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Mr. KOMIVES (Hungary): The First Committee is now discussing the disarmament items, including the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) in an international situation which is generally characterized by détente. There are many here and there who criticize the results achieved so far in the conditions of détente, but no one can deny that there has been a very important turn from the cold war to a relaxation of tension, from confrontation to negotiation, from a deadlock to the solution of important international problems, or at least to the beginning of their solution.

The Hungarian delegation deems it very important that there is a growing understanding of and support for the idea according to which political détente should be accompanied by military détente, in order to become more comprehensive and irreversible. It is in this context that we consider the various forms and forums of disarmament negotiations, from bilateral talks like SALT, through regional ones like the Vienna negotiations on Mutual Reduction of Forces and Armaments and Associated Measures in Central Europe, to global approaches like the Geneva Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. It is in this spirit that Hungary takes part in the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and the Vienna negotiations.

No one can ignore the efforts made for progress in the above-mentioned bodies, but at the same time no one can be really satisfied with the results achieved in the last period. The Hungarian delegation attaches the utmost importance to the resumed SALT talks in Geneva and expects further concrete results. We continue to believe that the results of the SALT negotiations have been not only in the interest of the United States and the Soviet Union but of universal significance. The Vienna negotiations on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe have met with difficulties because some delegations are disregarding the principle of equal security which is the basis for any successful disarmament negotiation and agreement. In the global, multilateral disarmament forum, CCD, no significant progress has been made lately and thus the Geneva Conference has been unable for three consecutive years to present a draft convention to the General Assembly. At the same time I have to add that the debates and expert meetings held and the suggestions made are very important and may enable us to find solutions to the problems we are facing.
The Hungarian delegation continues to be of the opinion that the most important problem of our time is the curbing of the nuclear arms race and the elimination of the danger of nuclear war.

To begin with, I should like to touch upon the partial test-ban Treaty, which was 10 years old last year. Today we can note with satisfaction that it can be expected that the provisions of the said Treaty will be more widely observed than they have been before. The intention of the French Government to stop atmospheric testing has been a step forward. My delegation notes this development and would like to express the hope that the example of France will be followed and thus that atmospheric nuclear testing will soon be totally eliminated.

After long years of deadlock we can register some progress in the direction of a comprehensive test ban, too. The threshold test-ban Treaty concluded this year between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States can be considered as a step towards a comprehensive ban. It is of great importance that this Treaty also contains a commitment by the signatories to hold further negotiations for a comprehensive ban.

The efforts made so far towards a comprehensive test ban are well known. The question of verification has until now been an obstacle to agreement, although the scientific and technical problems of a comprehensive test ban have been fully clarified. The Hungarian delegation continues to share the opinion of many delegations that national means of detection are sufficient for reliable control and verification of underground nuclear tests.

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons attracts growing attention from countries Parties to the Treaty and non-parties to the Treaty as well. The Hungarian delegation holds the view that the non-proliferation Treaty has been the most important instrument for halting the spread of nuclear weapons. Hungary was among the first to sign and ratify the Treaty and continues to think that this very important international legal instrument should rest on a universal basis with the widest possible adherence. In this connexion, my delegation takes note with satisfaction that the Federal Republic of Germany has completed the ratification procedure. We take this opportunity to renew our appeal to those States which have not yet done so to sign and ratify the non-proliferation Treaty.
Recent developments have enhanced the significance of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and that of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. Therefore the Hungarian delegation attaches great importance to the resolution adopted by the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in September this year which authorizes the Director-General of the Agency to establish within the secretariat a separate organizational unit with responsibility for the provision of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. Another significant move has been made by the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom and some other countries regarding the export of nuclear material and of certain categories of equipment and other material. They have committed themselves not to provide such materials to any non-nuclear-weapon State even for peaceful purposes, unless the source of special fissionable material is subject to safeguards under an agreement with the IAEA.

We are approaching the review conference of the non-proliferation Treaty to be held in May next year in Geneva. Hungary has the privilege of participating in the Preparatory Committee. We consider that the first two sessions of the Preparatory Committee have made good progress, and we are looking forward to its third session. We are doing our best to contribute to the strengthening of the Treaty by a well-prepared and successful review conference, which will doubtless be one of the most important international events of the coming year. My delegation wishes to express the hope that in the course of this preparatory process for the conference additional countries, among them near-nuclear ones, will accede to the Treaty.
The Hungarian delegation, in principle, attaches great importance to the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We consider it an essential factor in limiting the nuclear arms race and reducing the danger of a thermonuclear holocaust. It is against this background that my delegation views the two new items on our agenda concerning the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

The Hungarian delegation listened with great interest to the proposal of Ambassador Hyvärinen of Finland concerning the preparation of a comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-free zones. We consider it an important and timely one. At the same time we are open-minded as to the selection of the body to be entrusted with the preparation of such a study; thus we could accept the idea it should be the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

While tackling the various problems of curbing the nuclear arms race, we must not lose sight of our ultimate goal in nuclear disarmament, which is the permanent prohibition and total destruction of nuclear weapons. That is why the Hungarian delegation continues to support the declaration on the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, submitted by the Soviet Union and adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session. We should like to express the hope that the Security Council will soon take the necessary action provided for in the declaration.

This year again the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament devoted a great part of its activity to the question of the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. This activity has been characterized by the submission of many important documents, among them a draft convention, by meetings of experts and by intensive debates. Hungary has been in favour of prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles, in order to eliminate for ever those weapons of mass destruction. It was in that context that Hungary participated in the elaboration of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction. We consider that Convention an important step towards the prohibition of chemical weapons.
It is in that spirit that my country has joined the sponsors of the draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons, submitted by the socialist countries in 1972 (CCD/361). As is well known, the draft convention of the socialist countries provides for the prohibition and destruction of all chemical weapons on the basis of purpose criteria and of an appropriate combination of national and international means of control. Unfortunately no real progress could be made in this respect because some Western countries were not ready for concrete negotiations aimed at preparing a common draft. The submission of the Japanese working paper (CCD/413) and then the Japanese draft convention (CCD/420) could not break the existing deadlock. The general situation remained unchanged, and the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament was again unable to present a common draft convention to the General Assembly.

In these circumstances the Hungarian delegation attaches great importance to the agreement between the USSR and the United States to consider a joint initiative for the conclusion, as a first step, of an international convention dealing with the most dangerous, lethal means of chemical warfare. We expect that the submission of this joint initiative will enable the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to overcome the present obstacles, to prepare a joint draft convention and to submit the draft for consideration and endorsement to the General Assembly.

One year from now we shall be observing the fiftieth anniversary of the 1925 Geneva Protocol, which has proved itself to be a very important and effective international legal instrument in prohibiting the use of chemical and bacteriological methods of warfare. Unfortunately there are countries which have not yet acceded to it. We take this opportunity to renew the appeal to those States which have not yet done so to sign and ratify the Geneva Protocol. Taking into account the forthcoming fiftieth anniversary of the Protocol, my delegation considers that it is necessary to give special emphasis to this question in the draft resolution to be adopted by this session of the General Assembly concerning agenda item 28.
Almost all of the delegations which took part in the general debate paid special attention to the problem of the constant increase in military expenditures. I am not going to deal with all aspects of the problem. I should like to touch upon only one question -- that under agenda item 24, reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent. As will be recalled, the last session of the General Assembly overwhelmingly supported the idea of a mutual reduction of the military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council, submitted by the Soviet Union. In so doing, the General Assembly recognized its competence in promoting disarmament, and thus international security, and confirmed the concept of linking the increase of development aid, in a very useful though not exclusive way, with disarmament measures taken by the permanent members of the Security Council.

We now have before us the Note of the Secretary-General in connexion with the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 3093 A (XXVIII) and the report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 3093 B (XXVIII). Having studied those documents, we cannot hide our dissatisfaction with the present state of affairs. The Hungarian delegation very much regrets that the proper functioning of the Special Committee has been impossible because some permanent members of the Security Council and some Western European countries refused to serve on that Committee.

Otherwise, the preparation of the experts' report has been a useful piece of work. One does not have to agree with all its details, especially all the rather over-emphasized technical considerations, to be able to support its general message which, not surprisingly, is in line with the Soviet proposal. It proves, with the authority of the contributing experts, that the reduction of military budgets is a most desirable and viable method of promoting international security through disarmament and of increasing development aid. It presents a picture of the different possibilities in this field and discusses the methods of complicated and more straightforward measures, among them that proposed by the Soviet Union. In so doing it conveys one simple conclusion: there must be the political will to achieve results.
The Hungarian delegation reaffirms its whole-hearted support of resolution 3093 A (XXVIII) of last year's General Assembly. We are convinced that both time and expert opinion have proved the importance and the practical nature of this measure, and we invite all those countries which represent the impressive majority in favour of this endeavour to continue to join their efforts with ours to bring about, as soon as possible, circumstances in which the reduction of military budgets can start.

I should like to turn now to the question of convening a world disarmament conference, which has been before the General Assembly since 1971. We have here the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, and we have had the opportunity to listen to the lucid introductory statement of Ambassador Hoseyda, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee.

The study of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee proves once again that an overwhelming majority of States are in favour of convening a world disarmament conference. Such a conference, adequately prepared, could provide a universal forum for disarmament discussions, and channel all the ideas, suggestions and proposals concerning disarmament into a broad stream. Thus, it could contribute to the strengthening of the work of various disarmament negotiating bodies in arriving at concrete agreements.

The Hungarian delegation considers the convening of a world disarmament conference more timely than ever. It is the considered opinion of my delegation that the results achieved so far in the conditions of détente have already furnished the necessary basis for the convening of the conference. The results to be derived from the conference, by coupling political détente with military détente, could further consolidate détente, providing better possibilities of making it comprehensive and irreversible.

Hungary has, from the very beginning, been in favour of convening an adequately prepared world disarmament conference. It is in this spirit that Hungary expressed its position in the First Committee, in the CCW and in the Ad Hoc Committee on which my country had the privilege to serve. The Hungarian delegation feels it necessary to express its appreciation to France and to the United Kingdom for their participation in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee, and
at the same time expresses its regret at the continued absence of the United States and the People's Republic of China from the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. My delegation would like to hope that these two countries will reconsider their positions concerning the world disarmament conference.

To sum up, the Hungarian delegation deems it necessary to continue the work concerning the world disarmament conference. In this respect we could favour the adoption of a draft resolution entrusting a body, which could be the present Ad Hoc Committee, with the concrete preparation and organization of the world disarmament conference.

Finally, the Hungarian delegation welcomes the forthcoming enlargement of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament because we think that it will become more representative by this action. As a member of the CCD, we extend our warm welcome to the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Iran, Peru and Zaire, which have been invited to become members of the CCD. My delegation offers its co-operation to the new members of the CCD and expects that the enlargement of the Geneva Committee will lead to fruitful negotiation and to new results in the work of the CCD.

Mr. M. I. Hassan (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): It goes without saying that each and every people on this planet yearn for disarmament. Disarmament has always been the dream of humanity. This is so because it reflects the desire of humanity for greater resources; yet in actual fact, it is a destructive activity. Based on 1973 prices, our world is spending on armaments a sum which ranges between $205,000 million and $240,000 million, a sum equal to the income of developing countries in all South Asia, the Far East and Africa. What a waste of the limited resources of our world and what a waste of the possibilities for creativeness which has been given to mankind. But we find that the really armed countries spend 80 per cent of the total amount of expenditure on armaments. So, if the whole world is disarmed with the exception of a few countries, this would save only 20 per cent of the total expenditure on arms. And we cannot ask those who do not have sufficient weapons to defend their existence to be unarmed. This shows us the direction in which our efforts should be channelled. Needless to say, the rise in the
expenditure on armament means an armament race both in terms of quantity and quality. This happens at a time when there is much talk of international détente. The facts would impel us to say that the relaxation of international tension and the establishment of warmer relations among countries cannot be achieved unless the atmosphere of détente permeates the whole world, and unless this is combined with a real desire for disarmament.

If the matter had been left to this Assembly, it would have achieved a lot. But we know that the resolutions adopted by the Assembly are not binding and the really important resolutions are those adopted by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and its machinery, which does not have normal relations with this Assembly. But we hope that the Committee on Disarmament will treat the resolutions of this Assembly with the respect they should command and that the resolutions of our Assembly will give the Committee on Disarmament some inspiration and wisdom.

During the past year we talked about the report of the Committee on Disarmament submitted to the previous session, and we said that when we read its report, we must feel a sense of despair because the report is void of any real progress in the field of disarmament. What we said last year may be applied to the report of the Committee on Disarmament submitted to us this year in document A/9708. In reading this document, we find that no tangible progress has been achieved on the issues which have been given priority by the General Assembly. And if we want to be more accurate, we find that all that has been achieved by the disarmament talks is the agreement on the prohibition of bacteriological (biological) weapons.

In the field of the prohibition of nuclear tests, there are some nuclear countries which respect those provisions of the agreement concerning a partial test ban. But there are some countries which have not become a party to the agreement and which are not bound by its provisions on the pretext that the agreement did not take their interests into account. We notice that those who conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere are encouraged by those who are carrying out nuclear tests in an environment which has not yet been subject to any international agreement. And we mean by this the underground tests.
As a result, nuclear tests are still being carried out both in the atmosphere and underground. In view of this situation, we want to express our deep concern with regard to nuclear tests in any environment whatsoever, because these tests, as we know, would mean a further increase in armaments, pollution of the environment, and a threat to the health of future generations. At this time, we urge all nuclear States to desist from conducting nuclear tests anywhere in the world. If this is not done, nuclear testing will be increased, as will the number of nuclear States.
We are also aware of the problems of inspection and verification that are linked to these tests and that have always been the obstacle impeding the prohibition of these tests. Good faith and mutual confidence alone are capable of solving these problems. The delegation of the Sudan thinks that the special agreement concluded between the Soviet Union and the United States at the summit Conference in Moscow cannot be an alternative for a comprehensive test-ban Treaty. We would welcome the Threshold Agreement if those who have concluded it would agree to subject their peaceful nuclear explosions to international controls and to entrust that control to IAEA.

After painstaking negotiations, the international community agreed to adopt the international document that would ban the proliferation of nuclear arms. That agreement would have been more effective had it found the necessary support from everyone. We say this because we know of the criticism that has been levelled against the Treaty, particularly by those who have not signed it and those who did not want to be bound by its provisions.

Some of them consider that that Treaty is unjust in some of its aspects because it does not give countries equal duties and equal rights.

May I also say that the smaller countries which should have obtained assistance in accordance with articles IV and V of the Treaty have not obtained the desired benefits. Moreover, there are those who think that the States Parties to the Treaty, which have certain duties in accordance with article VI, have failed to carry out their obligations. We know that article VI provides that those countries should conduct negotiations without any delay in order to stop the nuclear arms race and to achieve nuclear disarmament.

There is a great deal that can be said about the guarantees offered to the non-nuclear States. Whether the Treaty on the prohibition of the proliferation of nuclear weapons is the greatest achievement since the beginning of the nuclear age, or whether it is a modest effort, it is, nonetheless, the most we have been able to achieve so far to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and to lessen the dangers emanating therefrom.
But the Treaty, like many of the international agreements reached in our troubled world, is not ideal. Our duty at this important juncture is to enable States, by means of the Treaty, to cope with events and developments of international relations. Hence, the importance of the conference to be held in order to review the Treaty.

Sudan is a member of the Preparatory Committee of the aforementioned conference. The conference has to consider many of the aspects of the Treaty, which require careful scrutiny. In that regard we would mention the following: first, strengthening the measures concerning the security of non-nuclear States; secondly, establishing international machinery to supervise nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, as provided in article V of the Treaty; thirdly, the possibility of applying the guarantees provided for by the Treaty to all Parties to it; fourthly, studying the means by which countries which are Parties to the Treaty may be compelled to implement the provisions of the ninth preambular paragraph and article VI of the Treaty.

As regards chemical weapons, we do not think that any progress has been achieved towards the conclusion of an agreement. After perusing the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, we notice that the two Co-Chairmen of the Conference have reached a preliminary agreement to start talks among them in order to draw up an agreement on the prohibition of the most dangerous chemical weapons. Thus, after strenuous effort, and after a long period of time, the necessary political will has been forthcoming to permit our arriving at an appropriate measure to prohibit some chemical weapons. We hope to achieve an agreement banning the production and development of all chemical weapons. As we take note of the preliminary agreement between those two countries, we express the hope that it may not be undermined because of a race in which each country would be trying to strengthen its bargaining position in the negotiations.

The establishment of nuclear-free zones constitutes an important element of the policy of my country, which is working for the accomplishment of disarmament and the realization of world peace.
This is one of the important measures contributing to the process of disarmament. The declaration of the conference of non-nuclear States declared that nuclear-free zones play an important role in preventing the proliferation of destructive weapons and contributing to the achievement of disarmament. Article VII of the Treaty prohibiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons has given the States the right to establish nuclear-free zones in all parts of the world. Africa announced, in 1964, the denuclearization of the region and the Council of the League of Arab States has adopted a resolution to declare the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Our support of the Tlatelolco Treaty and its initiative is undiminished and it is clear that the declaration of certain areas as nuclear-free zones would put an end to the dissipation of material and human resources. Therefore, we approve of any initiative designed to render any part of this world a nuclear-free zone.

We think that the first step which should be taken to declare any region nuclear-free is the signing of the Treaty banning the proliferation of nuclear weapons. That is the main test of good faith and goodwill on the part of all those who demand the declaration of any given area as a nuclear-free zone. We find that all African-Arab countries have signed that Treaty, and we are pleased by the announcement of the Egyptian representative a few days ago that his country would accede to and ratify the Treaty if Israel would do likewise. We are waiting for a positive effort on the part of those who have come to lecture us about the implementation of an initiative we approve of whole-heartedly.

As regards item 24, our attitude is similar to what it was last year. We have supported resolution 3093 A and B (XXVIII) which was adopted last year. The delegation of Sudan, as part of the group of developing countries, has always called for measures that would link disarmament with the need to speed up the process of development in developing countries. Our delegation has read the report of the Group of Experts in document A/9770 and we should like to thank the Experts for their efforts, because they have really submitted a good report which contains much important information on the subject. That report states that the reduction
of military budgets on disarmament will not achieve successful results, unless there is sufficient good will and unless the countries concerned provide sufficient information about their budgets and about their desire to implement any relevant agreements.

We notice that the international climate today is more propitious than before and therefore we should try to improve the international atmosphere still further so as to pave the way for the implementation of the initiative of the Soviet Union.

Last year my delegation supported the call for the convening of an international disarmament conference. Our attitude still remains the same. There is an urgent need for the convening of such a conference, because no considerable achievements have been realized in that field and we hope that new initiatives may advance the issue of disarmament and that guidelines and principles may be laid down during the second part of the Disarmament Decade.

There is no magic formula for achieving the necessary conciliation between divergent views as regards the convening of a conference and the definition of its objectives and aims. In this case also, we can only hope for a better atmosphere and a climate more conducive to the convening of the conference.

The Sudanese delegation takes pleasure in supporting the new initiative submitted by the Soviet Union and included under item 103.

These are some of our views with regard to some of the issues submitted to us. We hope to deliver a detailed statement on the two subjects of napalm and incendiary weapons and the Indian Ocean when the draft resolutions concerning those two items are submitted to the Committee.
Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): It gives me great pleasure at the outset of my statement to extend to Ambassador Ortiz de Rozas our congratulations on his election to the chairmanship of this Committee. I should like also to congratulate all the officers of the Comité on their election. The praiseworthy efforts exerted by Ambassador Ortiz de Rozas in the field of disarmament both at the Geneva Conference on the Committee of Disarmament, where he represents his country, Argentina, and here at the headquarters of the United Nations, give us hope that the deliberations in this Committee will yield positive results not only in the field of disarmament but also with regard to the other responsibilities and functions assigned to the Committee.

It is indeed a source of pleasure to us that our meetings are taking place against a world atmosphere governed by the policy of détente and by a constructive trend towards the elimination of tension in all parts of the globe. The big Powers, headed by the United States and the Soviet Union, realized that the cold war constituted a terrible threat to mankind as a whole and had brought our contemporary society to a very dangerous pass. The danger emanated not only from the tension which accompanied the cold war but also from the fact that there were many elements of instability and decadence inherent in that situation. The cold war was similar to a needle standing amidst powerful and unpredictable storms; just as it is inevitable and natural that such a needle will fall sooner or later, so it was similarly inevitable that we should move from the cold war stage either to the stage of an all-out destructive war or to a path leading to peace. The choice of the latter alternative was the result of patient efforts exerted by the responsible authorities in the United States, the socialist countries and Europe, which were clear evidence of profound political wisdom and farsightedness.

In this connexion I cannot but pay a tribute to the new Government of Portugal for the steps taken to renounce its colonialist policy in Africa, thus restoring to the Portuguese people their dignity and their rightful place among nations. It is my belief that such steps encourage the establishment of a world climate characterized by stability and peaceful coexistence.
A number of representatives who have spoken before me have expressed their hope that the policy of détente will be extended and will encompass the whole world. On behalf of the delegation of my country I should like to announce here that I share that hope with them. My country is a small one which is passing through a stage of development and exerting its utmost efforts to diversify its economy, which is dependent on an exhaustible natural resource, oil. It has decided to devote all its natural resources for purposes of development, without overlooking the need to assist other, friendly developing countries which are suffering from the consequences of the present economic crisis.

We are indeed sorry that some of the consequences of the cold war are still prevalent among us, such as, for instance, the arms race, in which some of the developing countries have begun of late to participate. The competition in the development of traditional and nuclear weapons and the increase in the number of countries, including developing ones, which devote a considerable part of their income to armaments, constitute a grave threat to international peace and security, not only because the existence of such a large quantity of weapons is in itself a great danger but also because this certainly leads to increased deficits in the balance of payments and exposes the population to hunger and famine, as well as widening the gap which separates those countries from the developed ones.

For this reason and because the armaments race is one of the main factors in the present world trend towards inflation, we support the convening of a world disarmament conference in the nearest possible future so that the big Powers may be able to submit constructive and hopeful proposals and so that the political détente of which we are now reaping the benefit may become a military détente and eliminate for ever the threat of war.

In this connexion I should like to welcome General Assembly resolution 3095 A (XXVIII) which supports the Soviet proposal aimed at 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. The importance of adopting such steps was clearly demonstrated during the sixth special session of the General Assembly when it was shown that the world community must hasten to provide assistance to developing countries in order to avoid the catastrophes which might be the
outcome of the present economic crisis. The reduction by the big Powers of their military budgets would not only be an important factor in eliminating or reducing tension but would also be likely to have a good effect on world peace since it would help the third world to promote development.

The delegation of my country welcomes the constructive steps that have been taken so far in the field of disarmament, including the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, as well as the bilateral agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union, such as the Treaty signed in June this year with the aim of restricting underground nuclear tests.
Such steps effectively contribute to the relaxation of world tension, but I believe that in themselves they are insufficient and that we must take more courageous steps under the auspices of the United Nations. I should prefer that such steps be compatible with the danger inherent in the situation and with the need to devote natural resources for purposes of international development.

My delegation believes that the creation of nuclear-free zones, in addition to contributing to the relaxation of tension in the regions, would also constitute steps forward in the area of comprehensive world disarmament. For this reason, I should like to express my delegation's unqualified support of the Iranian-Egyptian joint proposal to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. This region, which has suffered and is still suffering many of the evils of war and of continuous tension cannot, in our view, be exposed to any other nuclear arms race, and my country, which belongs to this region, has a natural and earnest desire for the stabilization of peace and security.

It is clear that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East should be based on sound foundations, including a pledge by all countries of the region to refrain from the production or acquisition of nuclear weapons and that nuclear States should not introduce such weapons in the region or use them against any country there. We are also in favour of establishing a world machinery to supervise such arrangements.

In this connexion I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to the real concern of the region arising from Israel's failure to sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, a fact which has led Egypt to refrain from ratifying the Treaty after having signed it. I do not doubt that the accession to this Treaty by all parties concerned in the region would have a positive effect on the stabilization of peace and security in the Middle East.

The use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes is an inherent right for all States, in spite of the fact that the acquisition of a nuclear-power technology may enable some countries to produce nuclear weapons. The possibility of acquiring this nuclear ability has now become available to a larger number of countries, and I therefore believe that any international convention or agreement
designed to prevent nuclear testing for military purposes would be extremely effective in reassuring a larger number of peoples that are at present concerned about the possibility of the military use of this powerful source of energy.

The discovery of nuclear energy was the outcome of scientific experiments conducted by extremely able scientists, and I believe that those scientists were fully aware of the peaceful as well as military potential of this energy. Science has always aimed and is still aiming at reaching the truth, and this objective in itself constitutes a great service to humanity and human progress. But science is a double edged sword; it can be used for peaceful purposes and it can also be used for destructive purposes. In our belief, the responsibility of using science and applying technology for peaceful purposes falls on the shoulders of politicians in countries and not on the shoulders of their scientists.

For example, I should like to mention that the famous scientist Albert von Szent-Györgyi, the Nobel Prize winner for his discovery of vitamin C, expressed his dissatisfaction because his discovery contributed to lengthening the Second World War since that vitamin is used in the prevention of scurvy and was used by Nazi crews to attack merchant and naval vessels as they could thus stay at sea for longer periods. That example clearly demonstrates that while science is designed to benefit man, its application for military purposes is the responsibility of leaders. Its use by warmongers defeats its original purposes.

In order to make sure that scientific discoveries are used for peaceful purposes, we should strengthen the international machinery, such as the International Atomic Energy Agency, and also the measures designed to prevent the proliferation of weapons, ensuring that any nuclear explosion would be for peaceful purposes only, and to control and limit the power of such explosions.

The legitimate fears of the international community as the result of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the continuation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests should not make us overlook the danger of chemical and bacteriological war. In this context I welcome General Assembly resolution 3077 (XXVIII), which calls on States to adhere to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on
Their Destruction and to accede to the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare of 17 June 1925.

The scientist who devotes his efforts to the discovery of lethal bacteria is capable of channelling those efforts to attaining means of enabling mankind to combat and resist diseases. The methods of preparing toxin phosphorous compounds are similar to those used in preparing chemical agents which may be used in the treatment of fatal diseases; and tests aiming at the discovery of fatal and toxin gases and bacteria are likely to increase the possibility of acquiring new and dangerous methods of warfare, thus threatening the life of millions of human beings.

In dealing with the question of weapons endangering peaceful civilians, I must refer to the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons. A large number of civilians died victims of napalm during the Second World War and the Korean and Viet-Nam wars. The Palestinian refugees in Lebanon -- men, women, children and the aged -- are still being exposed to barbaric Israeli napalm attacks on their camps. My delegation urges the countries producing napalm and other incendiary weapons to halt their production and use and to destroy existing stockpiles. A group of Harvard University scientists who have greatly contributed to scientific progress in numerous fields have also effectively participated in the preparation of napalm.
The methods used by some to influence the environment for military purposes should also be directed to the improvement of the environment and to the removal of the effects of pollution, which is a consequence of our civilization and of industrialization trends. Considering that these methods may influence the climate and affect man's survival, I urge those countries which adopt such methods to take into consideration the Soviet proposal in document A/C.1/L.675 submitted on 24 September 1974, which calls for the prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes which are not compatible with the need to maintain international security, human well-being and health.

That any country should be able to launch a secret war against another country by altering its climate or effecting certain changes in the ozone layer is a source of grave concern among us. That is a subject which is worthy of the attention of all countries, not only of the big Powers, and I believe that the maximum that small countries can do in this respect is to urge the big Powers to reach an agreement along the lines of that suggested by the Soviet Union.

Before I conclude my statement, I should like to deal briefly with a subject which has a direct impact on the peace and security of my country, namely, the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. In this connexion I should like to appeal on behalf of my delegation to the big Powers which have military bases and spheres of influence in the area, as an initial step to desist from strengthening those bases or expanding their spheres of influence. We hope that that step will be followed by the liquidation of their military presence in the area as a whole. These measures are likely to be effective in the progress towards general and complete disarmament and would cause all the peoples of the area to pay tribute to and express their admiration for the big Powers.

Considering that the two items concerning establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace are directly related to the security of my country and its vital interests, I reserve my right to speak about them in future if the matter so requires.
The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Qatar for the kind remarks he addressed to the officers of the Committee.

Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): I shall devote my statement entirely to the Middle East denuclearization proposal since I spoke earlier on disarmament in general.

Rarely, if ever, has the Middle East been closer to the shimmering glimmer of hope for a just and durable peace. Its long history has been rent by bitterness and torn by uncertainty. Despite the yearnings of the authentic peoples of the Middle East for peace and security, foreign Powers have been meddling, either directly or by proxy, in the affairs of the region. Other regions have either subdued the causes of conflict or eliminated them whereas the Middle East is still enmeshed in a conflict of such proportions that it may engulf all its peoples in a horrible inferno. International endeavours designed to wipe out the causes of conflict in our area are essential to inject a wider understanding and also to contain local passions fanned by these causes. Hence, my delegation attaches particular importance to the proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the region of the Middle East.

The proposal was jointly submitted by Iran and Egypt, countries with which we have the closest bonds of friendship and co-operation. I should like to take this opportunity to express the appreciation of my delegation for the statement made by Her Imperial Highness Princess Pahlavi of Iran on the morning of 25 October which placed this topic in a broad perspective and touched on its wider implications. I should also like to pay tribute to Ambassador Abdel Meguid of Egypt who on the same afternoon made a comprehensive statement in which he laid down certain basic principles for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the region of the Middle East.

My delegation is unshakably convinced that the chief components of any course of action expected to attain effectiveness are the following.

First, the States of the region should refrain from producing, acquiring or possessing nuclear weapons; secondly, nuclear States should refrain from introducing nuclear weapons into the area, or using nuclear weapons against any State of the region; and thirdly, a system of international control should be established for the implementation of previous commitments.
My Government fully endorses these principles which, if strictly observed, would ensure the noble aims they are intended to fulfil.

These principles derive additional weight from the fact that adherence to the non-proliferation Treaty has not been universal. The non-proliferation Treaty prohibits the transfer by nuclear-weapon States to any recipient whatsoever of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. It also prohibits the receipt by non-nuclear-weapon States from any transferor whatsoever, as well as the manufacture or other acquisition by those States, of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

Kuwait was among the first countries to sign the non-proliferation Treaty. We have neither the ambition nor indeed the pretension to be nuclear, but we do have apprehensions. Yes, we do have apprehensions. Information flows out thick and fast to the effect that Israel is actively engaged in the production of nuclear weapons and that it has already received all the technical assistance it needs from abroad. Moreover, impartial international disarmament research institutes and bodies supply us with adequate information about the activities of Israel in the field of nuclear weapons. That is the main reason for our apprehensions. If we do not become apprehensive, then -- to borrow the old Kuwaiti proverb -- we will not be worthy of the pure milk we sucked from the breasts of our mothers. The clouds of uncertainty in our area are thickened by such reports. Conventional weapons have already ravaged the area for so long, causing unspeakable devastation and gruesome deprivation.
The attempts to introduce nuclear weapons into our already torn area amount to an ominous act of crass insensibility. It will cut asunder the remaining fibres of reason. Kuwait believes that universal adherence of the non-proliferation Treaty will restrict the evils of nuclear weapons and may ultimately lead to their prohibition and destruction. However, the fact that many militarily significant and near-nuclear States are still outside the non-proliferation régime naturally undermines the Treaty and makes it of limited value. My Government is convinced that the proposal to establish a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East can act as a surrogate in our region for the non-proliferation Treaty provided all the countries of the region, with no exception, accept the régime establishing a nuclear-free zone in our region.

While discussing the proposal to establish a nuclear-free zone in the region of the Middle East, we believe that we can gain much by studying the example of the Latin-American continent, which proved to be a pioneer in this field. The Latin-American countries have shown us the way in the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which not only prohibits the testing, use, manufacture, production or acquisition of nuclear weapons by any means by the countries of the region but also contains provisions binding on the nuclear States.

According to Additional Protocol II annexed to the Treaty, the nuclear-weapons States undertake to respect the status of military denuclearization of Latin America as defined in the Treaty, not to contribute to acts involving a violation of the Treaty and not to use nuclear weapons against the parties to the Treaty. We hope that the régime for establishing a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East would also include a similar arrangement guaranteeing respect for the status of the region on the part of all nuclear Powers.

My delegation hopes that at the present session a draft resolution will be adopted to initiate a process that will in due course and without much delay make a living reality of the concept embodied in the proposal to create a nuclear-free zone in the region of the Middle East. The people of the Middle East have long suffered from war and devastation and would like to apply their energies to the task of building and construction in an atmosphere free from fear and anxiety.

In line with our policy of supporting arrangements for regional denuclearization, my delegation finds the proposal of Pakistan for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia meritorious and worthy of support. It may sound impossible to denuclearize the universe at a stroke,
but it is certainly possible to approach denuclearization on a regional basis. The concept of regional arrangements has been tested with admirable success, so it is heartening to note that proposals for nuclear-free zones are multiplying. That is a clear indication and tangible proof of the determination of the small Powers to extricate themselves from great-Power rivalry and of their refusal to be used as pawns in the conflict between the big Powers. Such proposals will put flesh on the slender skeleton of détente and will ultimately help to promote better relations among the big Powers.

Naturally, action on the proposal of Pakistan will have to be taken by the countries of South Asia which are our immediate friends and neighbours. South Asia is in an area by no means noted for its wealth. It needs all its resources for its economic development and welfare. No country in that area can afford the exorbitant price of nuclear devices. Such devices are devastating to mankind in war and equally to budgets in the absence of war. We understand the anxiety of countries of the area such as Pakistan and believe that necessary measures to dispel it should be taken by all the countries therein and by the international community. We have a stake in their security and welfare which we hope will reinforce our efforts and have a salutary effect on our plan.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon representatives who wish to exercise the right of reply.

Mr. ERELL (Israel): I wish to exercise my right of reply because I strongly feel that the representative of Qatar was in contravention of the admonition from the Chairman at one of our previous meetings against injecting extraneous material of a polemical nature into our debates here. At any rate, I should like to make it absolutely clear that there is no truth at all in the allegation that Israel attacks in any way, shape or form civilians anywhere in the Middle East or outside it. The method of warfare which consists of attacking civilians, particularly schoolchildren and women, is strictly the method used by the Arab terror groups.
Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): This is a committee, the First Committee, not a bazaar for polemics. I understand that. I have no inclination or genuine proclivity for polemics.

That was not the answer expected of Israel. The question is this. Is Israel going to sign the non-proliferation Treaty or not? That is the essence and genesis of this debate.

We are not discussing incendiary weapons or the napalm-bombing of refugees. We do not here discuss the exchange of napalm or refugees in Israel or in Lebanon. What we are discussing is the crux of the matter. And the crux of this constructive debate is that the countries that have so far refrained from signing the non-proliferation Treaty should adhere to it, sign it and scrupulously observe it.

That is the answer we expect of Israel. We do not expect denials. We are not really anxious about denials, counter-denials, charges and counter-charges. What we want, and legitimately so, is to know whether Israel is going to sign the non-proliferation Treaty or not. That is the source of our apprehension. We were and still are apprehensive because of information flowing from every source -- and the Western Powers in particular -- to the effect that Israel is bent on manufacturing nuclear weapons.
We should like these apprehensions to be dispelled and they cannot be dispelled by countercharges or charges but by a clear-cut commitment that Israel is going to sign the non-proliferation Treaty. That is the answer which we expect and legitimately ask for from the representative of Israel.

Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) (interpretation from French): The representative of the authorities occupying Palestine has just told us that Israel does not attack innocent people. We all read this morning in The New York Times the report that I have before me, which I shall read in English:

"A squadron of Israeli gunboats bombarded a Palestinian refugee camp of Rashidiyeh in southern Lebanon, today, just hours after the Lebanese Army said it had repulsed an Israeli ground patrol in the same area.

Preliminary casualty reports received at the Beirut offices of WAFA, the Palestine news agency, said three persons had been killed and five others wounded in the Israeli naval attack." (The New York Times, 31 October 1974, p. 2)

The Chairman: Before calling on the next speaker inscribed on the list, I should like to appeal to all representatives here that we should not start a debate in this Committee on matters which are not really related to the Committee and which should be discussed in another forum.
Mr. ERELL (Israel): Mr. Chairman, I fully concur in your strong suggestion that the debates here should be confined to the items on the agenda. As a matter of fact, our Chairman warned us that he would have to stop any speaker who strayed outside the direct limits of the question under discussion.

I have only a few words in reply to the previous speaker whose entire contribution was really quite outside the subject on our agenda.

Everybody knows, including the previous speaker, that the refugee camps in Lebanon are in a large measure, in fact, armed camps of the Arab terror organizations. The murderers of Ma'alot, of Nahariya and of all those other villages where women and children were killed, came from those camps. Those are the places where these people are trained, armed and from which they are sent on their murder missions.

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning this meeting I wish to announce that the delegations of Egypt and Ghana have co-sponsored the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.675.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.