise.

However, there was one point of some importance in the statement he made today. If I understood him correctly, he confirmed that his Government does not recognize the sovereign equality and the sovereign rights of my Government. He can correct me if I am wrong, but if that is Syria's position, surely Syria would not expect my Government to respect Syrian sovereignty, Syrian equality and any Syrian rights which may be claimed.

The last point I should like to make relates to the statement I made in this Committee and to which the Syrian representative has just taken such strong exception. I understand he claims that the statement that I have attributed to the Syrian Defence Minister in the Syrian Parliament was not made. I suggest that he look up the Syrian Official Gazette -- called in Arabic Al Jarida al-Rasmiya -- of 11 July 1974, in which he will find the proof that what I said was absolutely correct.

Mr. SIBAHI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): I should like to put my name down for a forthcoming meeting of our Committee in order to exercise my right of reply to the representative of Israel.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope I may consult with some delegations which are negotiating among themselves regarding the draft resolutions. At the end of the general debate we shall, of course, start our consideration of the various items and draft resolutions.

We have no plans yet as to how we shall proceed during our discussion of those items. Presumably we could start with the draft resolutions already before us, in respect of which delegations have had sufficient time for consideration and for seeking instructions from their Governments. We shall then proceed to consider other draft resolutions as they come in.

I have no proposals to make to the Committee yet. I shall consult it next Monday on this particular aspect of the organization of our future work, and I hope that between now and then, in consultation with interested delegations, I shall be able to present the Committee with a clearer picture.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.