



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/C.1/PV.2099
28 November 1975

ENGLISH

Thirtieth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND AND NINETY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 28 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 1 DECEMBER 1975, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 4 DECEMBER 1975.

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

75-71311/A

- 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 of 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)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will continue its consideration of the draft resolutions relating to the question of disarmament. I call on the representative of Nigeria to introduce the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.731.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): It is a great honour and privilege for me to introduce on behalf of the co-sponsors -- namely, Argentina, Brazil, Dahomey, India, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Sweden, Yugoslavia and Zaire -- the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.731 of 25 November 1975, pertaining to item 42 on our agenda, on the mid-term review of the Disarmament Decade. It is a non-controversial draft resolution which seeks to plot further the graph of our consideration of disarmament issues. Whether the graph goes upwards or downwards will depend on our critical appreciation of general and complete disarmament as a legitimate goal of the United Nations.

When the late Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant of blessed memory, proposed in the introduction to his annual report on the work of the United Nations for 1968 to 1969 that the Members of the United Nations should decide to dedicate the decade of the 1970s as a disarmament decade, he did not have to resort to hyperbole and frightening language to scare us into accepting his proposal. The situation was already too serious, too grotesque to dramatize even in Mephistophilean terms. The choice U Thant put before us was clear and specific.

"The world," he said, "now stands at a most critical crossroads. It can pursue the arms race at a terrible price to the security and progress of the peoples of the world, or it can move ahead towards the goal of general and complete disarmament, a goal that was set in 1959 by a unanimous decision of the General Assembly on the eve

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

of the decade of the 1960s. If it should choose the latter road, the security, the economic well-being and the progress not only of the developing countries, but also of the developed countries and of the entire world, would be tremendously enhanced." (A/7601/Add.1, para. 41)

Because of U Thant's persuasive words and the acute awareness on the part of the Member States of the United Nations that the question of general and complete disarmament was the most important one facing the world, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2602 E (XXIV) of 16 December 1969, which declared the decade of the 1970s as a disarmament decade.

Already at the back of our minds lay the preparations for the adoption of an international development strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade. When, therefore, on 24 October 1970 the General Assembly adopted resolution 2626 (XXV), which proclaimed the United Nations Development Decade starting from 1 January 1971 to create conditions of stability and well-being consistent with the fundamental objectives enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, it was logical that an organic link be forged between the Second United Nations Development Decade and the Disarmament Decade. Hence resolution 2685 (XXV).

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

Besides the unspeakable danger posed to mankind by weapons of mass destruction, the resolution on the Disarmament Decade and the Second United Nations Development Decade clearly focused our attention on two issues. The first was the immense risks for man and his civilization, for international peace and co-operation, involved in the continuing development and stockpiling as well as in the possibility of use or threat of use of weapons of mass destruction -- nuclear, chemical and bacteriological. The second issue was the heavy economic and financial burdens which each and every nation are bearing as a result of the arms race, both nuclear and conventional, particularly the nuclear arms race. We also had to consider the factual situation where, on the one hand, countless millions of people in the developing countries are still undernourished, uneducated, unemployed and totally deprived of essential amenities of life, while on the other hand, thousands of people in the developed world, though not begging for bread, are still unfulfilled and frustrated because of soaring inflation and unseemly diversion of resources, which ought to be used to improve the quality of their lives and cities, into the production and technology of weapons that afford them no security beyond what they had before.

In implementation of resolution 2685 (XXV), which I referred to above, the Secretary-General appointed a Group of Experts on the Economic and Social Consequences of Disarmament under the able leadership and chairmanship of Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden. That Group of eminent and select experts was given the following terms of reference:

"(a) To formulate suggestions for the guidance of Member States, the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency, as well as other organizations of the United Nations system, with a view to establishing the link between the Disarmament Decade and the Second United Nations Development Decade so that an appropriate portion of the resources that are released as a consequence of progress towards general and complete disarmament would be used to increase assistance for the economic and social development of developing countries;

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

"(b) To propose measures for the mobilization of world public opinion in support of the link between disarmament and development and thus encourage intensified negotiations aimed at progress towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control." (Resolution 2685 (XXV))

The experts' report on the link between disarmament and development which was later issued as document ST/ECA/174 in August 1972, was most informative and instructive. The report was unanimous and it endorsed related conclusions reached in 1971 by another panel of experts who reported on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and of military expenditures.

I shall read only two paragraphs from the two reports, one from each. Paragraph 120 of the Secretary-General's report entitled "Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures" in document A/8469 read as follows:

"A halt in the arms race and a significant reduction in military expenditures would help the social and economic development of all countries and would increase the possibilities of providing additional aid to developing countries." (A/8469, para. 120)

Paragraph 22 of the Alva Myrdal report read as follows:

"Disarmament would contribute to economic and social development through the promotion of peace and relaxation of international tensions as well as through the release of resources for peaceful uses."

(ST/ECA/174, para. 22)

It is paradoxical and absurd that five years after the adoption of the Disarmament Decade and the Second United Nations Development Decade, at a time when we speak lyrically of détente, of the lessening of international tensions, the resources being used in each country, particularly in the nuclear-weapon States, for military instead of peaceful purposes have continued to increase. At a time when man's achievements in science and technology are so spectacular and sufficient to master his needs, we live in unparalleled and unprecedented fear -- fear of want, fear of security.

World military expenditures in 1970 were roughly \$200 billion. Today, the expenditures on armaments are approaching \$300 billion a year. They are increasingly absorbing the human and intellectual resources so desperately needed to enhance the economic and social life of all States and which, if employed for peaceful purposes, could have a tremendously positive impact, especially on the developing countries, where the need for trained manpower and the lack of material and financial resources are most keenly felt.

Apropos our consideration of the link between the Disarmament Decade and the Second United Nations Development Decade is the reference to the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD). The General Assembly, in adopting resolution 2602 E (XXIV), declaring the Disarmament Decade, requested the CCD to resume its work with a sense of urgency. Besides drawing the attention of the CCD to all relevant proposals and suggestions before the First Committee relative to the debates on disarmament, the General Assembly pointedly requested the CCD to work out a comprehensive programme of disarmament under effective international control.

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

Earlier on, the CCD had adopted its agreed principles for disarmament negotiations in September 1961 and subsequently, as a price for the General Assembly's endorsement of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the CCD on 15 August 1968 adopted the following provisional agenda for its work:

"1. Further effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament.

Under this heading members may wish to discuss measures dealing with the cessation of testing, the non-use of nuclear weapons, the cessation of production of fissionable materials for weapons use, the cessation of manufacture of weapons, and reduction and subsequent elimination of nuclear stockpiles, nuclear-free zones, etc.

"2. Non-nuclear measures.

Under this heading members may wish to discuss chemical and bacteriological warfare, regional arms limitation etc.

"3. Other collateral measures.

Under this heading members may wish to discuss prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed etc.

"4. General and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control." (A/7189-DC/231, para. 17)

In recounting the aforementioned facts and resolutions, the co-sponsors of the draft resolution I am introducing do not have only negative criticism in mind; they fully appreciate the serious political and security implications of disarmament. Our main point is that it is high time that concrete measures leading towards the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, be formulated in detail and a plan of action to execute those measures agreed upon without further delay.

We believe that the achievements of the Disarmament Decade, as the reports of the Secretary-General on the mid-term review of the Disarmament Decade in documents A/10125 and A/10294 have shown, are too paltry to leave things as they are. The second half of the Decade has to be drastically different. Only thus, we believe, can we achieve some progress in the field of disarmament; only thus can international peace and co-operation be fostered; and only thus can economic and social justice be attained in our individual countries and in the world.

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

With the Committee's permission, I now commend the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.731 for its unanimous approval. Its seven preambular paragraphs flow from the review and appraisal of various General Assembly resolutions and the relevant experts' reports to which I have referred. Similarly, its seven operative paragraphs merely reaffirm the commitments and obligations that we have already assumed to promote substantive disarmament negotiations.

Operative paragraph 1 is familiar to us, as kitchen utensils are to a diligent housewife. It is the anchor-sheet of the Charter; otherwise we cannot speak of uniting our strength to maintain international peace and security in conformity with the principles of justice and international law.

Operative paragraph 2 is a truism; it needs no elaboration or clarification.

Operative paragraph 3 is not a value judgement; it is a statement of fact. Both nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States have said the same thing so often in better and more persuasive language. Both the rich, industrialized countries and the poor, developing countries say so. The Secretary-General of the United Nations and all the panels of experts which have been seized with the subjects of disarmament and development have said so. All States stand to benefit economically and socially from disarmament -- and, if this means availability of resources to close the ever-widening gap between the rich and the poor nations of the world, all the better for our world.

Operative paragraph 4 imposes no extraordinary obligations upon Member States and the Secretary-General. The Member States and the Secretary-General are merely being requested to continue to do -- and do more efficiently and for good reason -- what they have already undertaken to do years ago.

Operative paragraph 5 carries the same import as the preceding paragraph.

Paragraph 48 of the Alva Myrdal report on the economic and social consequences of disarmament spoke of the purpose of mobilizing public opinion in support of the goals of disarmament and development. The idea

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

was for Member States and the Secretary-General to spotlight the blatant contrast between the waste of resources on armament and the great unfulfilled needs of social and economic development. We would like the Secretary-General to give the objectives and purposes of the two Decades -- that is, the Disarmament Decade and the Second Development Decade -- a more aggressive visibility and prominence in his report so that world public opinion may be more aware of them. There may be also other appropriate demands on his time and resources by Member States anxious to realize the purposes and objectives of the Decade. The co-sponsors of the draft resolution would like the Secretary-General to be of assistance to such States, if so requested.

Operative paragraph 6 is an invitation to the CCD to reflect the wishes of the United Nations for disarmament and détente more accurately in its deliberations. The principles which form the basis of its negotiation are not a mere form of words. Its agreed agenda is relevant and workable. Collateral measures are not substitutes for substantive disarmament. If there are difficulties other than political considerations, let them be tackled realistically, purposefully and with deliberation. That is why we believe that a review and appraisal of its principles and method of work by the CCD itself may enable it to return to its true track, to decide upon a working programme of concrete negotiations based on concern and priorities.

The last operative paragraph -- operative paragraph 7 -- will enable us to consider the subject-matter next year.

In conclusion, I should like to announce that Liberia has joined the sponsors of this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Nigeria for introducing the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.731.

Mr. DOMOKOS (Hungary): Our Committee has before it for a decision the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.725. Last Friday, the representative of Poland gave us a detailed and convincing explanation of the underlying motives that guided the sponsors of the draft in proposing its adoption by the Committee with a view to facilitating the prohibition of chemical weapons. In his introductory statement Ambassador Wyzner dealt extensively with both the preambular and the most important operative paragraphs, setting forth considerations of expediency and necessity for supporting the draft. For my part, I wish to make a few points only.

The first paragraph of the preamble reaffirms General Assembly resolutions calling for the prohibition of chemical weapons. The first of those resolutions adopted in December 1968 has been followed by others each year. Today we can say once more that the draft resolution now before us is not out of place at all but is of great topical interest.

(Mr. Domokos, Hungary)

Almost all speakers in the First Committee have felt it necessary to point with regret to the lack of any notable progress in this field over the past years. A number of General Assembly resolutions and insistent appeals by delegations have brought no tangible result to date. In 1975 the CCF has been presented with several new documents, but it has not yet got as far as taking up debate on these and earlier working documents with a view to reaching an international agreement.

Given the fact that so many resolutions have not been implemented, there might well be a justifiable concern about the present draft resolution sharing a similar fate. I think we have more chance this time, and 1976 may well signalize a turning point in contrast to previous years.

What can we invoke in support of this hope? First, the numerous proposals, working documents and draft conventions submitted to the CCD provide an appropriate basis for identifying the positions of the different countries and groups of countries, as well as the meeting points which might give substance, on the basis of consensus, to the provisions of a draft convention.

Second, the accession of the United States of America to the Geneva Protocol of 1925 may encourage further positive steps towards an early conclusion of a convention as the instrument of a more comprehensive regulation.

Third, the B Convention, which entered into force early this year, may also provide an impulse towards another international arrangement on related aspects.

An added element is the pressure of international public opinion, which may similarly spur on States still maintaining an attitude of reserve to develop a political willingness to settle this question. This is indeed necessary in view of the immense threat posed to mankind by chemical weapons.

One may reasonably suppose that tremendous material and human resources are wasted on research into, and experiments with, chemical agents that may easily be put into weapons and utilized for development of new systems of

(Mr. Domokos, Hungary)

chemical weapons. Such weapons are being produced even today in peacetime. The delay in reaching agreement on their prohibition makes it more likely that an increasing number of new weapons like binary nerve gases will be added to the arsenal of these extremely perilous and highly destructive methods of warfare, with the resultant build-up of such systems of weapons as are deemed to have even more terrible and largely indiscriminate effects upon human life, and to pose a serious threat to the security of States. Delay on an agreed international regulation may also facilitate proliferation of these dangerous types of weapons.

Such danger may be further increased by the fact that certain chemical agents can be used in a relatively short time-lag after discovery and experimentation. Consequently, an effective and strict prohibition would make a substantial contribution to general and complete disarmament, to the reduction of arms expenditures and to the release of funds and human energy for nobler purposes and projects of greater utility to mankind, with stronger peace and security ensuing in their wake.

The bacteriological Convention has fortunately come into force, but the problem remains that relatively few States have signed it and many signatories are delaying ratification. This fully warrants the need for operative paragraph 4 of document A/C.1/L.725, inviting all States that have not yet done so to accede to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction.

In like manner, any accession to the Geneva Protocol, which is thus far the most important international arrangement in this field, will strengthen hopes of reducing the danger of these types of weapons being used in war, and increase the probability of reaching, with less effort, an agreement on as comprehensive as possible a prohibition, and also of securing the accession of a greater number of States. Accordingly, operative paragraph 5 cannot be considered superfluous either, on the contrary, it is most important and may have a direct influence on the preparation of a draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Domokos, Hungary)

I believe that these observations entitle me to express my hope that our Committee will adopt this useful draft resolution by consensus, since it was carefully co-ordinated in the course of its preparation.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Mexico to introduce the amendments in document A/C.1/L.729.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): In this statement I shall explain, as briefly as I can, the purpose, meaning and scope of the 15 amendments which the delegations of Nigeria, Peru and Mexico have submitted to the First Committee in document A/C.1/L.729. So that the representatives who are present may derive the utmost benefit from my statement, I would urge them that when they listen to me, they have before them two documents: document A/C.1/L.721, which is the draft resolution to which the amendments apply; and, of course, the document that contains the amendments, document A/C.1/L.729.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

In its resolution 3261 D (XXIX) of 9 December 1974, the General Assembly appealed to all States, in particular nuclear-weapon States, to exert concerted efforts in all the appropriate international forums with a view to working out promptly -- I repeat the word "promptly" -- effective measures for the cessation of the nuclear arms race and for the prevention of the further proliferation of nuclear weapons.

In one way and another the same resolution requested studies on peaceful nuclear explosions from five different sources. First of all, the International Atomic Energy Agency was requested to continue its studies on the peaceful applications of nuclear explosions, their utility and feasibility, including legal, health and safety aspects.

Secondly, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) was urged in submitting its report to the General Assembly on the elaboration of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban, to include a section on its consideration of the arms control implications of peaceful nuclear explosions.

Thirdly, the hope was expressed that the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons would also give consideration to the role of peaceful nuclear explosions as provided for in that Treaty.

Fourthly, the two nuclear Powers were, in connexion with the above, invited to provide the Review Conference with information concerning such steps as they had taken since the entry into force of the Treaty, or intended to take, for conclusion of the special basic international agreement on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes envisaged in article V of the Treaty.

Finally, the Secretary-General was invited, if he deemed it appropriate, to submit further comments on this matter.

That resolution, 3261 D (XXIX), containing the provisions I have just recalled, had as its source the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690, sponsored by 11 delegations, to which five others were added later, submitted to the First Committee last year. In introducing the draft resolution at our 2018th meeting, on 13 November 1974, the representative of the Netherlands emphasized that:

"The subject of the draft resolution is the problem of horizontal and vertical proliferation and the interrelationship of peaceful nuclear explosions with such proliferation." (2018th meeting, p. 11)

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Thus the draft resolution dealt with -- and here again I am quoting the representative of the Netherlands in his statement of a year ago:

"... two closely interrelated subjects. First of all, it addresses itself to the problem of horizontal and vertical proliferation in general. Secondly, it highlights the steps to be taken on the different aspects of peaceful nuclear explosions so as to counter the possible risks which such explosions can pose for the achievement of an effective system of control of nuclear weapons." (Ibid., p. 12)

A few days later, on 18 November 1974, when some amendments were submitted to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690, to which I have just referred, and those amendments were incorporated in the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.693/Rev.1), and then became General Assembly resolution 3261 D (XXIX), in introducing the amendments in document A/C.1/L.693/Rev.1, we indicated that we shared the basic reasoning that had led the sponsors to submit the draft to the Committee, and we suggested that, in addition to the four bodies of which the draft in document A/C.1/L.690 requested studies, reports and documents, there were other sources, and perhaps the most important ones: the two nuclear super-Powers which were the authors of the draft revised text on non-proliferation, which became the Treaty itself. The representatives of those super-Powers on 31 May 1968 made separate statements regarding the provisions of article V of the future treaty. Those statements are reproduced in document A/C.1/1052, which my delegation submitted last year. We would venture to hope it is still in existence. If it is, we recommended that all representatives read it.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

From what I have said it is clear why the delegations of Nigeria, Peru and Mexico -- and now Grenada has been added to them -- felt compelled to submit, in document A/C.1/L.729, a series of amendments to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.721, which was introduced on 13 November by the delegation of the Netherlands on behalf of its co-sponsors. The purpose of our amendments is twofold: first, to restore the balance that exists in resolution 3261 D (XXIX) between the problem of the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons and the question of the horizontal proliferation of these weapons; and, secondly, to complete the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.721, which, apart from overlooking the problem of vertical proliferation, seems intentionally to forget the invitation addressed by the General Assembly last year in operative paragraph 5 of resolution 3261 D (XXIX) to the United States and the Soviet Union:

"to provide the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons with information concerning such steps as they have taken since the entry into force of the Treaty, or intend to take, for the conclusion of the special basic international agreement on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes which is envisaged in article V of the Treaty".

The first amendment proposed in document A/C.1/L.729 reproduces almost word for word the fourth preambular paragraph of resolution 3261 D (XXIX). We believe that the co-sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.721 could not object to this, since the origin was their own text, document A/C.1/L.690 of last year. For the same reason, we believe that the second amendment -- which is intended to go back to the text of the sixth preambular paragraph of last year's resolution -- cannot be objected to either. The third amendment is to delete the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.721, since, while we agree with the idea expressed therein, we consider that the present wording might induce some Governments to have mistaken interpretations regarding international co-operation in the field of nuclear technology -- a co-operation which is specifically recommended in article IV of the Non-Proliferation treaty.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The next two amendments, namely, the fourth and the fifth, are intended to make the sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs accord with article V of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. That is also the purport of the seventh amendment.

The new preambular paragraph proposed in our sixth amendment is almost identical to the amendment the delegation of Mexico submitted a year ago. I say "almost identical" because at this time it is necessary to add, after the word "recalling" the words "once again", so that, as may be seen at the top of page 2, the amendment will read:

"Recalling once again the statements made at the 1577th meeting of the First Committee, held on 31 May 1968, by the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America concerning the provisions of article V of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons which relate to the conclusion of a special international agreement on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes (A/C.1/1052)" (A/C.1/L.729, p. 2).

I shall now go on to the operative part of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.721. In this connexion, in our eighth amendment we propose that a new paragraph be added at the beginning of the operative part, the text of which is the same as that of paragraph 1 of resolution 3261 D (XXIX) of last year. The ninth, tenth and eleventh amendments are linked to the present operative paragraph 1, and a new paragraph would be inserted which, if our eighth amendment is accepted, would become operative paragraph 2. The amendments we suggest are intended, apart from slightly altering the wording of subparagraphs (b) and (c), to change the order of the paragraphs so as to follow the same order as operative paragraphs 1 to 6 of the resolution adopted last year.

The reasons which have impelled us to suggest the deletion of the present operative paragraph 2 appearing in document A/C.1/L.721, as we propose in our twelfth amendment, must be obvious to all those delegations whose countries were represented at the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which was held in Geneva last May. Nevertheless, since the vast majority of Members of the United Nations were not present at that Conference, perhaps it would be fitting to recall here that the final document of the Conference was the subject of many statements of interpretation and even some reservations, which are reproduced in annex II of document A/C.1/1068.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The first of these statements of interpretation was the one I had the honour to make on behalf of the delegations of the States members of the Group of 77 parties to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons that participated in that Conference. With that statement we placed on record our view that the relevant provisions of the Final Declaration were to be interpreted, in respect of the position of those delegations with regard to them, in the light of the contents of the working documents mentioned therein and the draft resolutions there included. Among those documents and draft resolutions there appears the draft resolution, reproduced as document NPT/CONF/C.II/L.1, which was presented by eight delegations -- Ghana, Mexico, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Syrian Arab Republic and Yugoslavia -- in connexion with the consideration of article V of the Treaty. The operative part of that draft reads as follows:

"Urges the Depositary Governments of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to initiate immediate consultations with all of the other States Parties to the Treaty in order to reach agreement on the most appropriate place and date for holding a meeting of the Parties in order to conclude the basic special international agreement contemplated in article V of that Treaty."

In the light of the foregoing, it is not difficult to understand the reason why, in our twelfth amendment, we have called for the deletion of operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.721. Likewise, it is easy to realize what reasons have led us to propose instead the inclusion of the following:

"Deplores, in this connexion, that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America have ignored the invitation addressed to them in resolution 3261 D (XXIX) to provide the review conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons with information concerning such steps as they have taken since the entry into force of the Treaty, or intend to take, for the conclusion of the special basic international agreement on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes which is envisaged in article V of the Treaty;" (A/C.1/L.729, para. 12)

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The next two amendments, the thirteenth and fourteenth, are a logical consequence of the preceding one. Hence, in the first of them, the two States possessing nuclear weapons are once again invited to submit such information, this time to the General Assembly at its next session, through the Secretary-General. For this reason also, the second of these amendments, the fourteenth that we propose in document A/C.1/L.729, calls for the deletion of operative paragraph 5 of the draft in document A/C.1/L.721, which, in some manner, might prejudice the information requested of the Soviet Union and the United States.

The last amendment appearing in document A/C.1/L.729 is the one that is customary in these cases, since, if the Committee adopts our amendments, it will be necessary to alter the numbering of the operative paragraphs of the draft in question.

The delegations that co-sponsor these amendments hope not only that they will be accepted by the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.721, but also that they will receive the support of all other members of the Committee. If this should be the case, the General Assembly would have before it a balanced draft resolution reflecting both the purpose and the content of resolution 3261 D (XXIX) and one faithfully answering to both the spirit and the letter of that resolution which we adopted nearly a year ago, on 9 December 1974.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Mexico for presenting the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.729. It is the hope, I think, of everyone here that the co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.721 and the proponents of the amendments in document A/C.1/L.729 will be able to consult appropriately, and I wish them success, in the hope that we will not have to come back to this matter next week.

Mr. NISHIBORI (Japan): I shall address my self briefly to some of the draft resolutions that are before the Committee.

(Mr. Nishibori, Japan)

The first is the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.721, concerning peaceful nuclear explosions, of which my delegation is a co-sponsor.

During the general debate on disarmament in this Committee, I stated that nuclear disarmament had three aspects which are inseparable from each other; they are: first, a nuclear-weapons test ban; second, a reduction in the number of nuclear weapons, and ultimately the destruction thereof; and third, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Each of these three aspects complements the others, and in our efforts to achieve the goal of nuclear disarmament we cannot ignore any of them. Because of my delegation's understanding of these aspects, we have a strong interest in the question of peaceful nuclear explosions and we are trying to solve this question through international co-operation.

(Mr. Nishibori, Japan)

We believe that the question of peaceful nuclear explosions is also one which must be solved by all available means as we seek to ensure non-proliferation and achieve a comprehensive test ban; and in this sense we consider that an agreement on peaceful nuclear explosions would be an important step towards nuclear disarmament. That reasoning does not require any new explanation. For it is plain common sense that, since all nuclear explosions intended subjectively for peaceful purposes are, when viewed objectively, simply explosions of nuclear devices which could be used as weapons, it is impossible to achieve either nuclear non-proliferation or a comprehensive test ban if we leave the problem of peaceful nuclear explosions as it now stands. That is well known and understood by well-informed public opinion in the world. However, I must concede that some delegations criticize our discussions of peaceful nuclear explosions on the ground that they hinder progress on the road towards a comprehensive test ban. But I will ask these critics the following question: how can we plug the loop-holes in a comprehensive test ban, how can we block the development of nuclear weapons by the back door, if we ignore the question of peaceful nuclear explosions? A solution to the problem of peaceful nuclear explosions would be anything but a diversion from our efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament. I submit with all emphasis that, on the contrary, this regulation of peaceful nuclear explosions is an indispensable step towards nuclear disarmament.

Fears have been expressed in this Committee that the discussion of peaceful nuclear explosions may help prevent non-nuclear-weapon States from sharing in the benefits of peaceful nuclear explosions, may deny them the fundamental right of developing nuclear technology, and may even perpetuate the superiority of nuclear-weapon States. Such anxieties derive from a simple misunderstanding and must be removed once and for all. My delegation wishes to emphasize that from the beginning our main objective has been to ensure the rights of non-nuclear-weapon States. In this case, in order that the non-nuclear-weapon States may enjoy the benefits deriving from peaceful nuclear explosions, we have to make certain that the arms control implications of peaceful nuclear explosions -- which are undeniable -- are not used as a

(Mr. Nishibori, Japan)

pretext to deny the right of the non-nuclear-weapon States to enjoy those benefits. Accordingly, we believe that necessary and proper measures with regard to the arms control implications of peaceful nuclear explosions constitute an essential pre-condition for the protection of the rights of non-nuclear-weapon States.

In the light of this explanation of my delegation's position, I wish to express the hope that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.721 concerning peaceful nuclear explosions will obtain the support of an overwhelming majority, just as a similar resolution did last year.

A few minutes ago we heard the representative of Mexico, Mr. Garcia Robles, introduce some amendments to our draft resolution. The proposed amendments deserve careful consideration, as is always the case with any proposal made by Mr. Garcia Robles. My delegation will try to clarify its position on them later.

In drafting the present resolution we have tried to make it as forward-looking as possible rather than dredging up past history. From this viewpoint my delegation wishes to make detailed comments on the proposed amendments after careful study and at an appropriate stage. I would hope, anyway, that the constructive and positive position of the sponsors of the draft resolution will obtain understanding and support.

Next I shall discuss the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.725 concerning the chemical weapons ban, of which my country is also a co-sponsor.

In order to expedite the discussion of a ban on chemical weapons, Japan has left no stone unturned. In April 1974 we submitted a draft convention on banning them to the CCD. We participated actively in the discussions at the informal meeting of experts held at the CCD last year, along with other concerned States. Furthermore, we submitted a working paper to the CCD this summer, as did some other States. It is entitled, "Working Paper concerning the scope of chemical agents that have justification for peaceful purposes and an example of the national verification system".

(Mr. Nishibori, Japan)

For my country it is a matter of no small concern that no significant progress has been made in the deliberations on this question. That is the background to our decision to join in sponsoring this draft resolution, which is aimed at expediting the discussions on banning chemical weapons.

In operative paragraph 2 the draft resolution urges all States "... to make every effort to facilitate early agreement on the effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction;".

Operative paragraph 3 requests the CCD

"... to continue negotiations as a matter of high priority, taking into account the existing proposals, with a view to reaching early agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and for their destruction;".

I believe that this draft resolution embodies the desire of the international community to ban these dreadful weapons, and I appeal for its unanimous adoption.

(Mr. Nishibori, Japan)

I should like now to address myself to the draft resolution on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests in document A/C.1/L.707, which the delegation of the Soviet Union submitted to this Committee. It has been the established policy of the Japanese Government to oppose any nuclear test by any country, and it has made every effort to achieve a comprehensive test ban as the first step towards nuclear disarmament. At the same time, however, my Government has taken the view that all disarmament measures, including those to be adopted for banning nuclear tests, should be effective, with adequate verification procedures. The Soviet draft treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, which is annexed to the draft resolution, fails to provide adequate verification measures against possible underground nuclear weapon testing. Moreover, it does not apply to any nuclear explosion conducted under the name of peaceful nuclear explosions and, in my opinion, this could provide the means of evading the prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. These are the points which have already been expounded in this Committee by many delegations, including the United States representative, who spoke on 30 October. At any time in the future when the question of the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests is considered, I would urge the countries concerned to examine other proposals, such as the draft treaty proposed by the Swedish delegation to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on 2 September 1971, together with the points I have just made.

The Committee has before it another Soviet proposal, the draft resolution in A/C.1/L.711 on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction, to which a draft agreement is annexed. I agree that even at this stage, before they come into use, it is necessary as a preventive measure to ban the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and of new systems of such weapons. According to the draft resolution, the draft agreement will be referred to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. As article I of the draft agreement indicates, what is to be prohibited in the agreement is "to be specified through negotiations on the subject."

(Mr. Nishibori, Japan)

I suggest that the specific weapons to be prohibited should first be made clear. However, as the representative of the United Kingdom stated in his intervention in this Committee on 13 November,

"... such preventive measures, dealing with possible future weapons, should not divert our attention from the need to deal with the vast quantity of armaments held now by many nations." (2086th meeting, p. 58-60)

Here I should like to stress that the control, reduction and destruction of nuclear weapons, which are the most destructive weapons known to us, should be given the highest priority in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, and that the importance of nuclear disarmament should in no way be neglected.

As for the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones, we have before us the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.724 and A/C.1/L.734.

As is clear from their special report, the Ad Hoc Group of Qualified Governmental Experts agreed that, in the regions where appropriate conditions for a nuclear-weapon-free zone exist, the establishment of such a zone would contribute to achieving the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, to halting the nuclear arms race, and to strengthening international security, and they also agreed that the creation of such a zone should be effected in accordance with international law, the principles of the United Nations Charter and the fundamental principles guiding the mutual relations of States. On the other hand, agreement was not reached on such important questions as the scope of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, what is to be banned, and the rights and obligations of zonal and nuclear-weapon States. This attests to the fact that the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones involves extremely complicated and difficult factors which require further in-depth study and consideration. Under the circumstances, the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.734 submitted by Finland would best serve our interests. My delegation, therefore, intends to give its full support to the proposal.

But my delegation finds it difficult to associate itself with the idea of defining the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones and the principal obligations of nuclear-weapon States by a General Assembly resolution.

(Mr. Nishibori, Japan)

Accordingly, the attitude of my delegation towards the draft resolution will be guided by the considerations which I have just explained.

Concerning the draft resolution on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, my delegation welcomes its unanimous endorsement by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean for approval by the General Assembly. As a member of the Ad Hoc Committee, my delegation continues to support the efforts made in that Committee for the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, which we believe would be a useful step towards the relaxation of tension and promotion of disarmament in this vital area. The consultations carried out this year, as is shown by operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, have yielded some tangible results on the question of convening a conference on the Indian Ocean. My delegation hopes that the further consultations of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean will lead to positive results on the agenda and other arrangements for the proposed conference, which would open avenues for meaningful and constructive dialogue with the great Powers and the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean, whose co-operation is essential for the realization of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal): The purpose of my intervention this time is to express our full support of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean as contained in document A/10029, which was submitted to this Committee for consideration by its Chairman and our distinguished colleague, Mr. Amerasinghe of Sri Lanka. I should like also to express my appreciation of the efforts that were made by Mr. Amerasinghe in trying to reach a consensus through consultations between the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, the big Powers and the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean on this question.

The maintenance of peace and security in that area is a matter of vital importance to my country, as one of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean. We are, therefore, taking great interest in all endeavours towards the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

Nepal's desire for peace is genuine and total. My country has always supported all moves, however small, which advance the cause of peace at all levels, whether national, regional or international. Our unreserved support of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, whether in Latin America, in south Asia, in the Middle East, in Africa or in the south Pacific, is motivated by the one and only desire of my country to see the atmosphere of peace and security restored in all such areas and ultimately in the world as a whole. The establishment of peace zones, though it does not directly constitute a disarmament item, greatly contributes to the restoration of international peace and security, which is the main purpose of all nuclear-weapon-free zones and the ultimate goal of all disarmament moves. We are, therefore, of the opinion that any move or initiative by any country or group of countries towards the creation of such peace zones which stems from their genuine desire and aspiration to live in peace, free from tension, should receive the serious consideration of the international community.

For the Indian Ocean to be a zone of peace it is imperative that further escalation and expansion of the military presence of the big Powers in the Indian Ocean be halted; that all the bases, military or naval, the disposition of nuclear weapons and all other manifestations of great Power military presence, whether "imperialistic" or "non-imperialistic", in the words of the representative of Sri Lanka, be eliminated. Every one of us is convinced that the greater responsibilities lie with the big Powers themselves, whose support and willingness are of essential importance in achieving those objectives and in the meaningful creation of, and respect for, such peace zones.

It is, however, regrettable that the big Powers and other major maritime users of the Indian Ocean have refused to enter into consultation with littoral and hinterland States on this question, and have not been giving the necessary support and co-operation to the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean in the discharge of its functions. It is, therefore, highly essential that the great Powers enter into consultation with the littoral and hinterland States without further delay as called for in the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, which was adopted at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

As a clear consensus on the demilitarization and denuclearization of the Indian Ocean exists among the littoral and hinterland States, the forthcoming conference could appropriately address itself to this issue.

We also appreciate the concern expressed by some littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean on the question of guaranteeing the security of States within the zone. We very much hope that the matter will receive careful consideration during the deliberations at the proposed conference so that acceptable arrangements may be devised to ensure valid conditions for the security of countries within the zone.

It is our considered opinion that a conference on the Indian Ocean should be convened at the earliest possible time, with prior consultations between the littoral and hinterland States, the big Powers and all major maritime users of the Indian Ocean and with adequate arrangements so that the question of the creation of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace may be examined in all its aspects to the satisfaction of all the parties concerned, and practical ways and means leading to the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace may be devised. We strongly support the extension of the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean so that it may continue consultations with all the parties concerned and submit its report, including the results of the consultations, to the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, and also recommend the time and venue of a conference on the Indian Ocean.

As a small peace-loving and non-aligned country, Nepal will always endeavour, as it has in the past, to contribute to its maximum possible capacity towards the maintenance of peace in the region in particular, and of world peace in general. The genuine and ardent desire of Nepal for peace is well known and was further emphasized by my august sovereign His Majesty the King of Nepal in his farewell address to his coronation guests. He said:

"We need peace for our security, we need peace for our independence and we need peace for our development."

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

It is with this total dedication to the cause of peace that my delegation has supported the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace from its very adoption, and we shall continue to lend our full support to the meaningful establishment of a genuine zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. It is in the same conviction that my delegation whole-heartedly supports the draft resolution contained in document A/10029.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Finland to introduce the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.734.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): On 3 November my delegation indicated its intention to present a draft resolution on the comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects. After consultations with the delegations countries whose experts participated in the work of the Ad Hoc Group of Qualified Governmental Experts and a number of other delegations, we are now in a position to introduce a draft resolution on the matter in document A/C.1/L.734.

My delegation had wished that all the 21 countries which participated in the Ad Hoc Group would sponsor this draft resolution. While the overwhelming majority of them were prepared to sponsor it, some special considerations made it impossible for all of them to do so. In these circumstances we, and most of the prospective sponsors, felt that this draft resolution should be presented by Finland alone. We are nevertheless confident that it will be adopted by consensus, as was the case with resolution 3261 F (XXIX) last year.

This draft resolution which I now have the honour to submit for consideration by the First Committee is above all of a procedural nature. In the view of the Finnish delegation, it therefore does not prejudice, nor does it preclude, any consideration of substantive issues arising from the study.

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

I am not going to deal with the study itself in any detail since the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group did so earlier when he presented his report to us. Let me only comment very briefly on certain points in the draft resolution.

As to the preamble, the first three paragraphs follow a conventional pattern. As to the fourth paragraph, one of the very purposes of the study was to enhance further efforts concerning nuclear-weapon-free zones as provided for in last year's resolution 3261 F (XXIX). By throwing light on various relevant aspects, we think the study will indeed enhance further efforts and thus serve usefully those purposes which were set forth in resolution 3261 F (XXIX). It recognizes that the establishment of such zones can contribute to the security of the members of such zones, to the prevention of proliferation of nuclear weapons and to the goal of general and complete disarmament. The fifth preambular paragraph reflects the over-all positive conclusion of the Ad Hoc Group as to the role of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the field of disarmament.

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

The sixth paragraph of the preamble expresses the wish that the study will be of assistance to States interested in the establishment of such zones. This follows from the general character of the study. As the Finnish delegation said on 3 November, the aim was not an academic exercise but a practical study to be of assistance to those who are interested in nuclear-weapon-free zones, by analysing both the opportunities and the problems involved.

Now, with regard to the operative part I think it is only appropriate to begin by expressing gratitude for the effective and highly qualified work done by the Ad Hoc Group. The task of the Group was greatly facilitated by the valuable support of the Secretary-General and his staff. Similarly, the Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and other international organizations associated with the study are to be commended for their assistance in the preparation of the study.

In order to give an appropriate follow-up to the study, the draft resolution commends the special report to the attention of all Governments, IAEA and other relevant international organizations, and requests the Secretary-General to give the widest possible publicity to it. As a further step, we have felt it proper to invite all Governments and relevant international organizations to give their views, observations and suggestions on the special report so as to enable the Secretary-General to prepare a comprehensive report based on this material. That is the main objective of our draft resolution. That report is meant to serve as a basis for further deliberations during the thirty-first session of the General Assembly under the proposed item entitled "Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all of its aspects".

The idea of creating nuclear-weapon-free zones has aroused steadily growing interest over the years. It has become one of the possible instruments of States in their efforts to enhance security in their respective regions and to contribute to a lessening of the danger of nuclear proliferation world wide. By increasing knowledge of the various aspects of nuclear-weapon-free zones we can best promote efforts towards that goal.

With those considerations in mind, I have the honour to recommend, on behalf of the Finnish delegation, this draft resolution for adoption by consensus in this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to announce that Kenya has become a co-sponsor of the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.725, A/C.1/L.728 and A/C.1/L.731.

I now call on the representative of Cyprus to introduce an amendment to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.727.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): In introducing an amendment to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.727, I wish first to commend the co-sponsors of that draft resolution, and particularly the delegation of Romania, which was the inspiring spirit of this item.

The draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.727 is very important because it requests a new study by experts that will call attention to new developments that will make the cessation of the arms race even more necessary, having in mind its economic, social and other consequences and its harmful effects on world peace and security. Hence, the matter turns upon the need to stop the arms race. That is the whole purpose of the draft resolution and the study for which it calls.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The resolution adopted on it in 1973, resolution 3075 (XXVIII) makes it very clear. It states:

"Noting that, despite the repeated calls by the General Assembly for the adoption of effective measures to put an end to the arms race ...

"Deeply concerned about the ever-spiralling arms race ...

"...

"Considering that persistent action is necessary in order to halt and reduce the arms race ...

"Calls upon all States to make renewed efforts aimed at adopting effective measures for the cessation of the arms race ..." (resolution 3075 (XXVIII))

Would it not be pertinent in a study that is to be made in this respect, which will take account of the new developments, to include a phrase in operative paragraph 2 where it:

"Requests the Secretary-General to update, with the assistance of qualified consultant experts appointed by him, the report on the economic and social consequences of the arms race" ...

"... the report of the Secretary-General on the economic and social consequences of the arms race ..."

"... extremely harmful effects on world peace and security ...

"... covering the basic topics of that report and taking into account any new developments ..."

The "new developments" are referred to in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the preamble, where it says:

"... new developments have taken place in the fields covered by the report of particular relevance in the present economic and political conditions ..."

Then, in the fifth paragraph of the preamble:

"Considering that the ever-spiralling arms race is not compatible with the efforts aimed at establishing a new international economic order ..."

So the new developments are this: that now as never before the arms race has to be stopped because otherwise there cannot be funds available for the new economic order the project for which was practically adopted in the special session of the General Assembly this year.

Therefore, in view of this situation where there are new developments now calling for the study of the Secretary-General to be updated, in the new light of the imperativeness of stopping the arms race, surely there must be, at least logically, in that study some consideration given to the possibilities that will make feasible the stopping of the arms race.

It seems lopsided to insist on emphasizing the dangers and the evils of the arms race merely in a negative way and not proceed in a positive way to suggest something be done to help towards arresting the arms race. Therefore, it should normally be included in that study now, in situations where it becomes imperative to stop the arms race -- a consideration of alternative security to the arms race by international security through the United Nations.

It is not that we are going to impose international security through the United Nations. To avoid a study in this respect seems a peculiar inconsistency with the aim for stopping the arms race. It means that we want to make a great fuss about the arms race, but we do not want to help towards stopping it. It seems so extraordinary that we want to have the arms race stopped, because of its consequences, but we would refuse a study to consider the only alternative to the arms race, namely international security.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

I do not think it should be necessary to argue at length to show how imperative it is to have a study of international security as part and parcel of every effort to stop the arms race. The fact that the consequences of the arms race are very destructive to economic and social order, does not make it less necessary but more necessary to consider the aspect of international security. Because, it was suggested, from some source or other, that this is a study merely about the economic consequences of the arms race. But the economic consequences of armaments do nothing more than to show the need of stopping it. The economic consequences do not stop the arms race. They just simply show how terrible it is and how those who carry out the arms race are to be considered as doing something wrong.

But let us help all the nations, because all the nations are turning to armaments -- and quite reasonably -- how can they do otherwise when there is no international security. The Charter did not provide for no armaments with no international security. It provided for international security pre-eminently.

Therefore, it seems to me quite logical, and that is why I put it to this Committee here, that on this occasion where a study is made with so much emphasis on the arms race and the need of its cessation, a look must be given to the aspect of international security through the United Nations. The study may come out and say: "It is not possible to have international security through the United Nations." Let us know it. It may say that it is possible in this way. But not to have anything to do with international security in such a study seems not to be within the spirit of the draft resolution to be adopted here for a new study in view of the developments.

I would, therefore, hope that the sponsors, in their obvious desire to bring an end to the arms race and to proceed in a logical way towards that end, will see the advisability of adopting this amendment which is really intended to strengthen their otherwise most praiseworthy effort in that draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I call the attention of the Committee that the representative of Cyprus also introduced this amendment last Wednesday, and the amendment appears in the official records of the Committee; also, an informal paper has been distributed for the consideration of delegations. I hope that this afternoon we will be able to proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.727. I am sure that at least one of the co-sponsors will be able to give the position of his delegation on this amendment.

I should like to announce that Tunisia has become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/L.725.

I wish to invite the Committee to take a decision on document A/C.1/L.725 concerning chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. Does any delegation wish to explain its vote before the vote?

Mr. BA (Guinea) (interpretation from French): With reference to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.725, of 20 November 1975, I wish to say that my country has always condemned the utilization and perfecting of chemical and biological weapons. We feel that biological and toxin weapons should be eliminated from war arsenals, and for this reason my Government was very pleased with the entry into force of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and hope that that Convention will make an important contribution to the negotiation of an appropriate agreement on the subject.

My delegation, which supports United Nations efforts to eliminate those arms, will therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.725.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegation has indicated its desire to speak at this time, is it the Committee's wish to adopt this draft resolution by consensus? If I hear no objection, I shall take it that that is the Committee's wish.

The draft resolution (A/C.1/L.725) was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations which wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. YEH (China) (interpretation from Chinese): With regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.725 which was just adopted, if that draft had been put to a vote the Chinese delegation would not have participated.

Mr. MISTRAL (France) (interpretation from French): My country did not wish to oppose the consensus that we have just had on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.725 on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons, even though it contains an explicit reference to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. But I must point out, in this connexion, that our participation in the consensus in no way implies a change in France's position with respect to that body; on the contrary, our position remains unchanged. The reservation which I make now will apply in all cases where a similar situation arises.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Mexico on a point of clarification.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation listened with much interest a few minutes ago to the introduction of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.734 by the representative of Finland. When the time comes, we hope to be able to vote in favour of that draft, since we find no contradiction between it and the one submitted by six delegations in document A/C.1/L.724 -- which I had the honour to introduce in the Committee two days ago -- the more so that in the seventh preambular paragraph of that draft resolution we were very careful to express clearly the following:

"Bearing in mind that, without prejudice to the results that may be obtained through any further examination of this matter, from the analysis of the contents of the special report it is already possible at this time to draw certain incontrovertible conclusions" (A/C.1/L.724).

But on listening to the statement of the representative of Finland, and on rereading the text of document A/C.1/L.734, it seems appropriate for me to indicate my impression that it would perhaps be well to clarify the contents of two of the operative paragraphs. I refer to paragraphs 7 and 8. In fact, in the draft as now worded reference is made to two reports: one is the special report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), which transmits to the General Assembly the study of the experts, together with the comments of the members of the CCD; the second report specifically mentioned is in paragraph 6, which requests the Secretary-General to prepare a report based on information received under paragraph 5.

As my delegation sees it, that report, if the usual practice is observed, will be a compilation to be made by the Secretary-General of the observations, views and suggestions -- to use the words in paragraph 5 -- requested therein.

I would therefore ask the representative of Finland -- while not expecting an immediate reply, but so that he may think over what I am going to ask -- to which of these two reports does paragraph 7 refer, in which the Secretary-General

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

is requested to "arrange for the reproduction of the report as a United Nations publication and to give it the widest possible publicity...". I assume that to be the special report. The other report, the compilation of observations, we do not yet know what it will contain. Perhaps 80 or 90 States will reply -- and that is what my delegation hopes; or, as was unfortunately the case with the military budgets, maybe only 25 or 30 States will reply; and, of course, we do not know either the extent or the nature of those replies.

Therefore, I repeat: my impression is that the reproduction requested there refers to the special report. If that is so, my delegation suggests that that be clearly stated -- "reproduction of the special report" -- so as to avoid any misunderstanding.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

In paragraph 8 it is recommended to all Governments that they "give a wide distribution to the study" and, in the final part, "to use their facilities to make the report widely known". That wording, "to give a wide distribution to the study", seems to me to be ambiguous. If the representative of Finland would agree, I think it should be made more specific. I would suggest that in paragraph 8, wording similar to that of operative paragraph 1 be used, which refers to "the special report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament containing the comprehensive study", and so on.

So that if this were done, then paragraph 8 would read:

"Recommends to all Governments to give a wide distribution to the special report containing the comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones", and then go on with what it says here: "so as to acquaint public opinion with its contents, and invite the relevant international organizations to use their facilities to make the report widely known".

Instead of "the report", we would say "that document", or, to repeat it, "the special report".

Those are the questions, together with suggestions, which my delegation would venture to offer for the time being in regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.734.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.