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Mr. HUERTA (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): It is with pride that the delegation of Chile speaks on the items regarding disarmament which appear on the agenda of this First Committee, because my country, together with her sister Republic of Argentina, which you, Mr. Chairman, so worthily represent, on 28 May 1902 signed the first treaty on disarmament and arms limitation known in the history of the world, thus setting an example of peaceful vocation which, in the course of the years, has but strengthened. It is precisely because of this vocation for peace that my delegation cannot fail to express its concern at the arms race in which the world is engaged, both at the level of nuclear weapons as at the level of conventional weapons.

The deplorable consequences which this arms race generates both for international stability and for the process of economic and social development to which our peoples aspire, make it urgent that the role which the United Nations is called upon to play should take concrete form. A first priority, which as in past years my delegation wishes to emphasize, relates to the urgent need to halt nuclear and thermonuclear testing. The repeated appeals to those States which are not yet parties to the Treaty which prohibits nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, to accede to it have proved to be fruitless. Accordingly, it becomes essential to make a renewed effort to ensure the full effectiveness of this instrument as well as to improve on it by prohibiting underground nuclear tests.

In regard to the last aspect we note with satisfaction the agreements reached between the United States and the Soviet Union on the limitation of underground tests which, despite their restricted scope, constitute a positive step within this procedure. However, the possibility of a treaty intended to achieve a general prohibition of these tests is still remote, not because of the difficulties in regard to supervision procedures, which have been
invoked more as a pretext than because they really exist, but because there is as yet no firm will on the part of the nuclear Powers which have primary responsibility in this field.

In close connexion with the problem of the cessation of nuclear tests, we must also refer to the need to further the implementation of the non-proliferation Treaty by encouraging the participation of a larger number of States by demanding compliance on the part of the nuclear Powers with the provisions of articles V and VI and, above all, the strict application of safeguards measures which constitute the corner-stone of the non-proliferation system. Only in this way will it be possible to arrive at an effective system of non-proliferation, particularly at a time when technology makes the differences between military and peaceful application of nuclear tests more theoretical and more difficult to determine every day. It is our hope that the conference which will consider and review this Treaty will provide an adequate framework for its improvement.

Consideration of the problem of general and complete disarmament is still trailing along with no set course. The scant and practically non-existent progress indicated in the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament is discouraging. We still believe in the essential usefulness of that multilateral forum, but we also believe that it is necessary to transform it into an effective vehicle to achieve the objective of disarmament. An undoubtedly positive step in this direction has been the invitation to join the Conference extended to the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, Iran, Peru and Zaire. My delegation also would be extremely pleased to see Australia join this important forum.

The agreements reached between the United States and the Soviet Union on the prevention of nuclear war, on basic principles for negotiations of new limitations of strategic offensive weapons, on the limitation of anti-ballistic missiles and on other points, together with the limitation on underground tests which I have referred to, do undoubtedly represent
important though partial progress in disarmament. Nevertheless, bilateral negotiations do not exempt the United Nations from its primary responsibility regarding the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament. In this connexion, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should continue to maintain under constant study and analysis the progress and development of negotiations between the nuclear Powers.

On the other hand, it is indispensable for any policy leading to disarmament to be progressively subject to control procedures which would give a real guarantee as to compliance with the commitments entered into.

On 31 October last, Senator James L. Buckley, in the Overseas Press Club of New York, made specific denunciations regarding violations of the SALT agreements. Problems of this kind can become more frequent daily, since the development of the technology of warfare will facilitate the discovery of mechanisms which will ingeniously make it possible to sidestep any commitments that have been assumed. Only strong control can prevent such situations. Here again, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has the unique responsibility of promoting the appropriate solutions.

The delegation of Chile received with satisfaction the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference of which my country is a member. In the opinion of my Government, the Committee has efficiently discharged its mandate which, as is known, was limited exclusively to the study of the opinions and suggestions made by Governments in connexion with the convening of and conditions for holding that conference. This important initiative, the origin of which is to be found in the Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Countries was held in Belgrade in 1961, has always had the support of my country. We consider that its objective must be general and complete disarmament under strict international control, for the achievement of which the active participation of the nuclear Powers is indispensable.
On the other hand, we also consider that the preparation of this conference should not preclude active continuation of disarmament negotiations among the nuclear Powers themselves. Without prejudice to the global efforts to achieve the objectives of general and complete disarmament, my Government attaches the greatest importance to regional efforts in that direction, which have proven to be viable and effective collateral measures.

Consistent with this policy, my Government, as was announced to the General Assembly by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Chile, has proceeded to complete the ratification procedures with respect to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, the Treaty of Tlatelolco, thus joining that exemplary and useful instrument of denuclearization.

For the same reason, we were very happy to learn that France and China, in the course of this year, adhered to Additional Protocol II of that Treaty. We must only regret, therefore, that one of the great nuclear Powers continues to be the main absentee in this policy of denuclearization. Once again the General Assembly should issue an appeal to that Power to comply with the provisions of six previous resolutions of this body. My delegation also supports the initiative to issue an appeal to those States which, although prospective parties to Additional Protocol I, have not yet acceded to it.

The policy of denuclearization at the regional level, which Latin America inaugurated some years ago, is now beginning to be studied from the standpoint of its feasibility for other regions of the world. Without prejudging the problems and specific characteristics of other regions, we take note of the initiative to create a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East, the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia and the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. We have also taken note of similar initiatives sponsored by the Organization of African Unity.

Furthermore, my delegation was pleased to learn of the joint communiqué issued by the Prime Ministers of Japan and New Zealand in the city of Wellington on 30 October last, in which they reaffirmed the non-nuclear position of their respective Governments and their objection to any type of nuclear
testing. Chile, as a coastal State in the South Pacific, considers these statements to be most positive.

The trends toward regionalization, which I have mentioned, at present warrant requesting the Secretary-General to submit a report in which, in consultation with high level experts, he can inform us of the feasibility of, and the problems involved in, these initiatives and in other efforts which may be undertaken at the same level as well as of the manner in which these are related to the non-proliferation Treaty and other multilateral instruments.

With respect to regional initiatives related to the problem of armaments, we believe that they also can be supplemented by various other measures which would not apply exclusively to nuclear weapons but to conventional weapons as well. Thus, referring to the positive proposal of the Head of State of Peru on freezing the acquisition of arms, the representative of Chile stated in the Ad Hoc Committee for a World Disarmament Conference that:

"The Government of Chile considers as a positive step the proposal of the Head of State of Peru designed to achieve a subregional agreement to freeze the acquisition of arms, and shares the hope that Peru and its neighbours will reach an agreement on freezing their defence expenditures and thus be able to use the funds thus released to combat under-development."

I am pleased at this time to reaffirm these concepts, as well as the permanent policy of friendship between the sister Republics of Peru and Chile. Consistent with this policy of the regional limitation of arms, as early as 1959 the Government of Chile proposed a general arms limitation in Latin America and the use of the funds thus saved to promote economic development.

What I have just said clearly shows the position of my Government to be the promotion of any initiative that will make it possible to reduce arms expenditures and allocate the resources thus saved to the needs of economic and social development. For that reason, we reaffirm the principles laid down in General Assembly resolution 3093 (XXVIII) on the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries.
While in the period 1971-1973 the developed countries allocated 5.9 per cent of their gross national product to military expenditures, official assistance for development amounted to only 0.26 per cent of that gross national product, according to the tables which appear in the report of the Secretary-General on this subject. This is highly indicative of the gravity of the situation for the developing countries. In order to implement the policy of the reallocation of funds it is necessary for the General Assembly to establish an effective machinery. Chile agreed to be a member of the Special Committee provided for in resolution 3093 (XXVIII). The reasons which have so far prevented the functioning of that Committee are well known. Until this situation can be remedied, my delegation considers that it would be a positive step if the country that originally proposed the reallocation of funds would proceed to implement that unilaterally as an expression of their concern for the needs of the developing countries.

The proposal regarding the prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health is certainly of great interest, since it anticipates problems that will appear if scientific and technological advances are applied to non-peaceful ends. These problems already exist to some extent. The proposal, which is intended to prevent a worsening of the situation, deserves careful study and the consideration of effective means to implement it.
Finally, my delegation cannot fail to refer to the serious problem posed by napalm and other incendiary weapons. We trust that very soon the use of those weapons will be categorically prohibited. Similarly, we believe that the General Assembly must again appeal for the ratification and effective implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction, as well as of the Geneva Protocol of 1925.

With regard to the important draft convention submitted by Japan on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction, my delegation regrets that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has not achieved concrete results in this field. We trust that the subject will again be given high priority.

All the disarmament items are closely interconnected. That is why my delegation preferred to refer to them jointly, rather than treating each one individually. We believe that a matter of substance that is common to all of the items is the necessity for effective control. Since the time of the League of Nations, successive efforts towards disarmament and the limitation of armaments have failed because of the absence of effective control. Hence, we believe that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and, in due course, the world disarmament conference should focus their action on devising strong international controls applicable not only to the non-nuclear-weapon countries, which have already demonstrated their goodwill through the signature of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and other instruments, but also to the nuclear-weapon Powers themselves. The only true guarantee of the success of measures for the total prohibition of nuclear tests, non-proliferation, general and complete disarmament, the prohibition of chemical and bacteriological warfare, and so forth, is the opening up of the frontiers of the great Powers to international control. We are perfectly well aware that that is the greatest obstacle. Nevertheless, we are prepared to persevere in the efforts to achieve that goal.
Dr. ALVARES MACIEL (Brazil) (interpretation from French): In a
detailed statement several days ago the head of my delegation set forth the
Brazilian Government's position of principle on the question of
disarmament and gave an analysis of that question. I shall therefore
limit my statement today to some brief comments on the ideas that have
been put forward during this general debate and on some specific items
of our agenda.

One first element that emerges from what has been said by the majority
of representatives here is the firmness with which they have set forth
the objectives to be sought with a view to real, effective general and
complete disarmament under international control. The reiteration of
the very sincere intentions to seek solutions to the distressing problem
confronting us is in contrast, however, with the general support for the
rather sombre and pessimistic view of the progress recently achieved in
this field, and is in contradiction with something that is fully conceded
by the nuclear Powers themselves -- that is, that the armaments race is
still in full swing and, indeed, is achieving a rate and nature hitherto
unknown.

The majority of representatives here have stressed the primary
responsibility of the great Powers, and particularly the nuclear Powers,
in the sphere of disarmament, in the light of the quantitative and
qualitative increase in the threat of destruction hanging over the world.
I shall not repeat the many examples of terrifying vertical proliferation
that have been cited during this debate. I would simply call attention to
the fact that the perfecting of nuclear weapons not only disturbs the
precarious nuclear balance but also renders ever more remote the possibility
of an agreement between the super-Powers to limit strategic armaments,
an agreement which is an indispensable precondition to general and
complete disarmament. Nor shall I dwell on the contradiction involved in
the fact that the expenditure for the production of armaments is maintained
at an astronomical level at the very moment when there is so much talk about
the serious economic difficulties facing nations and the world.
That gloomy picture is made even more gloomy by the feeling of discouragement arising from the absence of proposals designed to settle the problem of disarmament as a whole and by the inadequacy of the partial and collateral measures suggested.

Underlying that assessment is the fact that the political phenomenon of détente has not yet been translated into effective military measures likely to lead to general and complete disarmament and to ensure the security of the non-nuclear States. One might even suspect that if détente does not in the final analysis lead to genuine understanding, it will have simply had the effect of trying to make acceptable the mere balance of terror established by the super-Powers, which is directly opposed to the true international security we all seek.

Within that context, the response to the threat of horizontal proliferation -- a problem whose importance and scope cannot be minimized -- can be satisfactory only to the extent that conditions of security are created that will reduce the possible motivations of States to acquire nuclear weapons. Thus, the question of non-proliferation must be placed within the over-all context of general and complete disarmament.

Presenting the question of horizontal non-proliferation as a primary and almost unique element in our discussion is tantamount, in this context, to distracting us from our final aims and relegating the consideration of crucial problems of disarmament proper to a secondary level. The adoption of that viewpoint can serve only the aims of those who would like us to confine ourselves to the consideration of partial and collateral disarmament measures.
It is reducing the sensitivity of world public opinion to the absence of progress, for example, in negotiations between the super-Powers on the limitation of strategic arms, nuclear arms testing, or mutual force reductions between them, at the very time when we are witnessing an acceleration of the arms race, an increase in vertical proliferation, and an increase in the nuclear threat itself. Finally, it serves to distract our attention from other important individual problems -- chemical weapons or napalm, for example -- or questions which are fundamentally deadlocked because of strategic, military and political implications which they have for the great Powers. I am thinking particularly of the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace and the reduction of the military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council.

The problem of the spread of nuclear weapons has been taken up with much emphasis in the general debate from the standpoint of the non-proliferation Treaty. I do not believe it is necessary to repeat here the position of my country with regard to this international instrument: it is sufficiently well known. Suffice it to say that, like other States we are refraining from making undertakings which might result in hindrances to our economic and technological development.

The treatment of the question of non-proliferation by means of that Treaty does in fact involve limitations on the idea of the sovereign equality of States, which are not offset by real guarantees of security. The non-proliferation Treaty is selective and discriminatory. It accentuates political, economic and technological differences within the present world power system. But what is perhaps even more serious, apart from its inequitable character, is its ineffectiveness as an instrument for nuclear disarmament, something which has been pointed out by other delegations in this debate.

The establishment of an international régime to govern peaceful nuclear explosions conceived in the spirit I have just described could only have the final effect of granting a monopoly over this important technology to the great Powers, to the detriment of the development prospects which it could offer to the economically and technologically less privileged countries.
The arguments which have been put forward along these lines are entirely in favour of those who have styled themselves the champions of the technological status quo. Unless we can now arrive at an absolutely clear cut definition of the scope of peaceful nuclear explosions, it is futile to attempt to prejudge the course of technological development in this field.

The nuclear option of each country is determined by a whole range of factors. The treatment of the question of exclusively peaceful explosions should not therefore be confused indiscriminately with the essentially political problem of nuclear disarmament. The question is already under study by the IAEA. Suggestions which have been put forward here that the question should be referred to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament for consideration seem to me rather out of place, since this would mean asking that body, which deals with disarmament, to undertake a task which goes beyond its particular field of competence.

I should like to add to these points a few brief comments on the question of the creation of denuclearized zones in the Middle East and in South Asia.

In the view of my Government, the creation of such zones could represent a very important step towards the final aim of general and complete disarmament. It is of the utmost importance, however, for the proposals which are put forward in this spirit to be in keeping with realistic criteria: first, the establishment of denuclearized zones with clearly defined limits should correspond to the wishes of all the countries in the region concerned. It is for those countries alone to conduct negotiations, without outside interference, in order to agree on the terms. Another essential point is respect on the part of all nuclear countries for the denuclearized status of the region. A third precondition would be the subsequent conclusion by all the countries in the zone of safeguard agreements with IAEA. In a word, the conditions I have just mentioned are fundamentally those stipulated by article 28 of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.
I would not like to conclude my statement without expressing the hope of my delegation that progress will be made very soon in the study of the necessary regulation of the use of certain weapons with cruel or indiscriminate effects; I am referring here to napalm and other equivalent conventional weapons. My Government is following with interest the examination of the question by the Conference of Experts in Lucerne.

We are also studying with interest the new Soviet proposal to prohibit action to influence the environment and the climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security and human well-being and health, although this proposal may perhaps be rather premature in view of the high priority which should be accorded to other questions.

As I conclude, permit me to change the somewhat gloomy note of the comments I have made by bidding a warm welcome on behalf of my Government to the five new future members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. The admission of the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, Iran, Peru and Zaire, which has been submitted for endorsement at this session of the General Assembly will, I am sure, contribute much to the attainment of our disarmament objective within CCD.
Mr. MISHRA (India): Mr. Chairman, my delegation has already extended its congratulations to you on your election to this high office. May I add my own to those and wish you all success in the performance of your task. We are confident that with your wisdom and tact at our disposal we shall successfully conclude the consideration of disarmament items within the time allotted to us.\(^6\)

Indian scientists conducted a peaceful nuclear explosion experiment on 18 May this year. Several delegations have expressed views on its implications and consequences as they see them.

Some representatives have asserted directly or indirectly that at present there are hardly any peaceful applications of nuclear explosion technology. As I have stated in this Committee earlier, we do not claim to have achieved a break-through in explosion technology. The announcement of the Indian Atomic Energy Commission had this sentence in it:

"As part of the programme of study of peaceful uses of nuclear explosion, the Government of India had undertaken a programme to keep itself abreast of developments of this technology, particularly with reference to its use in the field of mining and earth-moving operations."

It is clear that the Government of India is not alone in this respect. Peaceful nuclear explosions carried out underground, over a period of several years, by other States have confirmed the feasibility of this technology, although many problems still remain to be solved. Their experiments have been oriented towards gas and oil stimulation, and have shown promising results and are even reported to have increased oil production by 30 to 60 per cent. It should not, therefore, be a matter of surprise or regret if India, without contravening any of its international obligations, were to experiment and try to develop this technology for exploiting the natural resources within its own territory. We are not prepared to wait for others to perfect the nuclear explosion technology and thereby lag behind by a decade or more in its development in India.

I should like to quote the Declaration on Disarmament adopted at Lusaka on 10 September 1970, by the Third Non-Aligned Summit Conference. The Declaration had this to say;

---

\(^6\) Mr. Heugebauer (German Democratic Republic), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.
"The Conference is aware of the tremendous contribution which the technology of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy including peaceful nuclear explosions can make to the economy of the developing world. It is of the opinion that the benefits of this technology should be available to all States without any discrimination."

There are enormous possibilities for harnessing atomic energy for developmental purposes. Our attitude is in conformity with the recommendations of the IAEA panel discussions in 1970, 1971 and 1972 on peaceful nuclear explosions. In the panel discussions in 1970 in which many countries including Japan, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States participated, the first conclusion in the summary of the discussions, as published by IAEA, read as follows:

"There is general agreement that the results obtained in experimental projects on the application of nuclear explosions to industrial projects, justify continuation, even an intensification of the programme."

Recently, the Soviet Union and the United States of America have given fresh indications of the trust they put in the usefulness of this technology by excluding underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes from the proposed limited ban on underground tests of nuclear weapons.

Another strange argument we have heard is that India, by exploding a peaceful nuclear device has broken some kind of a barrier to proliferation of nuclear weapons. We have solemnly declared for the last 20 years that we intend to use nuclear energy solely for peaceful purposes. Even after exploding a nuclear device, we have reaffirmed our solemn declaration. If other non-nuclear-weapon States follow us in reaffirming their resolve to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, is it to the benefit or to the detriment of mankind? If, on the other hand, one or more non-nuclear-weapon States proceed to acquire nuclear weapons, they certainly will not be following India's example.

It is quite wrong to imagine that the Indian explosion for peaceful purposes has somehow damaged the non-proliferation Treaty. India has not campaigned and does not intend to campaign against that Treaty. The Treaty stands or falls on its own merits or demerits. Even after India's peaceful nuclear explosion, we are not aware that any so-called near-nuclear State, which had
intended to become a party to the non-proliferation Treaty, had decided not to do so now. The others in the same category, which from the beginning had refused to accept the obligations of the non-proliferation Treaty, did so for their own reasons.

For many years, India has been campaigning against the nuclear arms race and nuclear-weapon testing. Only by tackling this problem can we hope to eliminate the danger of nuclear war. We should not take the nuclear arms race for granted. But this is exactly what some delegations are doing. They seem to imagine that if restrictions are placed on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy the fundamental problem will be solved. We should not ignore the fact that there are hardly any negotiations going on concerning nuclear disarmament — and I emphasize "disarmament". Two nuclear-weapon States are engaged in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. Three nuclear-weapon States participate in the work of the Conference on Disarmament which for some years now has been unsuccessfully engaged in elaborating a comprehensive test ban treaty. Two nuclear-weapon States are outside the CCD.

We can make a beginning in controlling the nuclear arms race by agreeing on a comprehensive test ban. We feel that there is no justification or excuse for continuing nuclear-weapon testing. Our approach to the general question of the comprehensive test ban is that there should be a complete cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests. As the partial test ban Treaty of 1963 already prohibits nuclear-weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, the conclusion of a treaty to prohibit nuclear-weapon tests in the underground environment will accomplish the objectives of a comprehensive ban on all nuclear-weapon tests in all environments. Therefore, the first priority should be accorded to achieving universal adherence to a régime of prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests in all environments. Only in the context of a complete cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests could consideration be given to the possibility of concluding an agreement on the regulation of underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, to be signed by all States. The accompanying system of international safeguards which will have to be devised should be based on objective, functional and non-discriminatory criteria. It should be universal in application.
India remains firm in its opposition to nuclear armament. Our policy has been stated and restated in this forum. We are opposed to all proliferation -- vertical and horizontal -- of nuclear weapons. We are for nuclear disarmament. It is our hope that all States, nuclear-weapon States as well as non-nuclear-weapon States, will, like India, commit themselves to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes only. The nuclear-weapon States have a special responsibility in this matter.

India has supported the General Assembly resolutions on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in Africa and Latin America because conditions were suitable for their establishment and, furthermore, they were proposed on the initiative of and with agreement among the countries in those zones. In both cases there were prior consultations leading to agreement among the countries concerned before endorsement by the General Assembly. At the same time, India has also consistently maintained that any proposal for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in a particular region has to be considered on its specific merits. Conditions for the establishment of such zones differ from continent to continent, and it is not possible to devise a single formula or procedure to cover all cases.

As regards Pakistan's proposal, no consultations among the States in the area took place before the item was inscribed on our agenda. Therefore, it would be premature, indeed it would be prejudging future consultations, to declare South Asia a nuclear-weapon-free zone or even to endorse the concept. My delegation has already pointed out in the plenary Assembly that any proposal to establish a nuclear-free zone in any part of the world has an important bearing on the vital interests of all the countries of that region. It is therefore natural that the first prerequisite to the creation of such a zone is agreement among the countries concerned.

Africa and Latin America are separate and distinct continental zones, geographically and politically. In that sense, South Asia cannot be considered a zone. The South Asian countries are surrounded by nuclear-weapon States or countries belonging to their alliances. It is clear that South Asia cannot be treated in isolation for purposes of the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone because South Asia is an integral part of the Asian and the Pacific region.
The presence of nuclear weapons in the region, the alliances with nuclear-weapon States and the existence of foreign military bases have to be taken into account in the examination of any proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Asia and the Pacific.

Nuclear-weapon-free zones constitute only a collateral measure; they are not and should not become a substitute for nuclear disarmament.

In 1974, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament was able to discuss the question of a chemical weapons convention at great length. Many of the technical questions involved were also examined thoroughly with the help of experts. A number of working papers and statements on the various aspects of that question by several delegations are also available to us. The Soviet Union and other socialist States members of CCD have submitted a draft convention on chemical weapons, and more recently Japan also presented another draft convention on this subject. Furthermore, at the Moscow Summit Conference this year the United States and the USSR agreed to consider a joint initiative in CCD with respect to the conclusion, as a first step, of an international convention dealing with the most dangerous lethal means of chemical warfare.*

We feel that our objective should continue to be to achieve a comprehensive prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons. If a phased approach is to be adopted, it becomes all the more necessary that the Geneva Protocol of 1925 should be adhered to by all.

The CCD should continue to deal with the question of a chemical weapons convention as a high-priority issue. If the working out of a convention is delayed, technological developments, particularly in the field of binary weapons, could make a ban almost impossible.

It is our firm conviction that a world disarmament conference will promote the cause of general and complete disarmament, and nuclear disarmament in particular, by providing a new impetus to our efforts. Having had the privilege of being a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, established

* The Chairman returned to the Chair.
pursuant to General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII), we have naturally followed its deliberations with great interest, and have also contributed our ideas to its work. We would like to record our appreciation of its Chairman, Ambassador Hoveyda of Iran, for the skilful way in which he piloted the meetings of the Committee and maintained contacts with the nuclear-weapon countries which did not attend the meetings. We are, however, disappointed that the Committee could not come out with positive and concrete recommendations and would urge further efforts in this direction.

We also have before us the valuable report of the Secretary-General on the question of reduction of the military budgets of the five permanent members of the Security Council. We should like to reiterate our support for the ideas contained in resolution 3093 A (XXVIII). We regret that thus far it has not been possible to establish the Special Committee on the Distribution of the Funds Released as a Result of the Reduction of Military Budgets. We consider reduction of the military budgets as proposed in the resolution will contribute to the slowing down of the arms race and prevent the waste of much needed and scarce resources.

We welcome the initiative taken by the Soviet Union to draw the attention of the world community to the dangers of the use of techniques to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health. Although these techniques do not seem to have much utility in warfare at present, one cannot rule out the possibility of their development and utilization in the not too distant future. It is desirable to start thinking about that problem now.

The adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 2832 (XXVI) on 16 December 1971 was a historic act. That resolution declared the Indian Ocean a zone of peace for all time to come and asked the great Powers to enter into immediate consultations with the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean with a view to halting the further escalation and expansion of their military presence in the Indian Ocean and eliminating from the region all bases, military installations and any other manifestations of the great Powers' military presence, conceived in the context of great-Power rivalry. This recognition and acceptance by the General Assembly of the ardent wish of the littoral and hinterland States to keep the Indian Ocean free from tensions and threats to their security arising from the great-Power rivalry in the region, was indeed extremely significant.
Nearly three years have elapsed since this epoch-making Declaration was adopted by the General Assembly and now is perhaps the time to review, in brief, developments that have since taken place. It will be recalled, that by resolution 3080 (XXVIII), the General Assembly asked the Secretary-General, with the assistance of qualified experts and competent bodies selected by him, to prepare "... a factual statement of the great Powers' military presence in all its aspects, in the Indian Ocean, with special reference to their naval deployments, conceived in the context of great Power rivalry". That statement, as subsequently revised, is contained in document A/AC.159/1/Rev.1 While the statement has its limitations, as it was based on published material only, it has been useful in that it indicates the extent of the great Powers' naval presence in the Indian Ocean. It is with great regret that one observes that on the whole the great Powers' military presence in the Indian Ocean area has not lessened but in fact seems to have increased.

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, created pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2992 (XXVII) has been performing a useful, although by no means exhaustive, task. The goals that the Committee has set for itself for the next year, as they appear in paragraph 35 of its report (supplement No. 21, A/9629), are important, although modest. That in itself is not to be criticized, because it reflects the realism with which the Committee apparently approaches its task. We are aware that the Committee's task was not easy and yet the success it has been able to achieve in its deliberations is in no small measure due to the very able stewardship of its Chairman, Ambassador Amerasinghe of Sri Lanka. We sincerely hope that the Committee's mandate will be renewed and that in its future work it will be able to pursue all the urgent tasks facing it without allowing itself to be deflected from its mandate as contained in the Declaration.

To conclude, we welcome the agreement reached in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to invite Peru, Zaire, Iran, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany to participate in the work of the Committee. We are confident that they will make a valuable contribution to the work of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of India for his good wishes.
Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal): Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to fulfill the pleasant duty of congratulating you on your election as Chairman of this Committee. Your wide knowledge of the complicated issues before the Committee will be of great benefit to all those of us who will have the opportunity to work under your able guidance. I should also like to congratulate the two Vice-Chairmen. We are happy to see that the representative of a country whose leadership has shown bold initiative in many spheres of current world trends has been elected as the Rapporteur of the Committee. We congratulate him and express our full co-operation.

My delegation has had the opportunity to hear a number of delegations, particularly those delegations whose statements assume a special noteworthiness because of their technical capability and which, therefore, can be an augury of hope or despair in the Committee. We are happy to note that the sombre horizon of the past years has been penetrated by a silver lining and hopefully a general atmosphere of détente seems to have emerged to stay. However, in the absence of a trustworthy commitment that could bind the nations of the world together and particularly bind those which have the capability for the destruction of the whole world, the so-called atmosphere of détente remains vulnerable and volatile.

Unless some concrete step is taken in the direction of curbing the armaments race, the cessation of the nuclear tests, checking the use of incendiary weapons, and prohibiting actions that might influence the whole environment, there can be no assurance of an atmosphere of continued peace and international security. Even promises of peaceful intentions every other day cannot rule out the possibility of a sudden eruption of conflicts of dangerous dimension.

Out of the twelve items which have been bracketed together to be considered as disarmament items, five are related to the cessation of nuclear tests, thus making the questions of the cessation of nuclear tests, the treaty for the prohibition of nuclear weapons, and the establishment of nuclear-free zones, of great importance and of an urgent nature. Therefore, at this stage, my delegation would like to concentrate mostly on the subject of nuclear tests.
The Assembly has been seized with the question of the cessation of nuclear tests and related matters for years. Yet, the temptation to carry out new tests has not ceased. The exclusive club of five has been extended this year and there are at least 20 which have achieved the standard that can make them claimants of the right to membership of the club. The exclusiveness of the club has been threatened and there seems no way to maintain the status quo.

The Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Rt. Hon. David Ennals, rightly observed in the meeting of this Committee on 5 November 1974:

"The question we must ask is: will 1975 be the year in which the non-proliferation régime was finally destroyed, or will it be the turning point when the new dangers were recognized and contained, with proper provision made for the extension to all States of the peaceful benefits of nuclear technology?" (2008th meeting, p. 21)

Those who refused to adhere to the non-proliferation Treaty had over the years consistently underlined the discriminatory nature of the Treaty which put curbs on non-nuclear-weapon Powers while allowing the nuclear-weapon Powers to pursue an unbridled and unprecedented arms race. Nepal signed the Treaty six years ago relying on the good faith of the nuclear-weapon Powers which had given assurances that they would do all within their means to achieve a balance of mutual obligations by living up to the provisions of article VI of the Treaty. Nepal had at that time also strongly urged the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty as a quid pro quo. Let me recall what our representative stated at the resumed twenty-second session of the General Assembly in 1968:

"We feel that, once the non-proliferation treaty is concluded, the political decision required for a ban on underground explosions cannot be postponed any longer under the convenient pretext that it is the other side that is holding up agreement. It is imperative that all States be prohibited from conducting underground nuclear explosions, not just the non-nuclear Powers, in the same way that the Moscow Treaty prohibits all countries from conducting tests in the remaining environments." (1559th meeting, p. 26).
Our representative had also suggested at that time that the question of peaceful explosions be separated from the non-proliferation Treaty and be dealt with within the context of an underground test ban that would prohibit all underground nuclear explosions by all States and set up a parallel regime to deal with the question of peaceful explosions. Our representative then elaborated on that proposal by stating as follows:

"Exemptions under the underground test ban agreement would be made for peaceful explosions that would be managed and controlled by an international body, perhaps the International Atomic Energy Agency. No country could then unilaterally conduct any underground explosions, peaceful or military. The sole discretion to permit peaceful explosions would rest with this international body, which would assess the feasibility of the proposed project and then request one of the nuclear Powers to carry out the explosion. This would apply equally to nuclear Powers." (ibid., p. 26-27)

Had the nuclear-weapon Powers agreed to an underground test ban at that time and divorced the question of peaceful nuclear explosions from the non-proliferation Treaty, the Treaty would have been greatly strengthened and perhaps would have secured the adherence of all those who had the potentiality of going nuclear. By continuing to test underground and in the atmosphere at a frenzied pace and in utter disregard for world opinion, these Powers have not only increased vertical proliferation but have contributed to the situation that has now opened the door to horizontal proliferation. Nepal is, of course, against all forms of proliferation, vertical and horizontal, and is against all nationally conducted nuclear explosions. However, we believe that only when the cancer of vertical proliferation is contained, can one begin to deal with the dangers of horizontal proliferation. The latter is clearly the consequence of the former.
The recently concluded threshold Treaty between the USSR and the United States would be highly commendable if it had arrived 10 years earlier or if it were coupled with a moratorium on tests under the threshold. Ten years ago, it might have served a useful purpose in conjunction with the partial test-ban Treaty; but now, to have any meaning, it must be coupled with a moratorium on tests not covered by the Treaty.

I recall that at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly in 1967 Nepal proposed the conclusion of a threshold treaty coupled with such a moratorium and in conjunction with Sweden's idea of verification by challenge. We should like to reiterate that proposal once again and urge the United States and the Soviet Union to include in the threshold Treaty the provision for a moratorium and to open the Treaty for signature by all States, including the other three nuclear-weapon Powers and countries that are now engaged in or contemplating the carrying out of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

Simultaneously with the threshold Treaty and the moratorium, negotiations must start on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Needless to say, any such treaty must make exemptions for peaceful nuclear explosions and would have to provide for an international régime to govern such explosions.

It is fairly clear that, as long as an underground test-ban treaty is not agreed upon and in the absence of an international body to manage and control peaceful nuclear explosions, non-nuclear-weapon States in need of peaceful explosion services have no alternative but to conduct peaceful nuclear explosions themselves. It is in this light that we should view the predicament of non-nuclear-weapon States that have nowhere to turn for obtaining peaceful explosion services. Were an underground test ban now in effect, with a parallel body to provide peaceful explosion services in a non-discriminating manner and at advantageous cost, there is no question that non-nuclear-weapon States would not have to expend their scarce resources to conduct these explosions themselves. The forthcoming review conference relating to the non-proliferation Treaty will undoubtedly have to look into the matter. The continued absence of an international régime governing peaceful explosions cannot but erode the effectiveness of the non-proliferation Treaty. Without such a régime, non-nuclear-weapon countries that adhere to the Treaty and that need
peaceful explosion services would now have to renounce the Treaty in order to conduct the explosions themselves. But the existence of such a régime would obviate the need for countries to renounce the non-proliferation Treaty in order to conduct these explosions, since they could obtain the services elsewhere.

For these reasons, we cannot stress enough the paramount need for the nuclear-weapon Powers to agree on a comprehensive test ban, to live up to the provisions of article V of the non-proliferation Treaty and to make arrangements whereby all non-nuclear-weapon States, whether parties to the non-proliferation Treaty or not, can obtain nuclear explosion services without discrimination.

By making this service available to both the signatories and the non-signatories of the non-proliferation Treaty, and on attractive terms, we would be ensuring that countries in the latter category do not in the future take it upon themselves to conduct peaceful explosions. Given the choice between taking advantage of the availability of low-cost and efficient explosion services, on the one hand, and doing it the harder and more expensive way by exploding its own device, on the other, it stands to reason that a developing country with scarce resources would opt for the first alternative.

From what I said above, it is apparent that the survival and the strengthening of the non-proliferation Treaty depend on the conclusion of an underground test ban. There would be no greater incentive for countries to adhere to the non-proliferation Treaty than the conclusion of an underground test ban. And while an underground test ban is being worked out, the United States-Soviet Union threshold Treaty should be expanded to include the provision for a moratorium and should be opened for signature and ratification by all States. Failing that, we see no alternative to non-nuclear-weapon countries conducting nuclear explosions themselves for whatever purpose.

Since underground nuclear explosions can have both military and civilian applications, and in view of the fact that the technology for conducting peaceful explosions is indistinguishable from that for explosions for weapon purposes, we welcome India's repeated assurances of its peaceful intentions in carrying out its nuclear explosions.
My delegation is expressing its view on the subject very candidly and consistently. We have always opposed proliferation, and, so, on the subject of nuclear explosions, we are firmly opposed to all explosions contributing to nuclear proliferation. We should like to urge restraint and patience so as not to create a situation that would endanger international peace and security.

Before concluding, I should like to make a few brief remarks on some other items under discussion in this Committee.

First, my delegation would like to reiterate its full support of the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace and would like to place on record its appreciation of the excellent work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean.

Secondly, on the question of banning chemical weapons, my delegation is happy to note that the delegation of Japan has come out with some constructive proposals which could be a very good basis for an acceptable formula to solve this problem.

Thirdly, I should like to express my delegation's appreciation of the Soviet initiative in introducing an entirely new and meaningful draft resolution on the prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health. Though my delegation feels that all the implications of this proposal have to be further studied and carefully considered, it would be inclined to support it as a matter of principle.

That is all I have to state today. However, my delegation reserves its right to intervene at a later stage if and when the occasion arises.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank Ambassador Upadhyay of Nepal for his cordial congratulations to the officers of the Committee.
Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand): Mr. Chairman, I had the opportunity last Friday to offer my delegation's congratulations to the officers of the Committee, but I should like now to congratulate you personally on your election to the chairmanship of this important Committee. Although we are more than half way through the session, perhaps the most difficult part of the Committee's work still lies before us. But we have every confidence that the impartiality and firmness which you have already demonstrated will bring the Committee's work to a successful and timely conclusion.

As this year's disarmament debate draws to a close, my delegation finds it possible to discern several main themes in the many thoughtful and penetrating statements to which we have listened.

In the first place, there is a widespread concern that the world stockpile of armaments, and especially nuclear armaments, continues to grow unabated. Frightening statistics have been presented to the Committee. For example, Senator Symington has told us that the United States alone now possesses the equivalent of over 600,000 Hiroshima-size bombs. Mrs. Thorsson has told us that world armaments expenditure is now running at some $275 thousand million a year.

Secondly, we have detected a growing disappointment that super-Power détente, and the limited bilateral agreements in the armaments field that form part of that détente, have not led more quickly to new agreements on disarmament in which all of us can participate and from which all of us can benefit. The representative of the Soviet Union, in opening our debate, spoke rather optimistically about the effects of détente, saying that the first perceptible steps have been taken towards the easing of the threat of a nuclear war and that the process of relaxation of tension and the normalization of relations among States belonging to different socio-political systems are creating favourable conditions for further progress.
It seemed to me significant, however, that the United States representative who spoke immediately afterwards did not echo this optimistic note, but warned instead that world peace rested on a knife edge:

"One miscalculation," he said -- "one sudden terrorist activity, one paranoid leader could set the spark to a world-wide nuclear holocaust."
(1998th meeting, p. 23)

Nor was the representative of France especially reassuring about the progress of our work. He spoke of:

"... a wild proliferation of useless projects" (2005th meeting, p. 13) and said that France had decided to equip itself with its own nuclear force because it had decided that nuclear disarmament was an unlikely eventuality.

The representative of China was even more pessimistic. According to him, the super Power arms race has not abated at all, but has intensified the danger of war has not been reduced in the least; and it is simply not possible to talk about détente in the present international situation.

When the nuclear-Powers themselves make such widely different estimates of the prospects of progress towards nuclear disarmament on the basis of improved great Power relationships, small countries may surely be excused for some scepticism as to whether nuclear disarmament will ever come about on the initiative of the Governments which own these weapons. Yet it is unavoidable that the prime responsibility in the pursuit of agreement on measures of disarmament should remain with the nuclear Powers. Their conspicuous failure to cooperate in a search for agreement on a multilateral basis is, we believe, generating mounting impatience among the non nuclear majority.

The third trend which we have noted in this debate is a direct reflection of this mounting impatience. Disappointed in their hopes for early progress towards worldwide measures of nuclear disarmament, more and more non-nuclear States are looking at the possibility of co-operating with their neighbours to establish nuclear-free zones on a regional basis. It is a noteworthy feature of this year's debate that all five States possessing nuclear weapons have indicated their support, or at least their acceptance, of the
nuclear-free zone concept, although with varying degrees of enthusiasm, and subject, in some cases, to certain conditions.

A fourth trend which has impressed us this year is the growing realization that widespread proliferation of the capacity to produce nuclear weapons is no longer an academic possibility, but an imminent danger. Until this year, the development of nuclear weapons has been confined to the five permanent members of the Security Council, and while such membership confers no special rights to develop a nuclear capacity, there may have been some illusory comfort in the fact that these countries have a special status and responsibility under the Charter to act together for the maintenance of international peace and security. We may have hoped, without any logical basis for that hope, that the development of nuclear weapons would stop there. The explosion of a nuclear device in a sixth country this year has effectively destroyed that hope, because it has demonstrated that proliferation is not something that could theoretically happen, but something that does happen and is bound to go on happening if the so-called neo-nuclear-Powers are not prepared to adopt a self denying ordinance by acceding to the non-proliferation Treaty.

A fifth point that has become clear in the course of this debate is that the question whether a State which explodes a nuclear device does so for peaceful purposes or for military purposes is not really relevant to the proliferation danger, if the State concerned is not prepared to conduct its nuclear programme under recognized international procedures and safeguards. As the representative of the United States has pointed out, it is impossible for a State to develop a capacity to conduct nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes without acquiring a device which could be used as a nuclear weapon. The motive force behind the proliferation of nuclear weapons capacity is distrust and suspicion, and distrust and suspicion will not be allayed by declarations of intent alone.

It is deeply discouraging that at a time when the world is facing a major food crisis, and indeed at the very time that a Conference is meeting in Rome to seek ways of averting starvation for the hungry millions in many developing countries, resources, energy, money and brainpower continue to be
squandered on the development and stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction. How can we have got our priorities so wrong?

My country for its part completely rejects the myth that possession of nuclear weapons in some way enhances a country's status or prestige. It amazes us that any country under responsible management would wish to join a club whose entrance fee is so ruinously expensive, whose sole purpose is the perfection of the means of mutual self destruction, and whose members immediately become the objects of the suspicion and fear of non-members without even the compensation of eliminating suspicion and fear of one another. It used to be thought that the main attraction of any club for its members was the satisfaction to be gained from excluding others, but the nuclear club does not even offer that advantage.

In my delegation's view, the countries which have earned a special status and merit are not those which have forced their way into the nuclear club, but those which, having the capacity to develop nuclear weapons, have voluntarily renounced the intention to do so. It is such countries as Canada, Sweden, Japan, the Federal Republic of Germany and others which have the resources and know how to develop a nuclear weapons capacity, but which, as we understand it, have taken the decision, as parties or prospective parties to the non-proliferation Treaty, to remain as non-nuclear weapon States, that deserve our gratitude and our admiration. Perhaps we should establish among the parties to that Treaty which are not already nuclear weapons States a non-nuclear club. After all, membership would be free.

What I have said already will indicate the great importance which my Government attaches to maintaining and strengthening the non-proliferation Treaty. Every new accession contributes to that objective; and, conversely, failure to do so, more particularly on the part of States with the potential for developing a nuclear capacity, detracts from it. The present position in this regard is a matter for some concern. The Review Conference which is to be held next year is, in our view, most timely. Not only do we hope that participants in the Conference will propose and agree upon intensified efforts to implement the purposes and principles of the Treaty,
but also that by focusing world attention on those purposes and principles we may give a new impetus to the objective of securing their universal observance.

While we expect that the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference will be the major conference on armaments control during 1975, we do not overlook the importance of the proposal for a world disarmament conference. It continues to be our view that such a conference should be convened as soon as there is evidence that the nuclear Powers are ready to participate. Although this condition has not yet been met, we believe that preparatory work for the conference should be actively continued.

I have already referred to one issue which has burst its way into the forefront of our attention during 1974, the question of peaceful nuclear explosions. The potential value of peaceful nuclear explosions is a subject which remains shrouded in mystery for the vast majority of States. For our part, we have yet to be convinced that peaceful nuclear explosions have practical applications of sufficient importance to counterbalance the complications which they undoubtedly create in the field of nuclear weapons control and disarmament. Since, as we are told, the technologies of peaceful nuclear explosions and nuclear weapons are indistinguishable, it is imperative that an international policy on peaceful nuclear explosions be formulated with great care, but as a matter of urgency. We look forward with confidence to the early introduction into this Committee of a draft resolution which is designed to fulfil that objective.
I have only a few further comments on certain items in which New Zealand has taken a particular interest. The question of weapons which cause unnecessary suffering or are indiscriminate in their effects is one of deep concern to my Government. We participated actively in the Conference of Government Experts which recently met in Lucerne under the auspices of the International Red Cross. We agree with the conclusion recorded by the President of that Conference that the session increased knowledge and understanding of the subject. It is also our view, in the light of that new knowledge, that the need to up-date the existing norm of international law by new and specific prohibitions has become more urgent than ever. We said last year, and we see no reason to change our view, that we saw substantial difficulties in the implementation of prohibitions on the use of incendiaries and similar weapons in particular circumstances or against particular targets. Therefore we continue to believe that there is a strong case for a total prohibition of such weapons.

The New Zealand Associate Minister of Foreign Affairs, speaking in the general debate last September, declared that the Assembly should stand ready to encourage positive proposals from countries of a given region to increase regional stability and security. We therefore approach with special sympathy the proposals to which I have already referred, and which have been such a feature of this year's disarmament debate, that the Assembly support or study the institution of nuclear-weapon-free zones in several regions of the world. The fact that five items on this question are before the Committee is a clear indication of the degree of interest that the concept of nuclear-free zones has generated. We appreciate that such proposals may raise complex issues, about which there may be different views both in general and within a particular region: we therefore welcome the suggestion put forward by the representative of Finland for a comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-free zones. We hope that such a study might examine the conditions which would make it profitable to consider the establishment of nuclear-free zones in particular regions and, if it uncovers difficulties, suggest solutions to them.

One aspect of the development of this concept which New Zealand for its part will follow closely is the effect which the creation of such zones, and
the conditions under which they are created, may have on the world-wide structure that the nuclear proliferation Treaty is intended to establish. The objective must of course be to avoid weakening the non-proliferation Treaty structure, and rather to strengthen it. When States become parties to a regional agreement for a nuclear-free zone, it will not become less important for them to accede to the non-proliferation treaty, if they have not already done so, but in our view, more important.

Finally, I should like to make one or two comments about item 29 of our agenda, concerning the urgent need for the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and for the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty. The New Zealand Government has for some time maintained a rigorous policy directed towards putting an end to all nuclear testing in any environment, and its views are, I believe, well understood in this Committee. An end to nuclear testing is not the ultimate objective; it is merely one rung on the ladder, one step further towards nuclear disarmament and the elimination of all nuclear weapons. But it is, in our view, a most significant step. A cessation of testing would immediately increase the chances of total nuclear disarmament. It would improve relations both between States and between peoples by reducing the apprehension of those subjected to the hazards of radiation and the possibility of damage to the environment and to health.

We in New Zealand have been obliged to pay special attention to this problem by the fact that, although the world's nuclear capacity and armaments have up to now been concentrated in the hands of a few large countries situated in the northern hemisphere, there have been a considerable number of nuclear tests in the southern hemisphere, relatively close to the shores of a number of countries in the South Pacific region. If there were any doubt that these tests continue to cause the gravest apprehension among the peoples of South Pacific countries, this would surely have been dispelled by the eloquent statement delivered by the representative of Fiji in this debate last Friday. However, our concern is not limited to our own neighbourhood. As the Prime Minister of New Zealand said last month:

"Our objective will continue to be the end of all nuclear tests that expose peoples and the global environment to radio-active fallout. We see no justification for the continuation of nuclear weapon testing by any nation."
Accordingly, New Zealand co-sponsored the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.683, which stresses once more the urgency of concluding a comprehensive test ban treaty to stop nuclear weapon testing of any kind. An internationally agreed comprehensive test ban treaty would be an important landmark on the road to nuclear disarmament and a roadblock to the further proliferation of nuclear weapons.

In this Committee last year I said that New Zealand saw the comprehensive test ban as the next achievable step in the disarmament field. Unfortunately, in the year that has passed we have not moved much further towards attaining our objective. We are encouraged, however, by the strong support that has been given to the objective of a comprehensive test ban by a large number of other speakers during this session. We most earnestly appeal to the members of the Committee on Disarmament, to which the preparation of a treaty has been entrusted, to approach this task with a real sense of urgency during 1975.

The representative of the Netherlands reminded us on Friday that on the cover of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists the hands on the doomsday clock had been moved forward five minutes closer to midnight. Some 28 years ago, Bernard Baruch, six months after making the famous proposal that bears his name, said:

"Time is two-edged. It not only forces us nearer to our doom if we do not save ourselves, but even more horrendous, it habituates us to existing conditions which, by familiarity, seem less and less threatening".

Let us, during the coming year, make a new effort to rouse ourselves from the torpor which threatens to overcome us, before the clock strikes.

Mr. DUGERSUREN (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian):
The delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic has already had occasion to express its views on the problems connected with the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction, that is, nuclear and chemical weapons, and also to express its support for the new proposal of the Soviet Union to prohibit action to influence the environment and climate for military purposes. Today we should like to devote our brief statement to some other items on the Committee's agenda.
The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic is of the view that the convening of a world disarmament conference would be an important incentive for the concertation and intensification of the efforts of all States directed towards finding new ways and means for resolving the vital problems of disarmament. We believe that, if such a meeting were successfully held and full use were made of all the favourable possibilities created by the current positive course of events, there might be a new turning point in disarmament efforts. On the basis of these considerations, the Mongolian delegation continues to favour the earliest possible convening of a world disarmament conference, with the participation of all States of the world without exception.
The urgent need for holding such a broad international meeting on disarmament questions has been stressed in the statements of representatives of an overwhelming majority of States both at the three previous sessions of the General Assembly and at this session. In these statements and in the comments submitted by Governments to the Secretary-General in answer to his letter, there was a detailed reflection of the position of States with regard to the purposes and tasks of a world disarmament conference, its agenda and the place and time for it to be convened.

In a word, in a certain sense it can be claimed that a considerable amount of work has already been done towards preparing for the conference. Everyone is well aware that the question of convening a world meeting to discuss disarmament problems has recently been actively discussed at a number of international meetings, and the idea has met with broad approval on the part of world public opinion and all peace-loving forces. I will just give two examples. The Moscow World Congress of Peace-Loving Forces, in which the representatives of more than 120 international governmental and non-governmental organizations and about 1,000 national organizations and movements from 143 countries of the world took part, supported the idea of convening a world disarmament conference as soon as possible. The Central Committee of the International Co-operative Alliance, at its meeting in October 1973 in Budapest, on behalf of the 270 million families belonging to the co-operative movement from 60 countries of the world, called upon the General Assembly of the United Nations to convene a world disarmament conference as soon as possible in order to call a halt to the arms race and thus free vast sums of money to meet the vital needs of mankind.

So the question arises, why do those who have claimed to be "the real representatives" of the interests of the broad masses so strenuously oppose the convening of such a world meeting? This unrealistic attitude continues to be maintained, in spite of the encouragingly positive fact that the United Nations and many of its organs have begun to co-operate even more closely with the non-governmental and public organizations and have been paying more attention to the voice of world public opinion in such important areas as the strengthening of peace, the struggle against colonialism, apartheid and so on.
The report submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee once again testifies eloquently to the broad support that exists for the proposal to convene a world conference in the early future, a conference which can become such an important step towards the fulfilment of the hopes and aspirations of the peoples to live in a world free of weapons and wars. The delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic on the whole supports this report and would like to take this opportunity to express its gratitude to the Chairman of the Committee, Ambassador Hoveyda, for the useful work done by the Ad Hoc Committee under his skilful leadership. Our delegation, like many others, considers that the time is now ripe, as has been pointed out in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee, for convening the world conference. It supports the idea of expanding the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee so that it can proceed to the practical preparations for convening the conference.

As we know, at the last session of the General Assembly a decision of fundamental importance was adopted on the question of reducing the military budgets of the five permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and using part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries. Our delegation, from the very beginning, has wholeheartedly supported the initiative of the Soviet Union and views it as a timely and topical step which combines three of the problems which are of the greatest concern to world public opinion. That is, the strengthening of international peace and security, disarmament and economic development. In the interesting report of the Secretary-General prepared with the assistance of a group of expert consultants on the reduction of military budgets, there are, we believe, three important conclusions. These are, first, that international conditions for considering the question of reducing military budgets are more favourable than they were before; secondly, that the reduction of military budgets is a partial disarmament measure and, as such, would promote a strengthening of mutual understanding among States; thirdly, that the initiative of the Soviet Union linked the question of disarmament organically with the question of development.
I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate our colleague, Ambassador D. K. Banerjee, under whose Chairmanship the experts made a start in the practical study of this important matter which, we believe, has very promising prospects. In our view, the implementation of the General Assembly decision on this subject would be a real contribution to curbing the arms race primarily in regard to the armaments of the nuclear Powers, that is, the permanent members of the Security Council who, under the United Nations Charter, bear primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. However, to our deepest regret, we have to point out that some of the permanent members of the Security Council, on various pretexts, are putting a brake on progress in this important matter and are virtually disregarding the view of the overwhelming majority of States of the world, as well as the responsibility which they bear under the United Nations Charter. The Mongolian delegation believes that the formation of the Special Committee on the Distribution of the Funds Released as a Result of the Reduction of Military Budgets should be completed so that it can get down to work as soon as possible.

Permit me to say a few words on another item of the agenda. The Mongolian delegation favours the prohibition of napalm and other incendiary weapons. Of course, there is no such thing as a humane weapon. But this kind of weapon which is being used ever more widely against the peoples who are waging their liberation struggle, is extreme in the cruelty and destructiveness of its effect. We think that because of the effects, particularly the long-term effects on human health and the human environment, these weapons essentially are really very little different from some types of weapons of mass destruction. The Conference of governmental experts recently held in Lucerne, in our view, did some useful work in studying further incendiary weapons, which are very complex in nature, and also many aspects of the problem of banning their use.
This kind of work, in the view of our delegation, is useful in preparing the ground for a comprehensive consideration of the problem of banning all forms of this weapon in the appropriate competent international bodies, particularly at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

In concluding this statement today, I should like to set forth briefly the position of my delegation on the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and its work. My delegation shares the feelings of dissatisfaction which have been expressed here and in that Committee itself with regard to the lack of perceptible progress in the work of that body over the last three years. At the same time, we believe that it is difficult to expect continuous concrete results from a multilateral negotiating body which deals with extremely complex matters such as the problems of disarmament. To this we should add that the Committee, like other similar international bodies, mirrors the actual state of the world political situation. In this regard it is worth pointing out the fact that two nuclear Powers have excluded themselves from the work of the Committee. Their positive participation would do a great deal to enhance the effectiveness of the Committee's work.

We believe that the lack of concrete results for a certain period of time should not serve as a pretext for overlooking the former achievements of the Committee and for disregarding the useful experience, skill and knowledge it has accumulated. As we might have expected, the majority of the Member of the United Nations do understand this objective fact and are in favour of strengthening the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and making it more effective. One piece of evidence for this is the interest displayed by many States in taking part in the Committee's work. In this regard, my delegation welcomes the expansion of the Committee's membership, as a result of which the talks on disarmament will include a few more States, including States which possess considerable economic and military potential.

The delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic sincerely congratulates the new members of the Committee: the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Iran, Peru and Zaire. We express the hope that these States will make a worthy contribution to the Committee's work.
Mr. TRAORE (Mali) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, before stating the views of the delegation of Mali on the items under discussion in the First Committee, I should like to express to you our great satisfaction at seeing you preside over our work. Your special interest in disarmament problems, your personal contribution to the activities of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, your eminent qualities as a diplomat, and the competence of the other officers of the Committee, will undoubtedly guarantee the success of our work.

It is said that the world is in a state of détente. The happy initiatives taken to bring about a meeting of minds, and understanding and co-operation among peoples and States will nevertheless bear no fruit as long as their destiny is haunted by the dangerous and terrible threat of the ultimate weapon.

The hecatomb which mankind barely escaped in the course of the last war is still something more than a remote possibility.

The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and the international community, although aware of the danger, have nevertheless not managed to reverse the trend towards the overkill.

Interventionist action and the infernal cycle of violence which has resulted and which has continued to create upheavals in the world since the end of the Second World War have regrettably proved that military power still remains the only guarantor of nations. That is the sad and cruel reality of our times.

It is reflected in a general spread of the arms race in its most disquieting aspects, that is to say, the further improvement of the weapons of mass destruction and their dissemination throughout the world -- in the seas, in the oceans and very soon, if it has not already taken place, in outer space.

The fear that we may destroy ourselves, our proclamations, and treaties on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons have not helped reverse this trend. On the contrary, haunting fears of instability have led small- and medium-sized States to give priority to strengthening their arsenals, to the detriment of their economic development. Today at least 20 States have become possessors of the nuclear secret. Instead of non-proliferation, we are therefore witnessing the potential proliferation of nuclear weapons.
The arms race continues at breakneck speed, as though the threat of the destruction of our universe, the hunger and deprivation which are already knocking at our door were not sufficiently disturbing to lead us to give up wasting enormous sums on the manufacture and development of weapons of death.

Talks on disarmament and the agreements reached have covered not the qualitative limitation of arms, but only their quantitative limitation. And here again the approach to solutions was not universal, as it should have been to be effective. Furthermore, this approach takes no account of the relationship between disarmament and development, which is one of the paramount elements of the Second Development Decade.

Is that not one of the reasons why the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament moves from session to session in almost academic discussions, in particular on halting the nuclear arms race and the prohibition of nuclear weapons?

It is true that in the course of 1974 efforts towards disarmament and in the more general direction of lessening tensions between nations have been made. We need only recall the continuation of talks on European security and co-operation, the European-Arab dialogue, and the signing on 31 July of the Treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union forbidding any tests over a certain threshold, together with the Additional Protocols.
But we are bound to recognize that the hopes aroused by the promise made in 1973 that SALT II would achieve substantial results are far from having been fulfilled. The latest agreements do not refer to the perfecting of strategic weapons.

Furthermore, the agreements concluded on the prohibition of nuclear tests on land and in the atmosphere were made possible by the improvement in the techniques for underground nuclear explosions; similarly, in the future the limitation of underground tests will doubtless be proposed when other, less ostentatious methods have been perfected.

The present level of the stockpiles of nuclear weapons, terrifying in itself, could certainly be reduced by the proper implementation of those agreements, but the spectre of a holocaust would not thereby be removed. Furthermore, the annual increase in military budgets and the perfecting of nuclear weapons destroy in advance the effects of such agreements.

Unlike the situation that prevailed in past decades, the most deadly weapons of destruction are now spread throughout the world, under so-called mutual defence agreements which, in fact, are nothing but alliances to dominate the world. What is more, the sea-bed and the surface of the oceans have not escaped this deployment of force. For example, it is most regrettable to note that despite the adoption by the General Assembly of its resolution 2992 (XXVII), which declared the Indian Ocean to be a zone of peace, the presence of warships warships continues to disturb that region. The plan to strengthen the air and naval base at Diego Garcia constitutes in that respect non-application of the foregoing resolution and is therefore a challenge to the international community. And, as we see, the trend of the arms race is far from having been reversed.

It was that hard and sad fact which was reflected in the following words spoken by the Foreign Minister of Mali in the General Assembly on 7 October 1974: "... no substantial agreement on disarmament has been concluded and ... in fact, the arms race has intensified, the club of nuclear Powers has expanded and the rate of research and development of nuclear weapons has accelerated. The two major Powers have passed from the second generation nuclear arms, that is, the multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicles (MIRVs), to the third generation, that is, the tridents (MARVs), which are capable of evading the anti-missile missile barrages".

(A/PV.2259, p. 28)
Our Committee must face that fact and redouble its efforts to ensure respect for the relevant provisions of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and of the resolutions on the demuclearization of Africa and the Indian Ocean. These measures would gain by being extended to other areas of the world which are the object of greed and rivalries. That is why the delegation of Mali firmly supports the idea of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle East and South Asia. The successive crises that have shaken those regions—the most recent crisis almost led to a general conflagration—should induce us to consider these proposals favourably.

Thus, although the Government of Mali adhered to the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, we have constantly pointed out that the Treaty is insufficient. The serious gap could have been closed, not by mutual security agreements among the super-Powers but by universal guarantees of non-recourse to these weapons, in conformity with resolution 2936 (XXVII) adopted by the General Assembly.

The atomic umbrellas of the two large military blocs dominating the world certainly do not suffice to reassure the majority of the States members of the international community, which do not belong to those alliances. In a word, the problems of nuclear disarmament have so far been considered in terms of relations of force, or, if you prefer, in terms of hegemony. It follows that all the agreements concluded so far are only arrangements peripheral to disarmament. The political will to negotiate general and real disarmament continues, unfortunately, to be lacking. The reports of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) have always stressed that. The Secretary-General's report (A/9770) on the reduction of military budgets has confirmed it.

With regard to the CCD, my delegation has already had occasion to emphasize the need to give it a new breath of life. Furthermore, although that body has been strengthened numerically, we continue to believe that its present system of an immovable co-chairmanship needs to be modified in order to give more dynamism to the Committee's work. Indeed, that is one of the proposals made by the non-aligned countries with a view to giving the CCD renewed vigour by making its structures more democratic.
Be that as it may, the problem of disarmament as a whole remains with us. The initiatives taken to solve it have been timid up to now, whether nuclear weapons or chemical weapons such as napalm are involved.

An examination of paragraphs 98 to 142 of the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (A/9708) indicates once again that the discussions in the CCD on chemical weapons are liable to go on indefinitely so long as there is no political will to conclude new agreements to prohibit the use of toxins as weapons of war.

With regard to the control of chemical disarmament, my delegation believes that the institutional machinery envisaged to undertake that control should in the first place concern itself with the localization of existing stockpiles of chemical weapons and with the control over their use for peaceful or non-peaceful purposes. That is why we support the proposal already made on those lines by the delegations of the non-aligned countries in the CCD. Before setting up institutional machinery to control the use of chemical weapons, the General Assembly should have before it specific proposals on the prohibition of such weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles.

The draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction, submitted in Geneva by the socialist countries members of the CCD; the working paper submitted there by the delegations of the 10 non-aligned countries; and the most recent draft convention, submitted by Japan, should make it possible for the CCD to pass from the stage of technical considerations and statements on the establishment of a control mechanism to the phase of negotiations that should rapidly succeed in formulating an agreement on the prohibition of nuclear weapons.

We venture to hope that the joint Soviet-American statement of 4 July 1974 in which the two super-Powers undertake to place before the CCD specific proposals on the prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles will very soon be put into effect.
As we know, the General Assembly has been concerned with the problem of napalm since 1972. The various reports of CCD and of other interested bodies have sufficiently emphasized both the deadly nature of that weapon of mass destruction and the atrocious effects on the human body for the international community to decide to forbid its use.

The arms race is as harmful for the political conduct of States as for their economic and social future.

In general, the rate of increase in military expenditures bears no relation to the funds allocated for the struggle against poverty, disease and ignorance.

The developing countries naturally bear the expense of the unbridled arms race and over-arming which we are witnessing and they are being ruined by it.

The amount of this monstrous waste becomes even clearer when one links disarmament to development, as provided for in resolution 2602 E (XXIV) on the disarmament decade and resolution 2626 (XXV) on the strategy for the second United Nations Development Decade.

In fact, in 1970 the developed countries allocated 6.70 per cent of their gross national product for arms, as against 0.35 per cent for assistance to developing countries.

It is likewise estimated that, during that same period, budgets for research amounted to \$60,000 million, of which \$25,000 million were for military purposes and only \$4,000 million for health research.

The report of the Secretary-General on the reduction by 10 per cent of military budgets indicates that military expenditures amounted to \$275,000 million in 1973 at current prices. Still according to this report:

"This figure is larger than the combined estimated product of the developing countries of South Asia, the Far East and Africa combined, and much larger than that of Latin America." (A/9770, p. 10)

The problem of disarmament, however complex it may be, is far from being essentially technical. Disarmament conferences could multiply and succeed one another, but they will never achieve conclusive results unless:

"... leaders ... change the direction of the policies which have led to arms races; if they reject external policies of intervention; if they reject international competition for power and prestige expressed through military might." (ST/BCA/174, p. 2)
This conclusion, from the Report of the Group of Experts on the Economic and Social Consequences of Disarmament, is an entire programme in itself. My delegation appeals to the members of this Committee to consider these guiding ideas.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank Ambassador Traore of Mali for the kind words he was so good as to address to the officers of the Committee.

Mr. PEREZ de CUELLAR (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, I could not start my first statement in this Committee without expressing to you my satisfaction as a Latin American and as a Peruvian on seeing, as Chairman of this Committee, a brilliant and experienced representative of a country with which we have such fraternal friendship. I express to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the other officers of the Committee, our warmest congratulations and our best wishes for success in your important task.

We are drawing to the end of this general debate on the disarmament items which are on the agenda of the First Committee. I bow to the desire of the officers of the Committee that we should conclude at the beginning of this week and accordingly my statement shall be both concise and selective. Therefore I shall not touch on every item, and I reserve my right to comment on specific aspects when we consider the draft resolutions submitted on those items.

The delegation of Peru was a member of the Ad Hoc Committee for the World Disarmament Conference and we were then able to observe how difficult was the task before it. It is true that its mandate was limited to a mere compilation and study of the opinions and suggestions on the desirability of convening the conference, to such an extent that we could almost say that its best efforts were devoted to the preparation of the report. But this was precisely the most difficult part of its work, since resolution 3183 (XXVIII) provided that the report had to be adopted by consensus; and consensus, as we know, included not only the 40 non-nuclear Powers who are members of the Committee, but also -- and this is essential -- the five nuclear Powers. As everybody knows, their positions were very different regarding the desirability of the conference, prior requirements and the timeliness of convening such a conference.
My delegation continues to believe that we must take advantage of the fact that no country rejects the principle itself of the usefulness of a world disarmament conference. We believe that the very fact of holding such a world conference with the participation of all the nuclear Powers would in large measure justify the effort of preparation, because, in our opinion, by focusing the attention of Governments and public opinion on the very serious problems of the arms race, the effect would be to give new impetus to the concrete measures which of course could not be negotiated in detail. A world disarmament conference, by setting the major guidelines, the broad general direction for disarmament, would serve as a catalyst for disarmament negotiations at every level.

For those reasons, my delegation will give its full support to any initiative which will bring us a step nearer to the conference. We consider it highly auspicious for disarmament in general that the idea of the conference remain alive.

We have received with great interest the new proposal submitted to the General Assembly by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, entitled "Prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health". My country has directly experienced some of the serious blows of nature due to ecological disturbances, disturbances in the environment caused by nature. We need only mention earthquakes, radiation from atmospheric nuclear explosions, changes in marine currents which result in the virtual disappearance of certain species of fish which are vital to our economy, and others which it would take too long to enumerate. We are gravely concerned that these uncontrollable phenomena of nature may come to be administered and used deliberately by human action. We can but be in favour of having the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament consider those problems and of the desirability of a convention on the subject being adopted, by which States will refrain in future from using such means of warfare.

Certainly, on welcoming the initiative of the Soviet Union, we are taking no position in regard to the priority which this proposal should have in relation to other items which are before CCD.
A brief review of our agenda indicates that a new approach is being evolved in regard to disarmament or arms control, principally in the nuclear sphere: this is the zonal or regional approach. No less than 5 of our 12 items adopt this approach in one form or another.

There cannot be any major doubt that the pattern set at Tlatelolco, namely by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, is an important source of inspiration. That is as it should be. The Tlatelolco Treaty has, for some years been going through which I might call a period of expansion if not one of gaining strength. A major part of the region is now covered by the provisions of the Treaty, and there are grounds for expecting that in the near future all the States of America, including the Bahamas and Grenada which have recently joined the United Nations, will be able to join the régime of denuclearization. Two of the four Powers which were in a position to sign and ratify Additional Protocol I have already done so, and all nuclear weapon States except one are parties to Additional Protocol II; and we appeal to the remaining State to become a party also.

But the success of the movement towards denuclearization in Latin America -- and it is important to emphasize this -- was achieved largely because the prevailing political circumstances in Latin America made it possible. We could wish that this model could be used automatically in other regions of the world, but we are not sure whether circumstances elsewhere are equally propitious.

Peru has received with gratitude the invitation extended to it by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to participate in its work as of 1 January 1975, as soon as the General Assembly confirms our membership in CCD.

My country will endeavour to live up to the responsibility it assumes in the certainty that the invitation of CCD has been influenced in some measure by the position of Peru concerning certain current problems of disarmament and arms limitation.
Today we can but reaffirm and re-emphasize, in this connexion, our firm position of principle as regards the priority item before CCD, namely, the urgent need for the cessation of all nuclear arms tests. Our position in this regard is perfectly well known and remains unalterable. I am pleased to affirm here that it is in the light of this position that we shall consider the draft resolutions submitted on this subject at the present session of the General Assembly as well as the proposals in CCD.

On the other hand, we cannot doubt that in the proposal of Peru as a member of CCD, account has been taken of the position of my country on arms limitation at the regional level, which is reflected in the proposal of the President of Peru, General Juan Velasco Alvarado, that the countries of Latin America reduce their military budgets and devote the savings thus obtained to purposes of economic and social development that are vital for our peoples.

This initiative not only reflects the friendly attitude of Peru regarding the friendly countries which are our neighbours but also --- if that were necessary --- it proves my Government's firm and active vocation for peace. This position will be expressed unflaggingly in the august negotiation forum in Geneva.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank my friend, Ambassador Perez de Cuellar, for the very courteous and kind words addressed to my country and to me.

Mr. MIKANAGU (Burundi) (interpretation from French): One of the former Presidents of the United States said that you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

The question of general and complete disarmament affects all the peoples of the world.

The peoples of Africa, who must, however, defend themselves against colonialism, imperialism, exploitation and neo-colonial pillage, do not produce a single cartridge and consequently have no armaments to reduce. Our peoples love peace, justice and liberty. That is why we are in favour of genuine disarmament, the total destruction of stockpiles of all arms of mass
destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, the prohibition of their
manufacture and of the development of other types of arms of this kind,
and also the dismantling of military bases and the withdrawal of foreign
troops from all parts of the world.

It is on the basis of this genuine commitment that a world
disarmament conference could take place, because that conference must not
be a mere rostrum for propaganda or misleading utterances made in order to
camouflage the arms race and thus deceive the people of the world. Nor
should we be in too much of a hurry to convene a world disarmament conference
lest it lead finally to the failure of the objective in view, that is,
genuine, general and complete disarmament.

We are convinced that at the very beginning that conference must have good
chances of success because all the peoples of the world have a vital
interest in the success of the world disarmament conference. There is no point in
being in too much of a hurry, we must start out at the proper speed. We cannot
accept the idea of the failure of a world disarmament conference. That is
why it is necessary for all the nuclear Powers to agree to participate in
the conference.

If the most powerful nuclear Powers of the world are tempted to get
together behind the backs of other countries by means of bilateral
negotiations in order to bring about a balance of their armaments so that
all the other peoples of the world will bow to them, they may be
sure in any case that they will not succeed in fooling all the people
all the time. The world disarmament conference can only succeed in an atmosphere
of mutual confidence among peoples, free from suspicion and distrust.

Today we are witnessing the advent of a new era in international
relations. The last Middle East war, and also the energy crisis which
followed it, have opened the eyes of the peoples of the third world.
These people are now beginning to raise their heads. They are demanding the end of exploitation, alienation, colonial and neo-colonial pillaging of their natural resources.

We hope that the most powerful countries in the world will not attempt to put back the clock by using their traditional weapon of the law of the strongest in this jungle of international relations.
We suppose that they will not try to use the bogey man of fear and terror and have recourse to a nuclear threat by setting in motion their navies, which are sailing over the seas and oceans. And, if a new war were to break out, it does not necessarily follow that we would stand to lose the most. The experience of the Second World War teaches us that, thanks to it, all the peoples of the world have finally won their political liberty.

However, we are quite aware that a planetary catastrophe might be entailed by nuclear war. But the fact remains that the violence which prevails in the world is particularly localized in the countries of the third world. Here I would venture to quote what my Foreign Minister said on 7 October last in the general debate in the General Assembly:

"The great Powers of this world should first of all renounce their policy of domination and hegemony which is at the basis of the incessant arms race, whose aim is eliminating the weaker States. It is no mere chance that all the conflicts and hotbeds of tension are located not within the spheres of the super-Powers or of the industrialized countries, but in the developing countries.

"It therefore appears clear that the true victims of the arms race are indeed the countries of the third world..." (A/PV.2259, p. 71)

Within the same context, we deplore the close military co-operation between certain NATO countries and the minority racist régime of South Africa. These imperialist countries are continuing a tragic and absurd situation which has changed that part of southern Africa into a veritable powder keg. This situation threatens international peace and security.

My Government is still in favour of genuine disarmament, the objective being, within the framework of a world conference, the total destruction of nuclear stockpiles. We are gratified by the work done by the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, whose task was to consider all views and suggestions put before it by Governments on the subject of convening a world disarmament conference. This work has been accomplished thanks to the exceptional intelligence and skill of Ambassador Hoveyda of Iran, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee.
I should also like to express my delegation's gratitude to the Rapporteur of that Committee and the Chairman of its Working Group, Mr. Elias of Spain, for his tireless efforts.

The unbridled arms race and the accumulation of nuclear weapons by the super-Powers will prompt other nuclear Powers in their turn to equip themselves with comparable military power, while the non-nuclear Powers are going to try to acquire nuclear weapons in order to break the monopoly and to be able to rely on their own resources for the defence of their vital interests. Where will this get us? While these vast sums of money are being spent on armaments they could be used for the highly humanitarian cause of improving the well-being of all peoples and in particular the economic and social development of the third world.

That is why we remain convinced that the peoples of the world -- those of the nuclear Powers and those of the non-nuclear Powers -- will one day succeed in overthrowing the fascist, belligerent Governments whose short-sighted politicians are incapable of understanding the course of history.

What sufferings, what privations and sacrifices have been imposed upon these peoples while millions and millions of dollars are being swallowed up every day in the industries of death!

The Burundi delegation believes that nuclear energy should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, for creative purposes, for the development of economic progress and human well-being.

The implementation of the Declaration making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace is of concern to my delegation. The growing rivalry between the great Powers in the Indian Ocean is a grave threat to the Afro-Asian countries and to international peace and security.

My delegation also supports the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East and South Asia. We are also in favour of Additional Protocols I and II of the Tlatelolco Treaty for the total prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America.
In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I should like to tell you how encouraging it is for the Burundi delegation to see you conducting the proceedings of this important Committee. We are not at all surprised at the way in which you have so effectively been conducting our proceedings, because we have long known your competence, diplomatic skill and political flexibility.

I should like also to take this opportunity to convey our congratulations to the other officers of the Committee.

It might have been noted that my delegation has failed to refer to several of the items on our agenda and we therefore reserve our right to speak again at a later stage when specific items are being examined.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Burundi for the kind words addressed to the officers of the Committee.

Mr. HYVÄRINKI: As delegations will recall, in my statement of 29 October I proposed, in the name of the Finnish Government, that a comprehensive study on the question of nuclear-free zones in all its aspects be initiated. The Finnish delegation has been gratified by the positive response that proposal has received. Several speakers have commented favourably on it in their statements in this Committee. The response has been equally favourable in consultations which my delegation has conducted with a great number of other delegations, particularly those which have expressed a special interest in the question of nuclear-free zones. During those consultations a number of points have been made with regard to the drafting of an appropriate resolution. My delegation will deal with them in due course in connexion with the introduction of a draft resolution.

In its statement of 29 October, the Finnish delegation dealt exclusively with the problem of the proliferation of nuclear weapons -- a question of unequalled importance at this time. Today I should like to speak briefly on three questions: the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, chemical weapons and ecological warfare.
Our interest in CCD is well known. The Finnish Government has closely followed its work by dispatching, on a regular basis, special observers to Geneva. Furthermore, it has tried to make an active contribution to the disarmament efforts within the CCD. In the field of chemical weapons, for example, Finland has submitted to the Committee working papers on a project for the creation of a control capacity on a national basis for possible future international use. I shall come back to this particular question in a few minutes."

* Mr. Siddiq (Afghanistan), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.
The Finnish Government continues to consider CCD the major
organ for multilateral disarmament negotiations. Through the years,
CCD has proved its usefulness by producing four important multilateral arms
control agreements. At the same time, it has given impetus to other disarmament
negotiations, notably the SALT talks. The regrettable fact that for the
last three years CCD has not been able to report new treaties for the
approval of the General Assembly is not due to any inherent weaknesses in its
structure or working methods. It is due to differences in the substantive
positions of the parties concerned. The Committee on Disarmament remains the best
place to overcome those difficulties.

As from the beginning of next year, CCD will have five new members.
This enlargement will bring a positive new element to CCD, while maintaining
its basic balance and preserving its character of a negotiating body of
manageable proportions.

We also note that CCD can expect an active, busy and, it is to be hoped,
productive session next year. It will, however, remain the task of its members --
and particularly its major military Powers -- to translate those expectations
and hopes into concrete progress. The work of CCD on chemical weapons has
received new impetus through the Japanese draft convention, as well as through
the declared intention of the two co-Chairmen to take a joint initiative in
the same matter. It has been proposed, further, that CCD should deal at
its next session with the new Soviet proposal concerning environmental
warfare. We furthermore hope that the General Assembly will request CCD
once more to make a renewed effort to find the right formula to induce the major
Powers to accept a comprehensive test ban treaty.

On the question of chemical weapons, it may well be that next year
will at last bring that breakthrough for which CCD itself has worked
so intensively and which all of us have been expecting for the last three years.
The makings are unquestionably there for an agreement on this question.

I referred earlier to the impetus which the work of CCD in the field
of chemical weapons received from the Japanese draft convention on the subject.
Once the joint initiative agreed upon by the United States and the USSR materializes,
CCD will have an opportunity to enter into concrete negotiations with a view
to elaborating a draft treaty on the subject. We hope that the negotiating process will be initiated in all seriousness and that concrete progress can be registered at the next session of the Assembly.

I referred a moment ago to the effort of the Finnish Government to make a concrete and practical contribution to the work of CCD on chemical weapons. This has taken the form of a project on the creation, on a national basis, of a chemical weapon control capacity for possible future international use. Work on the project has now been continuing for three years and has progressed as planned. The Finnish Government has kept CCD continuously informed about the project by submitting detailed working papers on it. The latest of these is annexed to this year's report of the Committee on Disarmament.

The proposal of the Soviet Union concerning the prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military purposes -- one of the three new items on our disarmament agenda -- is both timely and important. The problems related to that question give rise to a few general remarks on the uses of advanced science and technology. The vast research and development effort for military purposes nourishes and maintains the qualitative arms race, and vice versa. This waste of human talent and expertise takes place at a time when all the energies and resources available should be channelled to serve constructive instead of destructive purposes. Yet, on the level of basic research the dividing line between the two is rather delicate. Many of its results may have both civilian and military applications.

Measures to influence the environment and climate are a case in point. Man has hoped that some processes of nature could be harnessed for human benefit -- as in the control of destructive natural phenomena like hurricanes, or in the discovery of means to induce rain in areas plagued by drought. Indeed, our Committee in its consideration of the outer space resolutions approved a request to the World Meteorological Organization.

"... to pursue actively the implementation of its tropical cyclone project, continuing and intensifying its other related action programmes, including the World Weather Watch, and, especially, the efforts being undertaken towards obtaining basic meteorological data and discovering ways and means to mitigate the harmful effects of tropical storms and to remove or minimize their destructive potential..."
Modest as the present achievements may be, the promises of new breakthroughs in science are great. Yet, these new inventions could, either now or in the foreseeable future, be utilized as methods of warfare to influence the climate and the environment destructively. The time has come, therefore, to act against that danger, however hypothetical. We agree that a pre-emptive action in this question is appropriate.

There is also concern that methods of warfare of this kind undermine the principles of existing international law. This has caused some Governments to take up the question of environmental war in the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts, in order to include a prohibiting clause to the Additional Protocols of the Geneva Convention. That process is still under way.

The concern caused by the prospect of environmental war is shared by ecologists. They know that intentional efforts to destroy some elements of the fragile ecological systems, or efforts to manipulate the sensitive mechanisms of nature for destructive purposes, could have incalculable and irreparable consequences. That warning was strongly voiced only two years ago by the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment.

As the report of CCD tells us, the question of environmental warfare was touched upon by some delegations during the past session. The joint statement by the United States and the Soviet Union where the two countries expressed their desire to undertake

"... the most effective measures possible to overcome the dangers of the use of environmental codification techniques for military purposes..." (CCD/431, p. 8) has been widely acclaimed. We welcome the initiative taken to bring this important question to the attention of the General Assembly. We also endorse the idea of requesting CCD to discuss this issue and report back to the General Assembly at its thirtieth session. We wish to stress the importance of including environmental experts in the deliberations of CCD on this question.*

* The Chairman returned to the Chair.
Mr. PENJOR (Bhutan): Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank you for calling on me even at this stage of our debate. My delegation also wishes to join previous speakers in congratulating you on your election as Chairman of this important political Committee. The bulk of the agenda is devoted to disarmament, and it is fitting that you should preside over the deliberations on a subject so familiar to you and in which you are well versed. You have already very ably demonstrated your capacity and experience in guiding the debate and harmonizing different viewpoints so that a widely acceptable pattern may emerge. I also offer our congratulations to the two Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur. I asked to speak as I deemed it essential to express the views of my delegation on some of the items to which we attach importance. The Kingdom of Bhutan is a peace-loving State and we follow the developments on disarmament with keen interest.

The arms race -- nuclear and conventional -- on which astronomical sums of money are spent, frightens all mankind. Several previous speakers furnished full details of the rising expenditure and of the inventory of the arsenals of the super-Powers and that of the medium and small Powers as well. Although it is necessary to avoid repetition, yet, in order to highlight the dimension and magnitude of the fear which grips humanity, it is essential to mention again that as much as $270 thousand million have been spent each year on armaments. Staggering as this amount is, it is no exaggeration to say that it has not benefited any person either in the developed or in the developing or poor countries. Vast additional sums of money are to be spent both on sophisticated conventional weapons to replace those made outmoded and obsolete, and on proliferation of nuclear weapons simultaneously with the improvement of the mechanics of the delivery system. If the development of new and more lethal weapons continues unabated, it will weaken the fragile fabric of the international order.

While a stable level of expenditure is to be preferred to a rising trend, the fact remains that an annual expenditure of some $270 thousand million not only represents a colossal waste of resources but also permits the refinement and expansion of an already enormous capacity for destruction. Despite the well-intentioned levelling off in world military expenditure, the technological arms race -- the development of new and more lethal weapons -- continues unabated. In view of this, my delegation last year supported the reduction in military
budgets in the hope that the production of destructive armaments could be minimized and that the developing countries would to that extent benefit. In spite of these efforts, certain nuclear-weapon Powers are unfortunately proceeding to accumulate deadly nuclear weapons. In the summary of the contents of the SIPRI Year Book, 1974, it is stated that world military expenditure is running at about $207 thousand million per year, which is over 6 per cent of the gross national product of the world and equivalent to fully one-third of the combined output of the 2,000 million people living in the world's underdeveloped regions. The report goes on to say that the military expenditure of those countries which provide development aid is estimated to be approximately 6.7 per cent of their gross national product, which is nearly 30 times greater than the official development aid that they provide. The report notes that the transfer of resources from military to peaceful uses could significantly raise standards of living and promote faster growth.

The corner-stone of the United Nations Charter was laid "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind". It is due to a curious combination of circumstances that the present generation has not yet been annihilated by the nuclear holocaust, and we should indeed thank Almighty God for his mercy.

To strengthen the steps towards disarmament, various proposals have been advanced in the recent past. We shall not advocate their rejection without carefully examining their import as well as the impact that they can make.

Nevertheless, being of serious concern to mankind, disarmament is taking on a new urgency. The present decade is for both disarmament and development, and they are of the greatest importance to the world community. It has been observed by many intellectuals that we have to learn to live with the bomb, as we are indeed doing every year. These remarks do not mean that we should be lulled into a complacent mood and that we should allow things to drift beyond control. At the same time, we should encourage new ideas and initiatives intended to accelerate the much needed development process, so that we do not leave the solution of the problem in the hands of a few.
Some previous speakers characterized the progress made in the field of disarmament within the framework of the United Nations as halting and disappointingly slow. There is some justification, but we must recognize the complex nature of the subject. It is also evident from the report that the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament is at a crawl, but the significant point is that the debate is proceeding and we believe that nothing should be done to stall this debate. The achievements of this Committee are by no means impressive, nor has its performance brought the world back from the brink of catastrophe and disaster. We therefore urge that, until other feasible arrangements are brought into existence, the Committee should continue with its work, intensifying its activities if necessary.

A comprehensive disarmament conference has become more urgent than ever. My delegation would welcome the holding of a world disarmament conference to create conditions under which real progress could be made. Such a conference might, in our opinion, strengthen the foundations for a lasting peace, which is the highest aspiration of mankind.

In this context we have read the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference. We recognize that careful preparations should be made if the conference is to meet with success. The goal should be universal and complete disarmament. The conference should undoubtedly be universal in character. All the Member States, without exception, should whole-heartedly participate in it. The deliberations should take place in a free and cordial atmosphere. The issues should not be prejudged. Above all, there should be a pervading and complete trust among the participants. Then one can hope for a desirable outcome.
Be that as it may, the trend towards détente and relaxation of international tensions appears to be holding. It is to be noted that small gains have resulted from this trend. The second stage of SALT is to be resumed soon. If and when a firm understanding is reached, it should, if possible, embrace the remaining nuclear weapon Powers so that the nuclear threat, hanging like the sword of Damocles, is banished forever. It is also hoped that the results of the mutual force reduction negotiations could bring significant consequences for nuclear policies.

My delegation regrets to note that progress towards outlawing chemical and biological weapons is very slow. This area, in the view of my delegation, offers a real opportunity for the Member States concerned to show a high level of statesmanship by reaching an agreement not to produce any chemical or biological weapons and to destroy those already in existence. It is realized that a quick result cannot be expected. However, keeping the Geneva Protocol of 1925 as the basis, a step by-step approach, especially in the Committee on Disarmament, should yield worthwhile results. The use of napalm and other incendiaries in modern warfare is most untenable.

Another area to which Bhutan attaches great importance is the preservation of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. This question has been engaging the attention of the Assembly since 1971. The Secretary General's factual statement of the effect of the great Powers' military presence in the Indian Ocean has been available, and we hope it has facilitated the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. My delegation fully recognizes that the Indian Ocean should be maintained as a zone of peace. If great Power rivalry is allowed to have its effect, it will affect the vital interests of all the littoral States; and acute and serious effects, such as to lead to political instability and social and economic miseries, will also be felt by the hinterland States.

In this regard we compliment Ambassador Amerasinghe for his relentless efforts as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee. We read the report of the Ad Hoc Committee with interest. There is a great need for co-operation among the States of the Indian Ocean as envisaged in the Declaration.
For this purpose it will also be essential to mention with clarity the littoral and hinterland States. We sincerely hope that the great Powers will operate in a practical manner with the Ad Hoc Committee in the discharge of its functions. Such co-operation would enhance the activities of the Committee immensely.

The question of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones is also before us. We believe that all proposals deserve careful consideration. Bhutan has always felt that the highest priority ought to be accorded to measures in the field of nuclear disarmament with a view to promoting the cause of general and complete disarmament. In this connexion, the proposal of the representative of Finland that a comprehensive and analytical study of the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones be undertaken deserves consideration. In fact, two nuclear-weapon-free zones are in existence now. Many delegations that have spoken so far seem to accept it in principle. Several previous speakers have also outlined certain criteria for the establishment of these zones. These criteria deserve careful examination and evaluation. The consensus appears to favour consultations first, amongst the States in the particular region, and an agreement before further action is initiated under the auspices of the United Nations. In this connexion, my delegation agrees with the views expressed by the representative of Bangladesh. In his statement before this Committee on 7 November 1974, he said:

"...the countries of the region should consult among themselves about the desirability of such an idea ... . Without a careful and thorough examination of these ... pertinent points, it would be unreasonable to expect a successful outcome."

"..."Let us ... approach the question of nuclear-weapon free zones as an opportunity that would help to promote regional co-operation and not become a source of disruption." (2011th meeting, pages 11 and 12)

In conclusion, my delegation trusts that disarmament as a method of preserving international peace and security will be given the highest priority in our deliberations of the political issues confronting the world today, and we believe that through disarmament the economic and social development in the third world will be accelerated to bring about peace,
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Bhutan for his cordial congratulations.

Mr. RAJPHUL (Mauritius): Sir, it is not out of sheer courtesy or protocol, but with profound sincerity, that I warmly congratulate you, distinguished colleague, on your unanimous election to the chairmanship of our most important Committee, namely, the Political and Security Committee of the twenty ninth session of the General Assembly. For many years now, I have had the privilege and honour of working closely alongside you in the interests of the world community. During that time, we have forged for ourselves as well as for our respective countries, a strong bond of friendship, mainly under the banner of non-alignment. This in turn naturally led to the establishment of diplomatic relations at ambassadorial level between Mauritius and Argentina.

Earlier this year, together with other African brothers, I had the pleasure of visiting your great and proud country. I shall never forget the hour-long fruitful discussions we had with the legendary late President Perón, in the gracious presence of Señora Isabelita, then Vice-President, and aided by Señor Vignes, your distinguished and learned Minister of Foreign Affairs.

We pray that Argentina will continue to prosper in regained internal peace to become the most important granary of the world, certainly of the third world, thus contributing in an even more effective manner towards the strengthening of international security.

My delegation fully shares the view repeatedly expressed in this Committee as well as in other gatherings, that a new course towards détente and co-operation has developed in international life as a consequence of the deep, on-going changes that have taken place in the world.

While welcoming the growing trend towards mutual understanding between States and peoples, and also towards the further expansion of international trade and economic, scientific, technological and cultural co-operation, we cannot help but notice that in spite of a marked relaxation of tension in recent years, particularly among the big Powers, the arms race continues unrestrained.
The depressing picture of the world today, faced with a multiplicity of economic and social problems, contrasts sharply with the unrestricted waste of resources, both material and human, on arms.
As the recent report by the Secretary-General on military budgets indicates, the world military expenditures in 1973 reached the enormous amount of $275,000 million, a figure which, as was pointed out earlier by the representative of Mali, is larger than the combined estimated product of the developing countries of South Asia, the Far East and Africa combined, and much larger than that of Latin America. The upward spiral in world expenditures for military purposes contrasts both in size and in trend with the aid to developing countries. In total, the developed countries' appropriations for military purposes are some twenty times their appropriations for development aid.

Faced with the prospect of self-destruction and having to solve economic and social problems which are overwhelming, mankind has no choice, no sane alternative, but to start the long-awaited process of disarmament. Regardless of their size or their stage of development, all countries share the responsibility of taking steps which would help achieve this goal.

Thus, our participation in the debates on disarmament stems from our vital interest in world peace, in which a central place is held by the struggle for general disarmament that should allow the material and human resources to concentrate on economic and social development and on raising the welfare of its peoples.

Nuclear weapons constitute the most fearful category of armaments and they pose the greatest threat mankind now faces. We place great hope in international bilateral and multilateral negotiations aimed at the prevention of a nuclear war and nuclear disarmament. This field should have priority over any other subject in international negotiations.

The non-proliferation Treaty reduced the danger of the spread of nuclear weapons, and its universal acceptance is in the best interests of the world community. Although the non-proliferation Treaty is discriminatory against non-nuclear-weapon States, we should admit that, if fulfilled bona fide, the treaty could mean a cornerstone for the prevention of a nuclear war and for making available to mankind the great benefits atomic energy and technology are capable of. The Review Conference scheduled to take place in May 1975 should consider seriously the operation of the Treaty with a view to
The prohibition of nuclear weapon testing is a traditional item on the First Committee's agenda. While agreeing that the 1963 partial test ban Treaty and the 1974 threshold Treaty constitute steps in the right direction, my Government continues to hold the strong view that a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty is urgently needed, particularly against the background of the series of nuclear tests, both in the atmosphere and underground, which we are still witnessing. The nuclear-weapon States have a special responsibility in starting the move toward this end.

The regional approach to disarmament has become an important element in the international search for security. Mauritius gave its support to the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace when that Declaration was adopted three years ago. Together with the other countries bordering the Indian Ocean, we are deeply concerned that the competitive expansion of the military presence of the great Powers in the Indian Ocean would lead to an increase of tension in the area, and we call upon the great Powers to refrain from increasing and strengthening their military presence in the region of the Indian Ocean. Of particular concern to us littoral States of the Indian Ocean is the recent agreement announced in the British House of Commons on 5 February 1974, under the provisions of which the United States would establish support installations on the island of Diego Garcia for warships and aircraft. Any decision by the United Kingdom and the United States to extend communications and military facilities on the island of Diego Garcia would constitute a flagrant violation of the United Nations resolution on the subject. We appeal once again to those directly concerned, especially the United States of America, to reconsider their present policy, which certainly is conducive to the creation not of a zone of peace but rather of one of tension. The peoples of the countries of the Indian Ocean must be allowed to live in peace and security. Therefore Mauritius will continue to explore with others every possibility of maintaining peace in the area.

It is in that spirit that my country approaches also the initiatives regarding the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. At this session of the General Assembly, this question is being dealt with under several agenda items. We support the creation of such zones whenever there is an agreement
in regard to them among the countries concerned. This presupposes, of course, prior consultation and agreement among all the States of those regions. Regrettably, that did not occur in the case of South Asia, as proved by the debates that have taken place so far.

We are living in an epoch which is characterized by revolutionary changes in science and technology. Unfortunately, the achievements of this revolution, because of the duality of their functions, are increasingly used in the military field. We cannot but fully subscribe to what our colleague from Ireland said in this Committee about the "tyranny of technique". Each major advance in military technology seems to impose its own domination and demands upon Governments, and as a result policies cease to be guided by rational political choice and become, instead, imperatives dictated by technical innovation.

Against this background, one should admit without hesitation the great merits of the initiative of the USSR regarding prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health. The frightening picture of the real possibilities of putting into practice certain methods of environmental warfare presented by Ambassador Malik in his speech on 21 October makes it completely clear that we should act before the possibilities become realities. Our attention was drawn to the fact that a particular danger of geophysical warfare exists in the fact that the aggressor can secretly, without declaring war, for many years use some of the methods of such a war against its intended victim. Mauritius shares the concern expressed here by many speakers on the possibility of employing the forces of nature for purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health, and had the privilege of co-sponsoring the draft resolution submitted by the USSR on this item as contained in document A/C.1/L.675.

There is unanimous recognition of the fact that the big Powers bear a special responsibility for the strengthening of peace and security in the world. We, the non-aligned, the small and medium-sized countries, are also aware of our responsibility to contribute to the forward march of contemporary
mankind on a new, progressive road. That is why we regard as extremely important the active participation of all countries in the debates on disarmament. The universalization of the disarmament talks could spur disarmament negotiations and facilitate the adoption of disarmament measures. With this conviction, Mauritius has fully supported the proposal to convene a world disarmament conference and would spare no effort to further promote this proposal at this session. We are of the opinion that a world disarmament conference should be adequately prepared and that participation in the conference should be universal, including the major military Powers.
It is certainly true that the last few years have seen a proliferation of the bodies dealing with disarmament, both inside and outside the United Nations. But the increased activity has not led to the kind of effective action that is so urgently needed.

Among other things, we would have liked to see implemented General Assembly resolution 3093 A (XXVIII) on the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries.

In concluding, I would like to pledge the entire co-operation of my delegation in making this session of the General Assembly a turning point in disarmament negotiations, a landmark in the United Nations efforts to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank Ambassador Ramphul of Mauritius very specially for the kind and moving words he addressed to me, to my country and its authorities. It is auspicious that he has addressed these words to me today when the Ambassador of Mauritius submitted his credentials in Buenos Aires, thus cementing the very close links existing between our two countries.

Mr. KASASA CINYANTA (Zaire) (interpretation from French):
Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted at this late hour to join with all those who congratulated you on your election to the chairmanship of our Committee. May I also congratulate the other officers of the Committee on their brilliant election. As the speakers before me have said, I should like to express the hope that our work will be successful. I should also like to point out that diplomatic relations have very recently been established between your country and mine, and I feel sure that your country and mine will both promote their development.
The delegation of Zaire in this First Committee has hesitated a long time before speaking on the various items on our agenda. Indeed, my delegation thought that all that could be said on (a) the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and the utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries; (b) napalm and other incendiary weapons and all aspects of their possible use, (c) chemical and bacteriological weapons; (d) the urgent need for cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban; (e) the world disarmament conference; (f) general and complete disarmament; (g) the prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health -- all that could be said has been said by the eminent speakers who spoke before me.

So could I really add anything new? Perhaps an original approach to the presentation of these matters in the spirit of the statement made on 4 October 1973 by our President, Citizen Mobutu Sese Seko at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, who, referring to the policy of a return to authenticity, said:

"Thus strengthened by this experience, we believe that Zaire can now modestly show the world its own interpretation of problems that confront us all." (A/PV.2140, p. 51)

And this is what I intend to do very briefly.

Before proceeding any further, may I recall in our Committee a passage in the important statement by Citizen Mobutu Sese Seko at the General Assembly on environment and disarmament:

'I believe also that it is my duty to draw the attention of this august Assembly to the collective responsibility of the human race. All leaders are not responsible only to their own nationals but also to all their counterparts. Indeed, it is no longer enough to sweep the streets outside your own house to have done your proper duty; you also have to see if your neighbour has done the same as you and particularly if he is not passing over to you the dirt he is causing in his own household.
"Now the whole world is talking of the disappearance of the human race because of the pollution in all environments. The misfortune in such cases is that we are witnessing a true inflation of texts and books which, in their desire to draw attention, in fact do the opposite.

"Without any doubt, it is a matter of prestige to possess the atomic bomb or even more the thermonuclear bomb, but to make it operational, and particularly to miniaturize it, you obviously have to carry out tests with it, and that is not always convenient. We condemn all nuclear tests wherever they may be and we do not condemn any one country more than another. In this particular area, we do not agree with the atomic countries which are asking all others to ratify the non-proliferation Treaty. For our part, we have ratified it with enthusiasm, but we do not manufacture bombs or even bullets. But the countries concerned are telling us every day about the invention of ever more sophisticated armaments. Now what is responsible about this?" (A/PV.2140, p. 76)

This is the crux of the matter. Where is the sense of responsibility of the international community and of those mainly responsible in this matter who, while very well aware of this terrible evil and its causes, refuse to meet it with effective remedies that they are also very well aware of? Indeed, whether it is a matter of napalm and other incendiary weapons, chemical or bacteriological weapons, nuclear weapons or, soon, meteorological weapons, the radical solution lies in their total elimination from our planet and the total and definitive commitment of all States in the world not to manufacture them any more. Therefore, we have to accept the idea of general and complete disarmament as advocated in the United Nations Charter in its Article 11, paragraph 1, as well as in numerous resolutions of the General Assembly.

But herein lies the difficulty because some do not wish to accept such disarmament accompanied by effective international control. Rather, the great military Powers impute ulterior motives to each other and each suspects the others of a lack of sincerity. Thus, for example, it will be said
that it seems that the nuclear club wishes to reserve its right to arm
and to over-arm. Or else, that a sound defence system is essential to
intimidate the aggressor. Or, that we recognize that the world disarmament
conference will play a useful role at the proper time, but we do not
believe that such a conference could lead to useful results now or in the
near future. Or even, that a particular threat resides in the fact that the
aggressor can, over a long period, work secretly without declaring war and
use some of the methods that I have referred to against his appointed
victims, and so forth.

Thus, we ascertain that it is easier to manufacture weapons of
excessive destructive potential than to part with them. We realize
that the question is a complex one and that it has to be tackled by indirect
means, which do not convince everybody: accession to the nuclear
non-proliferation Treaty; a conference to review this Treaty; the reduction
of the military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council;
prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military
and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international
security, human well-being and health; the demilitarization of certain
regions, and so on.
But all these initiatives bypass the real problem: the imperious need for general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

In referring to all these matters, my delegation wishes to place the problem in the context of Zaire's analysis of the problem of disarmament. Zaire is a party to the nuclear-weapon non-proliferation Treaty and will participate without doubt in the conference to review that Treaty as envisaged in 1975, as it has participated in the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, in the diplomatic conference on the reaffirmation and development of international humanitarian law applicable in armed conflict and in the Conference of governmental experts on weapons which can cause indiscriminate harm, which was recently held in Lucerne, Switzerland.

By its participation in all these conferences, and in those to come, Zaire wishes to demonstrate its loyalty to the Charter of the United Nations and to the international community. Zaire does not wish to side-step any initiative launched by the latter in its efforts to promote the cause of peace and international justice. That is why Zaire is pleased at its admission to the Committee on Disarmament, where it hopes to bring its authentic and creative imagination as well as its sincere and frank collaboration, free from any ulterior motives. May its innocent voice receive a sympathetic response in that Committee. In conclusion, I should like to thank all the representatives who voted in favour of the admission of Zaire to that Committee.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Zaire for his cordial remarks concerning the officers of the Committee and for his reference to the relations that exist between our two countries.

I now call on the last speaker on my list in the general debate, the representative of Bahrain.

Mr. AL-KHALIFA (Bahrain) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, I should like to join the previous speakers in extending congratulations to you on the occasion of your election as Chairman of this Committee. Your excellent qualities as a prominent and experienced diplomat are clearly evidenced by your unanimous election as Chairman of the First Committee, and we are fully confident that under your wise guidance this Committee will be able to achieve fruitful and constructive results.

The United Nations, as a centre for co-ordinating international efforts, has contributed positively and effectively to the attainment of the objectives and principles embodied in the Charter which are aimed at safeguarding international peace, security and progress. However, despite the achievements of the United Nations, we find ourselves today facing grave conditions created by the absence of security, a situation which still faces humanity.

The continuation of the armaments race and the increase of expenditures on arms, which are intensified by the rapid consumption of stockpiles of weapons and the technological obsolescence of those weapons, has induced the big Powers to increase their spending on armaments and on attempts to improve the technological efficiency of those weapons. In other words, the consumption of stockpiled weapons plus their technological obsolescence have led to increased expenditures on armaments and to the improvement of their technological efficiency. This has resulted in a vicious circle which is difficult to break. That vicious circle cannot be broken unless the big Powers provide guarantees and just and permanent solutions.

The international community is facing a difficult task which calls for guarantees to limit the proliferation of nuclear and chemical weapons and to put a halt to their production as well as efforts to achieve general and complete disarmament, which would enable each country, whether large or small, to live in international peace and security.
Therefore, my delegation believes that it is the duty of the international community, in suitable circumstances and in this era of détente, to discuss in a fruitful manner the question of disarmament and the need to consolidate international security, and to take action that would contribute to the elimination of tension and the solution of the economic crisis.

We believe that the solution of problems of disarmament and economic development are closely interrelated. Therefore, my delegation welcomes the important international conventions which have been concluded with a view to limiting armaments, particularly nuclear weapons.

Bahrain, as a small country, believes that economic development cannot be achieved unless stability and international security are guaranteed. Therefore, we have supported the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and the appeal to maintain the Gulf area free from the competition of the big Powers and free from foreign interference in order to guarantee peace and stability in this sensitive region of the world. The area of the Indian Ocean consists of peace-loving peoples, and my delegation therefore supports the Declaration on this area as a zone of peace. At the same time, my delegation supports the creation of a nuclear-free area in that part of the world.

On this occasion my delegation would like to express its deep faith in the need to keep the Indian Ocean in general, and the Gulf area in particular, free from the rivalry and competition of the big Powers. Bahrain's support of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace stems from its deep faith in the need to spare the region and its people the sufferings of a destructive war that would not be in the interests of the region or of humanity at large.

References to the Indian Ocean region and the armaments race leads us to speak of the Iranian initiative concerning the declaration of the Middle East as a nuclear-free zone. My delegation supports the important statement made here by Her Highness Princess Ashraf Pahlevi of Iran, which could pave the way to the desired goal of general and complete disarmament.
Dealing with the Middle East region as a nuclear-free zone leads us also to refer to the attempts by Israel to acquire nuclear weapons. We call on the international community to exert pressure in order to prevent Israel from producing those weapons and to call on Israel to sign the nuclear-weapon non-proliferation Treaty. My delegation supports the declaration of the Middle East as a nuclear-free zone and hopes that this initiative will meet with the full support of the countries of the area and that it may lead to the establishment of a nuclear-free zone, under effective international control.

The common aspirations of humanity for peace, security and progress in our age call for putting a speedy halt to the armaments race, particularly the nuclear armaments race. The adoption of immediate and effective measures to bring about general and complete disarmament would be likely to give a strong impetus to economic and social development, thus helping to achieve prosperity for the peoples of the world.

The question of disarmament cannot be solved by mere wishful thinking or by ineffective measures, but only by genuine and common efforts to solve this problem. The economic discrepancies are clearly manifested in our contemporary world between the advanced and the developing countries. The conditions of economic instability prevailing in the world cannot be removed in an atmosphere permeated with the nuclear armaments race. World public opinion attaches great importance to the achievement of disarmament. It is therefore incumbent on the Members of the United Nations to hasten to sign the agreements and conventions on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and to implement the resolutions on the cessation of nuclear tests. The technical resources used in the field of armaments could be directed to peaceful purposes so that mankind could benefit from them.
In that connexion I cannot but thank Ambassador Hoveyda, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, for the efforts he has exerted, which have made it possible, despite the difficulties faced by the Committee, to achieve some progress.

My Government has on more than one occasion stated its opposition to the continuation of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological and chemical weapons and has constantly called for the cessation of nuclear tests. The cessation of nuclear tests would, in my country's opinion, certainly contribute to a relaxation of international tension. It would also contribute to preventing the use of nuclear weapons.

Incendiary weapons have always been and still are the most horrible means of waging war. Their use has been rejected by the countries of the world, because they are contrary to human rights and human dignity. The bombardment of commando camps by Israel has had shocking and permanent consequences. My delegation thinks that the international community should spare no efforts to remove dangers of that kind.

Convinced of the harmful effects which actions designed to influence the environment and climate for military purposes can have for the present and future generations, my delegation thinks that the Soviet proposal for the prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health -- the proposal to be found in document A/9702 and Corr.1 -- is indeed worthy of careful study.

I have made only a few observations on certain aspects of the problems facing the world today, in the hope that the international community will embark on a path that will take us away from the brink of a destructive war that we cannot afford.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Bahrain for the congratulations he extended to the officers of the Committee.

I now call on the representative of Sri Lanka.
Mr. AMARASINGHE (Sri Lanka): I am greatly beholden to you, Mr. Chairman, for the indulgence you have shown me in allowing me to speak at this late hour, despite the fact that I let you down once by inscribing my name on the list of speakers but not appearing. Had there been here a stock of those over-ripe vegetables which are often used against unpopular speakers, I am sure I would have been a victim of that form of attack today.

Having spoken in disarmament debates here during the past seven years, I cannot pretend that I have anything new to say, especially as nothing new has emerged from the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

I thought I heard one speaker say that general and complete disarmament was in the interests of peace, chastity and liberty. I felt that the first and the second were quite compatible with each other, but not the second and the third. It was only later that I realized that, under the pressure of oratory, my sense of hearing was being steadily impaired and that the speaker had referred not to chastity but to justice. I must confess I was greatly relieved.

The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has no reason whatsoever to congratulate itself on its performance. It has only one achievement to its credit: it has added to its numbers. I congratulate the new members of the Committee on their admission to that very exclusive club. I hope their presence at least will help the Committee to change its ways and to produce better results. If the trend of the past few years continues, we may soon find the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament consisting of the entire membership of the United Nations, with the exception of two nuclear Powers.

When it comes to disarmament, the excuse is given that there has been no agreement on verification procedures and that therefore you cannot disarm. When it comes to a reduction of military expenditure and the diversion of a percentage of the resources thus saved to development, the excuse is that there is no agreed definition of what constitutes military expenditure. So that at every turn we find those who are chiefly responsible for the present state of affairs very solemnly and piously declaring their interest in disarmament and the reduction of military expenditures, but always finding some
excuse for not proceeding towards the fulfilment of that goal. The proposal
must therefore remain purely academic in character and consequences.

How much more practical it would be if those whose military strength is
phenomenally superior to that of others were to set an example by making at
least a slight reduction in their military budgets. That would be a real
earnest of their good faith.

In my delegation's opinion, it is not by reducing military expenditures
that we reduce armaments. There is, I fear, a pathetic fallacy in that argument.
It is by reducing armaments that we are more likely to reduce expenditure.

Every year some new item is introduced into this debate, in order, it
would appear, to introduce some oxygen into the rarefied atmosphere. Like the
proliferation of nuclear weapons and their continued sophistication and
refinement, so every year a new item is inscribed on the agenda -- lest we
forget, lest we forget. This year the Soviet Union has introduced a new item:
"Prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military
and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security,
human well-being and health".

I must confess that I was terribly alarmed by the revelations made by the
Soviet representative in his statement introducing that item. I have an uneasy
feeling that this type of radioactivity has already had its adverse effects.
I have no other explanation for the frenetic competition that is now going on
in regard to the refinement of nuclear weapon systems to proportions capable
of annihilating several planets the size of planet Earth. That does not,
however, detract in the least from the credit the Soviet Union deserves for
having brought this matter to our attention. The item merits consideration,
but I think that the remedy is in the hands of those who do conduct these
tests and do create this menace to life and to mental stability among human
beings.

This year some concern has been expressed over nuclear testing for peaceful
purposes. This is admittedly a delicate and controversial problem.
It is easy to condemn such tests; it is equally easy to sympathize with those who conduct them. The representative of India, in his statement this afternoon, said that they were not prepared to wait for others to perfect nuclear explosion technology and thereby cause a lag of a decade or more in its development in India. He pointed out that the experiments in nuclear explosions conducted for peaceful purposes:

"... have been oriented towards gas and oil stimulation, and have shown promising results and are even reported to have increased oil production by 30 to 60 per cent." (supra, p. 21)

The question we must ask ourselves is whether countries which do not have this technology at their disposal are to be precluded from conducting tests in order to acquire such technology, or must be dependent on the charity and good will of those who possess this technology for the transfer of such technology, which might result in the entry of a new competitor in all fields in which such technology offers the promise of profitable exploitation of a natural resource. This is an aspect of the matter that deserves special attention and that must be examined dispassionately.

In our opinion -- the opinion we have consistently held -- it is the duty of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to concentrate on the real programme of general and complete disarmament, without allowing its attention to be distracted by other matters which are only the side effects of nuclear explosions and the development of nuclear technology. These are, as we have said, a comprehensive test ban treaty, the complete cessation of the production of nuclear weapons, the categorical renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons for warlike purposes and the dismantling of nuclear arsenals. The total prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and the destruction of all such stockpiles should be an additional step in this process of eliminating the possibility of the use of those devastating forms of warfare. As a first step, as I have also previously stated, there must be universal adherence to the Geneva Protocol of 1925.

These are some of the thoughts I wished to offer on the subject. They are by no means new, and I make no apology for repeating them. I must thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of this Committee once again for the indulgence they have shown in listening to me at this late stage.
ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Tomorrow, we shall begin consideration of and voting on specific draft resolutions under this item. I would accordingly urge those delegations which for days have been preparing draft resolutions, and which therefore deserve the gratitude of the Committee, to submit them as soon as possible so that they can be translated into all languages and circulated to delegations for their consideration. I would venture to ask those delegations which already have texts ready, but are still waiting for co-sponsors, to submit those texts, because co-sponsors will be added as the proposals are examined.

I would also ask delegations which have already come to a conclusion on draft resolutions that we already have before us, or that will be circulated shortly, to put their names down on the list as soon as possible to speak on the items of interest to them. This request is addressed in particular to members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which is not based in New York, who wish to return home as soon as possible. The request is addressed to all other delegations as well, of course.

I think that the best way to proceed in the discussion of specific proposals is for delegations that speak to refer in the course of their statements to one or more draft resolutions, so that they will not have to take the floor repeatedly to refer to various draft resolutions. A single statement will then cover all comments by delegations on matters of interest to them. The interest of the Chair is to make maximum use of our time by acting with flexibility, that is, by permitting the broadest possible exchange of views. But whenever there are no speakers and whenever we have time to do so, we can vote on those draft resolutions which are not controversial. Thus we shall dispose of those drafts quickly and can continue with our consideration of those that require more comments.

Naturally, when we come to vote on items on the agenda on which there are two or more draft resolutions, we shall abide strictly by the rules and put the draft resolutions to the vote in the order in which they are submitted. For instance -- and it is not because Ambassador Amerasinghe of Sri Lanka, who introduced this draft this morning, is here -- I believe that the draft resolution on the Indian Ocean should not give rise to too many difficulties and if, tomorrow afternoon, we do not have enough speakers to fill the three hours allotted to us, we could vote...
Tomorrow we shall meet only in the afternoon, and on Friday only in the morning.

I would urge delegations to use the free time tomorrow morning to prepare their statements.

I should like to remind the Committee that the deadline for consideration of and voting on proposals is 22 November, and that I shall do all I can to adhere strictly to that date.

I thank the Committee for its co-operation during the general debate.

Before adjourning, I should like to announce that at tomorrow's plenary meeting of the General Assembly the report on outer space will be dealt with.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.