

CD/PV.6
26 January 1979
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIXTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday, 26 January 1979, at 3 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. R. Boudjakdji

(Algeria)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria:

Mr. R. BOUDJAKDJI
Mr. A. FASIA
Mr. A. BENSMAIL
Mr. N. KERROUM

Argentina:

Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS
Mr. F. JIMENEZ DAVILA
Mr. A.N. MOLTENI

Australia:

Mr. L.D. THOMSON
Mr. A.J. BEHM
Ms. M.S. WICKES

Belgium:

Mr. P. NOTERDAEME
Mr. P. BERG
Mr. G. VAN DUYSE

Brazil:

Mr. G.A. MACIEL
Mr. L.P. LINDENBERG SETTE

Bulgaria:

Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. I. PETROV
Mr. I. SOTIROV

Burma:

U SAW HLAING
U THEIN AUNG
U THAUNG HTUN

Canada:

Mr. G.A.H. PEARSON
Mr. R. HARRY JAY
Mr. J. GAUDREAU

Cuba:

Mr. L. SOLA VILA
Mr. F.O. RODRIGUEZ
Mrs. V.B. JACKIEWICH
Mr. C. PAZOS BECEIRO
Mr. R. VALIENTE
Mr. R.L. GARCIA

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. V. TYLNER
Mr. J. JIRUSEK

Egypt:

Mr. O. EL-SHAFEI
Mr. F. EL-IBRASHI
Mr. M. EL-BARADEI
Mr. N. FAHMY

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. TERREFE
Mr. G. ALULA

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. S. KAHN
Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. G. VAN WELL
Mr. F. RUTH
Mr. G. PFEIFFER
Mr. H. SCHNEPPEN
Mr. J. POHLMANN
Mr. H. MULLER

Hungary:

Mr. M. DOMOKOS
Mr. A. LAKATOS

France:

Mr. F. DE LA GORCE
Mr. F. BEAUCHATAUD
Mr. J. FEVRE
Mr. J.C. PARAVY

India:

Mr. C.R. GHAREKHAN
Mr. S.T. DEVARE

Indonesia:

Mr. A. SANI
Mr. A. KAMIL
Mr. M. SIDIK
Mr. I. DAMANIK

Iran:

Mr. M. FARTASH
Mr. D. CHILATY
Mr. D. AMERI

Italy:

Mr. N. DI BERNARDO

Mr. F. FERRETTI

Mr. M. ALESSI

Mr. M. MORENO

Mr. C. FRATESCHI

Japan:

Mr. M. OGISO

Mr. T. NONOYAMA

Mr. Y. KIKUCHI

Mr. T. IWANAMI

Mr. Y. NAKAMURA

Kenya:

Mr. K. MWAMZANDI

Mr. C.G. MAINA

Mr. G.N. MUNIU

Mexico:

Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES

Miss A. CABRERA

Mongolia:

Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG

Mr. LUVSANDOR BAYART

Morocco:

M. ALI SKALLI

M. MOHAMED CHRAIBI

Netherlands:

Mr. R.H. FEIN

Mr. A.J. MEERBURG

Nigeria:

Mr. O. ADENIJI

Mr. K. AHMED

Pakistan:

Mr. J.K.A. MARKER

Mr. M. AKRAM

Dr. M. HUMAYUN KHAN

Peru:

Mr. J.A. MONTERO

Poland:

Mr. H. PAC

Mr. S. KONIK

Mr. M. KRUCZYK

Romania:

Mr. T. MELESCANU

Mr. G. TINCA

Sri Lanka:

Mr. A.C.S. HAMEED

Miss M.L. NAGANATHAN

Mr. I.B. FONSEKA

Sweden:

Mr. C. LIDGARD

Mr. L. NORBERG

Mr. J. PRAWITZ

Mr. J. LUNDIN

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN

Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN

Mr. A.M. VAVILOV

Mr. E.D. ZAITSEV

Mr. V.A. VERTOGRADOV

Mr. Y.V. KOSTENKO

Mr. M.G. ANTIUKHIN

United Kingdom:

Mr. N.H. MARSHALL

Mr. C.L.G. MALLABY

Mr. C.K. CURWEN

Mr. P.M.W. FRANCIS

United States of America:

Mr. A. FISHER

Mr. C. FLOWERREE

Mr. A. AKALOVSKY

Mr. R. HAGENGRUBER

Ms. BLAIR L. MURRAY

Mr. M.L. SANCHES

Mr. A. YARMOLINSKY

Venezuela:

Mr. R. CARLO CASTILLO

Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT

Mr. H. ARTEAGA

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. PESIV

Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC

Mr. D. DJOKIV

Zaire:

Mr. BUKETI-BUKAYI

Mr. M. ESUK

Assistant Secretary-General:

Mr. R. BJORNERSTEDT

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic): The Geneva Committee on Disarmament is convening this year with an enlarged membership.

In accordance with the desire expressed by an overwhelming majority of States at the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, the enlargement of the membership of the Geneva Committee on Disarmament is to improve the conditions for making significant progress towards the cessation of the arms race and disarmament.

On behalf of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic, I congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, as representative of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, on assuming the chairmanship of the Committee, and I am sure that under your guidance the Committee will make great efforts, so that a good foundation will be laid already in the early phase of the spring session for further productive work.

We welcome the delegations of those States which participate for the first time in the work of the Committee: the delegations of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, Australia, the Kingdom of Belgium, the Republic of Cuba, the French Republic, the Republic of Indonesia, the Republic of Kenya, the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka and the Republic of Venezuela.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic has noted with satisfaction the statements made by the delegations of the new members, which reflect the willingness of their States to co-operate in the solution of the tasks facing the Committee.

As for the German Democratic Republic, we are ready, as we were before, to work together with all delegations in the interest of our common concern.

Only a few days ago the general position of my country to contribute its own efforts to those of other States for the cessation of the arms race and for disarmament, found expression in the Joint Statement which was signed on the occasion of the official visit to the Republic of India by Mr. Erich Honecker, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, and Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic.

The Statement reads, inter alia:

"The two sides called for an end to the arms race and took note of the various talks and negotiations under way towards this end. They expressed the hope that these would come to a speedy conclusion, thereby

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

contributing to the process of détente and disarmament. The resources and energies released through the process of disarmament should be rechannelled into the all-round development efforts of nations, particularly among the developing countries."

The results of the tenth special session and of the thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly strongly reflect the striving of peoples for détente and security which can be only achieved if the arms race is halted through effective measures and if sweeping progress is made in the field of disarmament.

This is all the more necessary and urgent as there are forces which have been attempting not just to halt the process of détente and disarmament but to reverse it. They adopted the long-term programme of NATO and measures for its implementation.

This also concerns the series of important military manoeuvres which are being held year after year by NATO all along the western State frontier of the German Democratic Republic. As to their extent, the number of participating forces and the duration, these manoeuvres have become the biggest ones after World War Two. These measures are in fact not appropriate to strengthen mutual confidence between the States and to lay the foundation for dissolving military blocs.

It is obvious that the German Democratic Republic cannot be indifferent to what military activities go on near its frontiers. Experiences of history confirm the correctness of the assessment made by the tenth special session that the arms race poses an incalculable threat to peace.

From this arises the pressing need, as the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty stressed in their Declaration of 23 November 1978, to bring about an early and decisive breakthrough in the talks on stopping the arms race and on disarmament as the most important task of international politics under present conditions. The Declaration contains a programme which, based on realities and requirements, sets out long-term and short-term tasks for arms limitation and disarmament. The Programme centres on concrete measures of nuclear disarmament, attaching to them priority importance.

It should be particularly noted that the socialist States are ready to negotiate on any type of weapon, among them on those which are a source of concern for each of the sides.

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

To the German Democratic Republic, a socialist State situated at the boundary line between the world's two most powerful military alliances, disarmament and the strengthening of international security are fundamental objectives to which it has been unswervingly committed throughout the thirty years of its existence.

The Government of the German Democratic Republic, in full accordance with the world public, attaches great importance to the early conclusion of an agreement on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons. The signing and ratification of that agreement would undoubtedly promote the achievement of further progress in understanding on the most pressing measures to be taken in the fields of limitation of armaments and détente.

This Committee will now have to translate the recommendations and decisions which the United Nations General Assembly adopted at its tenth special session and at its thirty-third regular session into practical measures. My delegation expects that the greatest attention in the Committee's work will be given to substantive matters right from the beginning. The responsibility which the Committee bears in this respect is a very great one, since it is the only multilateral negotiating body for global measures of disarmament.

In accordance with the interests of an overwhelming majority of States, the Committee should also in its future activities primarily concentrate on the elaboration of agreements on the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction, particularly of nuclear weapons.

In this connexion we attach great importance to the initiation of negotiations on nuclear disarmament among all the five nuclear-weapon States, which has been urged by the thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 33/71 H. Considering that the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, stated that measures of nuclear disarmament have the highest priority, such negotiations constitute an important step towards this goal, provided that all nuclear-weapon States live up to their high responsibility and co-operate in a constructive spirit. A successful course of such negotiations would, no doubt, have favourable repercussions on the consideration of the problems facing the Committee now.

The conclusion of an agreement on the comprehensive prohibition of nuclear-arms tests which has been for some years now the subject of negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament would be an important step towards the limitation of the

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

arms race in nuclear weapons. As you know, the USSR had submitted a number of concrete proposals on that subject which made it possible to find comprehension between differing views during trilateral negotiations and to reach important progress in the elaboration of a joint draft agreement. We hold the early conclusion of such an agreement to be an essential contribution to strengthen the régime of non-proliferation of nuclear arms, to halt the arms race in weapons of mass destruction and to deepen international security.

Besides continued efforts to achieve a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests as soon as possible, any other measures which might diminish the danger of nuclear war should also take a central place in the Committee's work.

The German Democratic Republic considers that the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States is one of those important measures.

International legal guarantees safeguarding the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons would enhance the security of such States and meet their legitimate interests.

They constitute a genuine confidence-building measure and will have a beneficial effect on the development of international relations between the nuclear-weapon States and the non-nuclear-weapon States. The German Democratic Republic is interested to see the Committee consider, in pursuance of resolution 33/72 A and at the earliest possible date, the drafts for an international convention that were submitted to the thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly, as well as all proposals on effective political and legal measures at the international level to that end. We deem the draft international convention submitted by the USSR to be a suitable basis for such deliberations.

In the view of the German Democratic Republic, continued efforts to reach a prohibition of the development and production of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction are another point of priority importance. The discussions at the thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly have again demonstrated the urgency of measures against the arms race with new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. The insistence of the socialist States on the conclusion of an agreement on the general and complete prohibition of such weapons which will prevent the development of new dangerous weapons of mass destruction is meeting with ever broader approval. My delegation believes that

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

the work the Committee has done so far in this respect has contributed to settling a number of complex issues in this connexion. There exist all the necessary prerequisites for the Committee actively to continue its work in that direction.

Since the Committee's summer session of 1978, world-wide protests against the production of the neutron weapon have grown further. This movement and the strong demands made at the thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly for effective measures against that weapon should be reason enough not to delay any longer the elaboration of a convention on the prohibition of the production and use of the neutron nuclear weapon. The Committee should promptly start negotiating on the basis of the draft for an international convention on the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, stationing and use of nuclear neutron weapons submitted by eight socialist States.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic welcomes the fact that the bilateral talks between the USSR and the United States in Geneva on a joint initiative with regard to the prohibition of chemical weapons are being continued. We consider the measure of results achieved in this respect to be a good foundation for agreeing on still outstanding problems. The negotiations should be continued so that such an initiative can be presented shortly. This would enable the Committee to deliberate in the near future on an appropriate draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction.

Being the only multilateral and independent negotiating organ on global disarmament matters, the Committee has a long record of thorough experience in this field. Its enlargement has made it even more representative.

In the opinion of the German Democratic Republic, there exist all preconditions for reaching tangible progress in settling a number of questions on its agenda in the foreseeable future. The decisive factors in this respect are the political will and the readiness of all those involved. These factors given, it will be possible to reach understanding also on the most difficult details.

The peoples expect the Committee to live up to its high responsibility, and its activities to find expression in the preparation of appropriate draft agreements on the cessation of the arms race. At the side of the other States of the socialist community, the German Democratic Republic will also in the future make its contribution to the successful work of the Committee.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): It gives me great pleasure, on behalf of the Netherlands Government to join previous speakers in expressing our satisfaction that this inaugural session of the Committee on Disarmament in its new composition is chaired by one of the new members, Algeria. We have particularly appreciated the fact that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria has found time to join us in this inaugural session and take upon himself the burden of presiding over the first two meetings.

I also should like to welcome the new members of this new Committee. We are looking forward to working with them, and we await eagerly their contribution to disarmament and arms control in this negotiating body.

In this first statement in the CD on behalf of the Netherlands Government, I intend to limit myself to only a few general remarks of a technical nature concerning the disarmament process, with particular reference to the role entrusted to this negotiating body.

I do not therefore intend to follow the challenging example of so many eminent speakers who preceded me, and I shall not attempt to cover in depth the broad political implications and ramifications of the arms race to which we are supposed to put an end. On all those broader aspects, the Netherlands has in the recent past, at the special session on disarmament, and at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly and in the CCD, expressed views in extenso and in numerous interventions, and we feel we have more or less exhausted the subject as far as general statements of intent are concerned. We would now like to get down to business.

Allow me therefore, after some introductory remarks, to go straight to the specifics of what we consider to be our task in the coming months.

The special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament not only clarified again the vital need of disarmament for the future of our planet, but underlined at the same time the complexities of the disarmament process -- no simple measure, no single structure can solve this global problem. What is required is a rational and logical diversification of our efforts in the disarmament field, to tackle the complexity of the issues involved. The special session recognized this problem and took some measures in the right direction.

First of all, a greater need for background information on the armaments and disarmament field was identified; objective information directed towards the public to enable the people to become conscious of the problems involved, but also certain well defined studies which can help us to find ways and means to accelerate the disarmament process. Besides studies by governmental experts, a significant role can also be reserved for non-governmental institutions in this field.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

Secondly, we need of course machinery for deliberations on a world-wide basis in order to allow all States to express their views on vital security and disarmament questions, including agreements worked out in the negotiating process. The General Assembly took particular action on this question, first of all by convening a special session devoted to disarmament and secondly by complementing the First Committee through the re-establishment of the United Nations Disarmament Commission composed of all Member States. My Government welcomes this development, although one may wonder — I do so from my personal experience last year — whether we are not deliberating too much and negotiating too little.

I come now to the third component of the disarmament process, and that is the one with which we here are most concerned, viz. the fora for negotiations.

A variety of fora are needed, and indeed do exist, to work out particular agreements on areas of arms control and disarmament which have become ripe for specific negotiations. Fora which are adapted to the military situation, the weapon-systems, the countries involved. One such forum must be a multilateral disarmament body to work out treaties and principles which find potentially world-wide application. To be able to work out such viable agreements, the body must have a representative character and must include in any case the major military Powers, and of course the nuclear-weapon States. As we all know, this last requirement was not fully met in the CCD, and the present membership of the Committee — in particular when all seats are filled — is therefore already an improvement. We welcome the presence of France and we look forward to the future co-operation of China.

The Committee on Disarmament is an essential element in the disarmament structure, but we should of course not pretend that it can solve all problems. In our future discussions on the agenda — and I shall return to this specific subject in a moment — we must realize that only certain issues lend themselves for world-wide agreements. Bilateral talks — like SALT — and regional ones — like the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction talks in Vienna — are other vital parts of the world-wide arms control and disarmament effort. For example, it is clear that the CD could not involve itself in any detailed negotiations on conventional arms control in a specific region, although it could perhaps work out some principles for regional talks in general, and stimulate such talks.

As in the past, the multilateral negotiating body, this CD, could be particularly involved in banning the development and/or deployment of complete weapon systems or means of warfare; in banning the deployment of specific weapons in areas outside national jurisdiction; in giving general guidelines for the disarmament process, etc. In the past, the CCD concentrated on weapons of mass

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

destruction, which can be separated more easily from specific regional security problems than conventional weapons. However, in our opinion the CD must not confine itself to weapons of mass destruction, but evolve its expertise in other fields. Especially since this body has now a more representative character, we should not shy away from accepting more diversified subjects than in the past. It is clear that for such a broader task, the Committee needs suitably flexible working procedures.

Of course, we shall have to consider very carefully which subjects lend themselves best for bilateral talks, which for regional approaches and which for the multilateral level. This question is not irrelevant to our work, taking into account certain procedures followed in the CCD. I refer in particular to the role of the two super-Powers in the negotiating process.

It is self-evident that any substantial multilateral arms-control and disarmament agreement cannot be negotiated without the active participation of the two largest military Powers in the world. It was and is therefore of the highest importance that these two countries, between them, try to settle questions which stand in the way of an agreement. Indeed, never before in history have two Powers been involved in such a broad range of disarmament talks as today. The question is, however, how far should they go on their own with respect to issues of a more or less multilateral nature. Let me give some examples.

My Government accepts the logic of, and welcomes, the fact that on a nuclear-test ban detailed negotiations take place between the three nuclear Powers who so far have expressed the will to achieve such an agreement. After all, the nuclear Powers are in the first place affected by such an agreement. We anxiously await the day when the other two nuclear-weapon Powers will join in these negotiations and agreements. The trilateral talks -- which hopefully will bear fruit in the near future -- could lay the basis for a widely acceptable CTBT as a very important step to stop the technological arms race and as an element in our fight against proliferation. This does not mean, of course, that the Committee on Disarmament does or would not have a role to play in the negotiations. On the contrary: to achieve a widely acceptable CTB, the Committee as a whole would have to be involved. This is all the more important since a world-wide seismic verification system is required, to which the Seismic Group of the Committee has already contributed substantially. However, in our view the Committee had better wait with its negotiations in detail on the whole CTB treaty until the trilateral talks have been concluded successfully.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

However, the logic of such a procedure -- I mean a more or less wait-and-see attitude -- is less evident in other cases. One may wonder, for example, why it is necessary to settle questions like the environmental modification convention or the radiological weapons question completely on a bilateral basis before the Committee on Disarmament is given the opportunity to take them up. Even more important for our future work is the chemical weapons issue. Although rather creative work was in fact done by several members of the CCD, serious discussions were avoided during the last years of the CCD because of ongoing bilateral talks. Now, speedy conclusive results of these bilateral talks would of course be helpful to the multilateral negotiations, but further delay in those bilateral talks could also lead to even further delay in our consideration of the question. Those exclusive bilateral talks could also lead to an agreement which does not sufficiently take into account possible preoccupations of other countries.

The CW issue is not of a specifically bilateral nature. Several countries may possess chemical weapons, and all industrial States will eventually have to accept rather intrusive verification procedures in their national chemical industry. The present procedure could, in the end, lead to an agreement which is perhaps not as widely accepted as required. More open negotiations, in this Committee, could lead to better results in the end.

In concluding my remarks on the third component of the disarmament process, the negotiating body and especially this Committee on Disarmament, I should like to add a few words on the agenda for this year, remarks which follow from what I have just said. The agenda for our work in the coming period must, of course, take into account the relevant recommendations of the General Assembly, the proposals made by member States and also the question whether an issue is indeed ripe for negotiations.

First of all we must be prepared to take up the work on a comprehensive test-ban treaty as soon as possible. We are happy to hear from the representative of the United Kingdom that the main stumbling-blocks in the trilateral talks seem to have been solved. While waiting for the outcome of these talks, we must strongly support the work of the Seismic Group, since a multitude of technical questions has still to be solved. Secondly, we must further concentrate on a chemical-weapons ban. These negotiations will probably take more time than a CTB, since the practical verification problems are complex. This year we could concentrate on definition and verification problems. With respect to the last question, we sincerely welcome the invitations by the Federal Republic of Germany

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

and the United Kingdom to attend chemical workshops which will contribute much to our understanding of how to solve on-site inspection questions. In the meantime, we could also start negotiating a radiological-weapons ban.

We could have serious and exploratory discussions on: a cut-off in the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes, security guarantees, guidelines for conventional-arms-control talks and the comprehensive disarmament programme. We could have preliminary discussions on measures to restrict the technological arms race. I doubt, however, whether it is useful to continue our discussions on new weapons of mass destruction on the same basis as in the past. An arms race in space would threaten world stability. I wonder, however, whether the time is ripe for discussions on this matter in this multilateral forum. We would like to stay informed about progress in bilateral talks on this matter. My delegation listened with great attention to other suggestions for the agenda and we will study these carefully.

I will not dwell further on this question of the agenda. There will be ample opportunity to discuss our future work programme in the coming weeks.

I would like to conclude by touching briefly on the fourth element of the disarmament process, viz. the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements.

As is well known, the Netherlands has proposed that the desirability of the establishment of an International Disarmament Organization as a servicing agency, to assist in the implementation of disarmament treaties, be looked into. Other, more or less related, proposals have been made by other members last year. In view of the expertise combined in the Committee on Disarmament, as well as the role it can play in the multilateral disarmament process, we consider the Committee to be the right forum to discuss implementation machinery. We intend to return to this question in more depth later in the year. We consider it a highly important matter.

One final word. We are looking forward with great interest to the appointment of a Secretary of this Committee, who will also, as the representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, maintain a link between this Committee and the United Nations system.

A lot of work has to be done. Let us settle our procedural and organizational matters efficiently in the coming weeks, without looking for problems where there are in fact none, thus allowing us to start our substantial work as soon as possible.

Mr. BUKETI-BUKAYI (Zaire) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, the delegation of Zaire feels keen satisfaction and genuine pride at seeing the Algerian delegation presiding over the debates of this first session of the Committee on Disarmament.

This legitimate pride is based on the fact that Algeria and Zaire, African and non-aligned countries, share the same ideals and are exposed to the same difficulties. You can rest assured, therefore, of the complete collaboration of my delegation in the accomplishment of your task.

The Zairian delegation welcomes the new members who have come to enlarge the membership of the Committee, and is convinced that their contribution will add a new dynamism to the work of the Committee, so that it can live up to the immense hopes of the international community and the trust the General Assembly has placed in us.

More particularly, my country welcomes the presence of France, a nuclear-weapon country and a permanent member of the Security Council, whose contribution will strengthen the results of our deliberations, for disarmament cannot, in the view of my delegation, be achieved without the assistance of all the nuclear-weapon States. In this context, my country earnestly hopes that the People's Republic of China will join us in the very near future to take its rightful place and bring its stone, too, to help in building a new world delivered from the fear of nuclear destruction.

Six months have passed since the end of the tenth special session, devoted to disarmament.

At the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, there was a long discussion on implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the tenth special session.

We are meeting here today in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 120 of the Final Document establishing the Committee on Disarmament as a negotiating body instead and in place of the former CCD.

In accordance with the wishes of the General Assembly, the better structured, more representative and more democratic Committee on Disarmament must meet the legitimate aspirations of the international community, which is haunted by the fear of overarmament and destruction.

(Mr. Buketi-Bukayi, Zaire)

This means that we at this meeting are starting a new, historic page in the long and difficult march towards disarmament.

We all agree that there should be disarmament, but how are we to disarm?

This is the question to which the new machinery established by the General Assembly at its tenth special session is expected to provide an answer. In face of the complexity of the equation, every unit of this machinery has a clearly defined role to play so that the sum of the results achieved will lead us to the ultimate solution, namely, general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

In paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the tenth special session, the General Assembly traced the blue-print we should follow in our approach to the objectives we have set ourselves.

It is clear from the statements made so far that every delegation is determined to make its contribution.

Let us, therefore, break with the past, its methods and its principles to the extent that they impeded our action and let us take advantage of the experience of the past in order better to succeed.

This Committee must fully discharge its task with the assistance of all States composing it. The nuclear Powers have a particular responsibility in the progress of our work. They must, therefore, make an extra effort to come out of their ivory tower and, through frank and sincere collaboration, enable the non-nuclear-weapon members to participate actively in the negotiations. They must take account of the views expressed by non-nuclear-weapon countries so that the latter will not, as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka so aptly said, be reduced to mere observers in the Committee.

Paragraph 45 of the Final Document of the tenth special session defined the order of priorities for disarmament negotiations. Nuclear weapons, the existing arsenals of which are capable of destroying our planet several times over, are our first concern. In this context, the General Assembly at its thirty-third session assigned to the Committee on Disarmament the task of negotiating, as a matter of priority, a treaty on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, an instrument for prohibiting the development and production of chemical weapons and a convention on the cessation and prohibition of production of fissionable materials for weapons and other nuclear explosive devices. Lastly, the Committee is to continue its efforts with a view to reaching agreement on the prevention of the emergence of new weapons of mass destruction.

(Mr. Buketi-Bukayi, Zaire)

If the nuclear Powers consider that nuclear weapons form an integral part of the security of a certain number of States, how can the excessive accumulation of their arsenals be justified when at present only a few bombs are needed to wipe out humanity? Hence, the search for new nuclear delivery vehicle systems is unjustifiable.

In the opinion of my delegation, conclusion of a treaty banning nuclear testing so as to put an end to the arms race should not meet with major objections on the part of the nuclear States.

The confinement of their defensive capacity to a level no higher than that required for guaranteeing their security and that of their allies is the only condition which, in an initial stage, justifies their possession of nuclear weapons.

For we must be realistic in our search for ways and means of achieving disarmament. At the present stage, it would be utopian to speak of general and complete disarmament. That will only occur at the final stage of our work.

Even Stone Age man had his spear and axe for hunting and fishing, to feed and, if necessary, defend himself.

We have certainly not chosen this example to justify overarmament; quite the reverse, pursuant to the principle of the right of every State to security, we also acknowledge the right of every State to equip itself with appropriate means for its defence.

Overarmament is therefore to be condemned. The most adequate means of curbing this overarmament race lies in the complete cessation of all nuclear tests and the verified destruction of other types of weapon.

The mere fact that the majority of States of the globe have voluntarily come out in favour of a non-proliferation régime must be seen as proof of their political will to work for peace and live in peaceful co-existence in accordance with the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

The non-nuclear-weapon States expect the nuclear-weapon States to show the same political will. To this end, they must, first and foremost, create a climate of mutual confidence and help the community of States to eliminate trouble spots where power struggles are often played out to the detriment of the population concerned. By this process, another phase of our task, that of limiting conventional weapons, the importance of which has increased in recent

(Mr. Duketi-Bukayi, Zaire)

years, will be accomplished. All local wars have been fed by this type of weapon. My country, which has suffered so much in local conflicts, fully appreciates the importance of limiting and prohibiting certain conventional weapons which may be considered to have excessive or indiscriminate effects.

We hope that the efforts we undertake in this context in the course of the year will be crowned with success.

It is not the intention of the Zairian delegation to waste time, at the present stage of our debate, on redefining its position on all disarmament questions; that position has, moreover, been expressed on several occasions and is perfectly consistent with the views of the non-aligned movement on the question.

My delegation wishes to confine its comments to the manner in which our Committee should conduct its work so as to obtain the best chances of success.

- (1) The Committee should first, on an annual basis, draw up a precise programme of work, observing the order of priorities established by the tenth special session and the relevant resolutions of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly.
- (2) It should avoid sterile discussions in its negotiations, so as to address itself to the real problems to be solved.
- (3) It should maintain the cohesion of its members by displaying moderation, a spirit of compromise and even tolerance.
- (4) It should reject a systematic cleavage which would induce its members to adopt rigid positions and make it difficult to achieve consensus. We must not forget that, through the General Assembly, we represent the peoples of our planet, which are ardently yearning for peace and security.

Let us not make ourselves responsible before history for having failed in our undertaking, when all the conditions for its success seem to have been assembled.

- (5) The Committee is entitled to expect the nuclear-weapon Powers to keep it regularly informed, and even to associate it with, discussions relating to their bilateral or regional talks.

In this connexion, my delegation recalls that the tenth special session upheld the principle of the universality of efforts leading to disarmament, which means that solutions to this grave problem must be found by all States Members of the United Nations.

(Mr. Buketi-Bukayi, Zaire)

(6) Lastly, no matter how important they may be, the procedural questions we shall encounter must not impede the progress of our work.

We must provide our Committee with simple and flexible rules of procedure that can be adapted to the development of our work.

Zaire, for its part, is determined to spare no effort to ensure its constructive participation in the work of the Committee and to make its modest contribution thereto as it did for three years within the CCD.

Zaire, a peace-loving and freedom-loving country situated in the heart of Africa, has always regarded disarmament as a very important question.

My country is determined to make its modest contribution. In practice, this is reflected in the support the Zairian delegation gives to various constructive initiatives taken by States of all ideological tendencies within the framework of disarmament. In this context, at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, my delegation supported 43 of the 45 draft resolutions adopted by the First Committee of the General Assembly, and joined the sponsors of 12 draft resolutions.

This modest balance testifies to the interest my country obviously takes in the thorny problem of disarmament.

Lastly, in conclusion, it is impossible sufficiently to stress the close links existing between disarmament and development. We must liberate the immense resources squandered on military purposes so that they can be used for combating misery, poverty, disease and inequalities of all sorts. Let us spare human society sufferings which it is constantly having to endure. We are thinking particularly of the populations of developing countries.

Let us build a new world in which co-operation based on confidence, equality and dialogue will reign.

Let us turn the principles of the Charter into facts.

The road is of course long, but the task is sublime, for we shall have been of some use to mankind.

Mr. MWANZANDI (Kenya): It is an honour and a privilege for me to lead the Kenya delegation to this inaugural meeting of the new Committee on Disarmament. My delegation attaches great importance to the work of this Committee. We know many peoples in the world look to this body with hope and a sense of urgency. We know the task before the Committee is complicated and difficult, but we are confident that the will of the people expressed in the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament will continue to inspire the work of this Committee.

Mr. Chairman, under your distinguished diplomatic skills the Committee has been launched. This augurs well, and we are confident, too, that before this session is over the Committee will have taken the decisions on its procedures and priorities of its work to enable it to address itself to the challenging substantive tasks ahead. May I also say thank you to all those who have graciously welcomed my delegation to the ranks of this Committee. My delegation reciprocates all the good wishes expressed and looks forward to strengthening the warm relations that already exist among the members of this Committee which we believe will have a lot to contribute to the success of the tasks entrusted to this new body.

The special session on disarmament was a unique event in many respects and, if the spirit it had generated is maintained, it might represent a turning point in the history of disarmament. The main achievement of the special session in our view was the establishment of new disarmament machinery, both to conduct negotiations on concrete issues and to deliberate on disarmament questions.

We are happy that the Committee on Disarmament has replaced the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), which has, in effect, eliminated the system of co-chairmanship and has instituted a monthly rotation of chairmen. Eight additional members have now seats in this Committee, including, for the first time, my country, Kenya. We are glad to see that France has agreed to participate in the work of the new body. We are also hopeful that China would find it possible to take its seat in the Committee in the near future. It is our belief that this Committee, because of the wider participation of nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States, will be a more effective negotiating body than its predecessor, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD). And since this is our first time to participate in the work of this Committee, I would like to assure you, Mr. Chairman, and all members of this Committee, of my delegation's fullest and positive co-operation.

My delegation notes with satisfaction that in so far as disarmament machinery is concerned, the provisions of the Final Document of the special session had so far been faithfully implemented. It is our hope that the work of this Committee, unlike

(Mr. Kwamzandi, Kenya)

the CCD, will not be paralysed at times when the nuclear Powers were unable to agree on disarmament questions. The task and responsibility before us are enormous. We must join our minds and hands together towards a common goal of eliminating once and for all the cloud of destruction that hovers over mankind.

The special session adopted a balanced approach to controlling armaments in various regions of the world by upholding the right of each State to preserve its security, and for both recipients and suppliers of arms to bear in mind the necessity of maintaining a numerical and technological balance of armaments in various regions of tension and conflict.

At present, as in the past, the military competition continues to act as the driving force for the wider dissemination of sophisticated conventional arms throughout the world. For economic, political, as well as military reasons, the supplier countries have actively promoted exports of the newest generation of weapons to other countries, mainly to developing countries. It is not surprising, therefore, that the military expenditures in developing countries registered some spectacular increases in the period 1960 to 1976. As the available studies show, some of the biggest increases in military programmes occurred in nations at the lowest end of the income scale. Furthermore, for the poorest 20 per cent of the world population, this meant that the military share of GNP rose from 1.9 per cent in 1960 to 5.2 per cent in 1976, a burden out of all proportion for a population with yearly incomes averaging \$124.

While the donor nations concentrated their efforts in a massive arms race, their aid efforts failed to achieve the goals to which they had agreed in the United Nations. Between 1960 and 1976, almost twenty times as much money went into military expansion as into aid for development. The average contribution of all donor nations for which records are available amounted to 0.3 per cent of their combined GNP, while their military expenditures took 6.2 per cent of GNP during those same years. It is quite clear then that the arms race is the single major obstacle to development. It affects not only the world's rate of economic growth but also the distribution of the growth that does occur. At the same time it contributes to the widening gap between rich and poor countries, a focus of increasing world tension and concern which has raised the debate on the new international economic order.

Let me now turn to another item to which my country attaches great importance. I refer to the question of the banning of chemical and bacteriological (biological)

(Mr. Ikwamzandi, Kenya)

weapons. Kenya is a party to both the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction. We have co-sponsored several draft resolutions on the item that have come before the First Committee in the past several years, and we plan to continue to give our support both in this Committee and in the General Assembly.

While my delegation appreciates the complex nature of the issues involved, we, nevertheless, feel that this Committee is charged with a task of negotiating an agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their destruction. This is not the first time that the question has come up before a Committee like this one. It has been before the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on several occasions and each time the principal problems appear to be (a) the scope of the prohibition, that is, whether it should be of a comprehensive or a gradual nature; (b) the activities that should be banned and the agents that would be subject to a prohibition, and (c) the way in which compliance with the convention should be verified.

On the question of scope of prohibition, my delegation would support those proposals calling for a convention that is comprehensive in its approach, which means its prohibition will extend to all chemical means of warfare. There has been considerable discussion concerning the activities that should be banned and the agents that would be subject to a prohibition, and there seems to be a consensus that it is highly important to agree on criteria that would determine which activities and substances should come under the scope of a prohibition. Several such criteria have been proposed. For example, one such criterion is that of purpose or intention, which means that a lethal chemical agent that has no peaceful use should be banned. Other proposals suggest that substances produced in amounts having no justification for peaceful purposes should come under the prohibition. Yet other proposals refer to certain properties which would make chemical substances warfare agents. While these criteria and proposals are essential in our negotiations, my delegation favours a convention that takes a comprehensive approach in connexion with both the chemical agents and the activities to be banned.

We must now direct our efforts towards finding a solution to the differences which still exist with respect to the question of verification. A convention such as the one we are hoping for will not be effective unless it contains some international verification measures to give assurances to the parties to an agreement

(Mr. Mwamzandi, Kenya)

that its provisions will be observed. While we believe that a verification system based on national means is essential, we also feel that, given the international political climate and mistrust that exists between States, it is necessary that the national verification system be supplemented by some agreed international verification measures.

Year after year delegations have stressed, both during the general debate as well as in the First Committee, the importance of an early cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests as a necessary first step towards nuclear disarmament and towards fulfilling the commitments contained in the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963, as well as in the non-proliferation Treaty. Many of us have expressed the belief that a comprehensive ban of nuclear-weapon tests would provide an impetus for further progress in other disarmament negotiations, such as the United States - Soviet Union Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT). We had also hoped that a nuclear test-ban could be negotiated before the beginning of the special session on disarmament. In fact, the General Assembly was so hopeful of a nuclear-test ban that in operative paragraph 5 of its resolution 32/78 it requested the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to take up the agreed text which, the Assembly had hoped, would result from the three nuclear-weapon States' negotiations, with a view to the submission of a draft treaty to the General Assembly at its special session devoted to disarmament. As it stands now, we have neither a nuclear-test ban, nor a SALT II agreement. My delegation is hopeful that this Committee will be able to come up with an acceptable draft treaty on a nuclear-test ban before the end of the session. We are equally optimistic that the two nuclear super-Powers will soon be able to reach agreement in the SALT II negotiations.

For an agreement on a comprehensive nuclear-weapon-test ban to be successful, it is necessary that all nuclear Powers adhere to it. But at the same time the two leading nuclear Powers must demonstrate their will to lead other nuclear Powers towards a comprehensive test ban and to ensure that there will be no violations once the treaty goes into effect.

Arguments have been made to the effect that nuclear-weapon tests and peaceful nuclear explosions were indistinguishable, and that it should be covered under a comprehensive test ban. While we strongly support all non-proliferation measures, we feel that the question of peaceful nuclear tests should not come under the nuclear-weapon-test-ban treaty. Kenya is prepared to support a moratorium on peaceful nuclear tests, but we are opposed to any suggestion that peaceful nuclear programmes be abandoned entirely. Any action of this kind would, no doubt, attempt

(Mr. Mvanzandi, Kenya)

to frustrate the intentions and purposes of paragraphs 68 and 69 of the Final Document of the special session, as well as article IV of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which recognizes the inalienable right of all parties to the Treaty to acquire nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.

This Committee is also requested to pursue its examination of the question of the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, with a view to reaching agreement on the prevention of the emergence of new weapons based on new scientific principles and achievements. Since 1975, when the item was included on the agenda of the thirtieth session of the General Assembly at the request of the Soviet Union, various approaches to the question have evolved. One approach calls for an all-encompassing agreement to prevent the emergence of such weapons in advance. The other approach opposes such a general agreement and advocates the conclusion of conventions regarding specific weapons as and when they emerge.

The CCD report, outlining the discussion on the item indicates that there seems to be general agreement regarding the need for some action by the international community in regard to new weapons of mass destruction. But at the same time serious differences still exist making it rather difficult to achieve consensus in this matter. Our efforts should therefore be directed towards narrowing these differences.

Finally, Kenya strongly believes that the continued growth of trust, as well as political, economic and cultural co-operation among States, is a basic factor of the efforts to strengthen international security. My country attaches great importance to the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other States. This principle guarantees every State the fundamental right to conduct its affairs without hindrance and in accordance with the wishes of its people. Current international efforts at establishing a new international economic order, to ensure equitable and fair international economic relationships between the developed industrialized countries and the developing, poor world could, with political will, augur well for the promotion of international security.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman and delegates, for your attention.

Mr. FARTASH (Iran): Mr. Chairman, may I begin by adding the congratulations of my delegation to those already extended to you and your eminent Foreign Minister as the first Chairmen of this Committee. It is fortuitous indeed that this duty should have fallen on a country which has already taken so many important international initiatives.

As we meet here to inaugurate the Committee on Disarmament I wish to express the optimism and satisfaction with which my delegation takes its place in this new forum. I am sure that my colleagues share our sense of renewed spirit and strengthened resolve as we enter this new phase of our work. We have already had the honour of hearing many distinguished Ministers launch their Governments' participation in this Committee, and we have been encouraged by the positive tone of all the statements made so far. Our expectations thus remain high that the deliberations of this negotiating body will substantially enhance the possibilities of concluding disarmament agreements.

Although we are all new to this Committee, allow me nevertheless to welcome the States which have not previously participated in the multilateral disarmament talks here in Geneva. We realize, of course that they are all well acquainted with the subject. We have listened to them attentively at the General Assembly debates as well as at other disarmament meetings. One of the fundamental intentions of the tenth special session was to democratize the process of the negotiations carried out in this delicate field. Consequently it was in this spirit that the Committee on Disarmament was established, and without doubt the active participation of eight additional States in disarmament negotiations within the framework of such a representative body will contribute to both these objectives.

We are, of course, especially gratified by the presence of the Government of France in our midst. We have listened with great interest to the statement of the distinguished Foreign Minister Jean François-Poncet and look forward to a resumption of the outstanding French tradition in disarmament negotiations. The importance of the participation of the nuclear Powers cannot be overemphasized, and we hope in this respect that all the nuclear-weapon States will be able to participate in our deliberations in the near future.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

My delegation hopes, as do many others, that the initiation of this new Committee heralds a new era in disarmament and that some breakthroughs will become possible. We have behind us a particularly fruitful year, which should provide a solid foundation for our work. The special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament undertook a broad attack on all the problems of disarmament. And at the General Assembly's thirty-third session the resolutions adopted in this field reflected this wide-ranging approach. They cover every possible area, from negotiated agreements to national restraint, to studies, information programmes and publicity. Everything is to be attempted, and the large packet of recommendations contained in document CD/1 is evidence of the expanded interest and intensity of the disarmament effort. It is up to our Committee as one of the important forums of negotiation to retain the global attention which the special session managed to arouse by maintaining this momentum.

Despite our new Committee and a new beginning, we remain faced, however, with familiar problems. Time has not made these problems easier to handle. One need only read the newspapers to note the increasing number of military-related items. Conflict and hostilities abound, and weapons developments are reported with spreading headlines. It is our job to seek to reverse this trend, to make the limitation of armaments a working policy of all Governments.

Before indulging in a short examination of the matters before this Committee, I would like to express the satisfaction of our delegation with the progress reported in the SALT negotiations. Although we shared the general disappointment when agreement was not possible in December of last year, we are nevertheless encouraged by the reports that differences have indeed narrowed and that we can still expect success within the coming months. There is no purpose in lamenting the many years it has taken to conclude this negotiation. We would at this point welcome the agreement wholeheartedly as a first step, and we await its accomplishment. Our foremost objective is to reduce nuclear weapons, and it is only through these bilateral talks for the time being that progress in this direction can be made. SALT II must be agreed in order to clear the way for SALT III to begin.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

In the Committee on Disarmament, our first discussions will be devoted to the organization of our work, agreement on the rules of procedure and on the agenda. We trust that these organizational matters can be efficiently dealt with so that we will be able to concentrate on the substantive items. Some of these tasks have in fact already been done for us. In accordance with the action programme of the tenth special session, General Assembly resolution A/33/71H recommends that the priority items for this Committee be the achievement of a comprehensive test-ban agreement and a ban on chemical weapons.

The comprehensive test ban remains our primary objective. Despite all our efforts, and despite repeated appeals for the cessation of nuclear testing, agreement has not been reached and nuclear-weapon tests continue. The rationale for this behaviour is not easy to grasp, for the nuclear Powers themselves favour a test cessation, and have certainly concluded for their own satisfaction that continued testing will not provide them with any additional security. Yet up till now it has not been possible for them to take action in accordance with the desires of the vast majority of States.

As far as this Committee is concerned, its role should not be reduced to hoping that the trilateral negotiations undertaken on this subject two years ago will now bear fruit. Little information has been made available on these talks, even though the draft treaty which eventually emerges will be submitted to this Committee for further negotiation. The subject will then require our immediate and continual attention until the approved draft is ready for presentation to the General Assembly.

Under these circumstances, it seems unfortunate that we have little information to date. It is after all in the interests of all States that the test-ban treaty which finally is presented to the General Assembly be a carefully prepared and well studied document. After many long years of discussion there would be no excuse for anything less.

I have emphasized the test-ban issue because it is the vital one for our Committee. It is perhaps the only item which is likely to result in an agreement this year. The reputation and strength of this forum may depend on our action in this area. In order to maintain the dynamism of this group, let us make it a point to accomplish a test-ban treaty this year.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

On the question of a ban on chemical weapons, this Committee should continue the work started by the CCD in this field. While the United States and the Soviet Union are pursuing their bilateral discussions to achieve a joint initiative, this Committee must undertake its own research and its own exchange of ideas. As we have had occasion to explain in previous statements, this issue is not limited to the nuclear Powers. While admittedly nothing can be done without their participation, neither can a ban on chemical weapons work without the co-operation of all the important military and industrial countries of the world. Thus, there is much that can be done without awaiting the results of the bilateral talks. And the time is ripe, if not over-ripe, for a CW prohibition now. Already reports in the Press of growing budgets for chemical weapons foretell that our task will become increasingly complicated.

Another major issue which will confront our Committee as a result of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly is the question of strengthening security assurances for the non-nuclear-weapon States. This measure, necessitated by the absence of any real nuclear disarmament, directly affects all non-nuclear countries. It is imperative that action be taken to safeguard the security of States which renounce nuclear weapons. They have a right to expect more explicit assurances that nuclear weapons will not be used against them. Many States, including my own, have already made a commitment by adhering to the spirit and the letter of the non-proliferation Treaty. Another route is through the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We welcome therefore the unilateral statements made in this regard at the special session by the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and China. We also welcome the recognition by these nuclear-weapon States of the need to respect and guarantee the status of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We believe, however, that more can be achieved in this direction and that more can be expected of the nuclear-weapon States. A useful discussion of this item in our Committee would be an important contribution to the nuclear disarmament debate.

We will also be considering this year the prohibition of the development of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction as well as the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. Both of these

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

items touch on essential aspects of nuclear disarmament. Neither are easy subjects, the first because of the problems of finding satisfactory definitions acceptable to all, the second because of verification complexities. Nevertheless we hope that the Committee will give serious consideration to both items and that some headway can be made in these areas.

Although the items I have enumerated will be the major ones before us, there are many other disarmament subjects which will continue to concern us and which we will surely discuss in this gathering. They have not necessarily been referred to our Committee for action. Two developments to follow will be the work of the Preparatory Committees, which will begin meeting this year for the second review conference of the non-proliferation Treaty and for the first review conference of the Convention on Biological Weapons. Many delegations here present will be serving on one or both of these committees, and all will be cognizant of the need to preserve and enhance these agreements, which have already been reached. These review conferences are also a good sign that some arms-control agreements have become part of the fabric of international law. They represent the foundation for our future work, and all must be done to support their objectives.

My delegation has a special interest in the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones, in particular in resolution A/33/64 endorsing such a zone in the Middle-East. As one of the sponsors of this resolution, we are especially sensitive to the nearly universal support for our initiative. However, the efforts to create a denuclearized area in the Middle East have not realized much progress to date. The problems of the Region still present formidable obstacles. Under the present circumstances we cannot yet hope for a conventional approach and thus we hope that through the United Nations Secretary-General and through the Security Council some initial steps towards our goal can be taken. We continue to support all efforts for the creation of similar zones in other areas of the world.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

Because of Iran's participation in the Preparatory Conference for the Prohibition or Restriction of the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons with Excessively Injurious or Indiscriminate Effects, we have followed this item closely. We look forward to a useful and effective meeting of the Preparatory Committee this spring to ensure a successful conference later this year.

My delegation also has a great interest in the work of the Expert Group to study the relationship between disarmament and development. We consider this to be one of the most vital undertakings to promote disarmament as well as to assure progress towards global social and economic goals. When the problems of the arms race are seen in isolation, the dangers of increasingly destructive weapons and of growing military budgets are already frightening enough. When viewed in comparison to the needs of development, however, these enormous amounts take on additional significance and acquire a decidedly social meaning with relevance to all countries. It will be of the utmost importance to study and bring to public attention the resources that are expended for military purposes every year. But the discussion about arms expenditures is inextricably linked to the question of national security. We cannot disregard the fact that as long as it remains impossible to establish viable international security arrangements through the United Nations, nations cannot be prevented from taking into consideration the requirements of their national security. Perhaps the most effective way of making States focus on the need for disarmament is to highlight the economic drainage which their individual defence efforts represent.

We expect to have an active and productive session of this Committee, and my delegation plans to contribute to the utmost of its ability. It is evident that a new forum can only provide the framework which makes progress possible. It is up to the member Governments to supply the proposals and the perseverance necessary to prove that agreements can and will be reached.

Mr. SANI (Indonesia): My delegation is most happy to see the distinguished representative of Algeria, a country which has always been in the forefront of the struggle for a new, more just and more equitable world order, presiding over the first meetings of our Committee. I would also like to express the particular appreciation of my delegation that it has been possible for the eminent Foreign Minister of Algeria, H.E. Mr. Bouteflika, President of the twenty-ninth session of the United Nations General Assembly and one of the most prominent and dynamic leaders of the non-aligned movement, to come to Geneva to preside over the opening of the first session of the Committee on Disarmament.

Being the last speaker, my delegation had the opportunity to listen with great interest to the delegations who have spoken before us and all previous speakers who have, without exception, expressed their hope and commitments as we begin with our task in the Committee on Disarmament. My delegation shares to a very large extent the views stated by representatives of non-aligned and developing countries on the difficult and complex issues related to disarmament.

My delegation does not intend to elaborate on those points, but wishes mainly to make a few general remarks on the role of the Committee on Disarmament, as we perceive it, within the framework of decisions and resolutions adopted by the special session on Disarmament and the thirty-third session of the General Assembly.

The tenth special session, on Disarmament, was an important event. The Final Document, arrived at by consensus, laid down the basic principles of disarmament and formulated a programme of action to achieve genuine disarmament leading to general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Also, the machinery necessary for its implementation was established. The United Nations Disarmament Commission, consisting of the entire membership of the United Nations, was revived as the forum for the deliberations, while the Committee on Disarmament was restructured, its procedure democratized, opening the possibility for participation by States non-members of the Committee. My delegation is especially happy that France has decided to participate, and hopes that China will soon be able to join the work of the Committee, so that all nuclear-weapons States will participate in our negotiations. The tenth special session has re-affirmed the central role the United Nations should play in the efforts to achieve disarmament.

Indonesia considers decision-making by consensus of great importance to the Committee in view of the nature of the problems which we are trying to solve.

(Mr. Sani, Indonesia)

Consensus is the most appropriate process to arrive at decisions, if we expect them to be respected and implemented by the international community.

The thirty-third session of the General Assembly has entrusted the Committee to undertake, on a priority basis, negotiations on a treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests and a treaty on the prohibition of chemical weapons. Additionally, it has been requested to consider issues relating to an international convention on the question of measures to strengthen the security of non-nuclear States, to examine the question of the prevention of the emergence of new weapons of mass destruction and the text of an instrument on the prohibition of new types of weapons. These are some of the issues to be considered, and our agenda will clearly be heavy for the coming years.

It is now our responsibility to follow up on the resolutions adopted by the special session and the General Assembly. We must try to narrow our differences and reach agreement on the steps we must take to implement them. Thus, we can fulfil the hope that the Committee will generate the needed momentum for international negotiations, and in this way carry out its responsibilities in accordance with the high expectations of the international community. As disarmament is a complex and sensitive matter, and its solution has eluded our efforts for so many years, my delegation is realistic enough not to be surprised if the Committee on Disarmament, restructured though it may be, would not be able to achieve disarmament easily in a short time. This does not mean that we should not persevere in our endeavours.

It has been said repeatedly that for our efforts to succeed the existence of a political will among the parties is essential. The adoption by consensus of the Final Document presupposes the existence of such political will, but that alone is not sufficient. We need to translate the political will, emanating from a strong moral commitment to peace of which disarmament is an inseparable component, into deeds. We should be able to carry out agreements in the form of concrete and effective actions leading to disarmament. We must remember that the political will is continuously influenced by the prevailing political atmosphere and vice versa, by the evaluation of the country concerned of its national interests, especially its national-security interests, which are directly related to the state of international peace and security. Disarmament negotiations cannot be viewed separate from international developments as they affect international peace and security. In this connexion, my delegation would like to underline the

(Mr. Sani, Indonesia)

view expressed by the President of the French Republic during the special session, when he said that "progress cannot be made towards disarmament unless further progress is also made towards improving international relations."

When we talk about disarmament, we are not exactly addressing ourselves to countries like Indonesia, but in the first place to the big Powers, especially the two super-Powers, whose arsenals are overflowing with arms, nuclear as well as conventional.

My delegation takes note of the optimistic assessment made by the distinguished delegate of the United States on the prospect of an early completion of the SALT II agreement. We hope that it would be possible for the two super-Powers to finalize and sign the agreement soon.

It is now generally recognized that nuclear disarmament is the issue of the highest priority facing the Committee as it poses the greatest peril to the very survival of mankind. My delegation wishes to emphasize that maximum efforts should be exerted to achieve this very important objective. Responsibility for progress in this respect belongs in the first place to nuclear Powers, in particular the two super-Powers. The present stockpiles are unquestionably already far beyond their security requirements. The international community expects the nuclear Powers to fulfil their obligations which they have undertaken with regard to nuclear disarmament. That is why priority should be given to efforts leading to the ban of nuclear tests in all environments and to the effective and substantial reduction of existing nuclear arsenals.

This Committee has been asked by the General Assembly to undertake on a priority basis negotiations on a treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests which have continued unabated. A comprehensive test ban will bring to a halt the production of more sophisticated nuclear arms with increased capability for mass destruction. For a number of years there has been no meaningful results from the negotiations on a comprehensive test ban, despite several United Nations resolutions. It is of overriding importance that a treaty prohibiting the conduct of nuclear-weapons tests come into force as soon as possible.

My delegation hopes that the ongoing negotiations among the three nuclear Powers concerned will soon lead to a successful conclusion.

Another priority item is the negotiation on banning chemical weapons. Achievement of an international agreement would be a major contribution, in

(Mr. Sani, Indonesia)

view of their destructive effect on human beings on a massive scale. Attention should also be given to conventional arms, which because of their increased sophistication have achieved a capability for mass destruction which is not far behind that of nuclear weapons.

I would like to emphasize the commitment of the Government of Indonesia to disarmament. We consider disarmament as indispensable if we are to achieve international peace and security. It is within this framework, that the ASEAN countries are pursuing the establishment of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in the region of South-East Asia as a contribution towards global peace and security. Likewise, my delegation would like to reiterate Indonesia's determination to co-operate with the littoral and hinterland States for the establishment of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. We hope that the negotiations between the super-Powers to reduce their military presence in the area of the Indian Ocean will soon lead to a successful conclusion. Such an agreement will substantially contribute to the realization of the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

It is well known that the arms race consumes billions of dollars annually. If the international community can agree on effective disarmament measures, certainly part of the enormous human and material resources now being spent for destructive purposes can be used for development purposes to meet the economic and social challenges of our times. Disarmament, when achieved, will be able to exert a positive influence on economic and social development in the third world, and to contribute to the enhancement of world prosperity.

Joining for the first time in the Committee's work, my delegation would like to give its assurance that it will endeavour to play an active and constructive role in close co-operation with other members and interested States. We would like to thank all those who have welcomed us to membership of the Committee. It is our hope that the restructured Committee will be able to contribute effectively to achieve the ultimate goals of disarmament under effective international control, bringing mankind closer to the realization of the purpose of the United Nations: to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I thank the distinguished representative of Indonesia.

Following the important contribution of the last speakers, this afternoon, and of the speakers at the first five plenary meetings, the Committee on Disarmament as a whole is now informed of a series of approaches which reflect the determination of member States to give new impetus to the efforts of the international community, with a view to achieving the objective of disarmament and thereby meeting the legitimate aspirations of the peoples to live in permanent peace and security.

The Algerian delegation has been loaded with honour, friendship and sympathy, and with many expressions of fraternal consideration for our Minister, Mr. Bouteflika, and through him for our country and the Algerian people, who will find further satisfaction in these ties of friendship with nations which share a common ideal, the just and peaceful advancement of human society.

I have no more speakers on my list for this afternoon, and I therefore propose to suspend this meeting and reconvene an informal meeting.

If I see no objections, I shall declare the meeting suspended.

The informal meeting which is to follow is open only to representatives of the member countries of the Committee on Disarmament. May I therefore request everyone else kindly to leave the room, and the security service to make sure that the gallery is empty and to close its doors.

The meeting was suspended at 5.20 p.m. and reconvened at 6.15 p.m.

I declare the sixth plenary meeting reconvened after a brief interruption.

I shall read each draft decision that the Committee wishes to take, and we shall adopt them one by one, if this procedure is acceptable to all. I ask the indulgence of delegations who use working languages other than French. I see no objection, and I shall now read out the text of the first decision slowly. It concerns the rotation of the chairmanship.

"At its sixth plenary meeting, the Committee on Disarmament, in accordance with the agreement referred to in paragraph 120 (d) of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to Disarmament, decides that the chairmanship of the Committee shall be rotated among all its members on a monthly basis, i.e. by the calendar month. Thus, the representative of Argentina will take over the chairmanship on 1 February 1979, following Algeria, which will have held it from 24 to 31 January 1979. The Committee postpones consideration of all other matters concerning the rotation of the chairmanship to a later date."

(The Chairman)

The observations of the various delegations which have spoken on this item will of course be taken into account.

I have to make a comment on the translation: "l'accord visé au paragraphe 120 (d)" should be translated in English by "the agreement referred to in paragraph 120 (d)". I do not know whether the English translation has taken this into account, but it will do so.

May I take it that the Committee adopts the text that I have just read out to you?

It was so decided.

I now turn to the second item. This is a text on attendance at meetings by representatives of countries not members of the Committee on Disarmament.

I shall read the paragraph.

"At its sixth plenary meeting, the Committee on Disarmament decided to admit representatives of non-member countries to plenary meetings in the Council Chamber where they may occupy the seats marked 'government representatives' which will be reserved for them. Any question relating to the application of the agreement referred to in paragraph 120 (g) and (h) of the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament may be discussed at a later date."

May I consider that the Committee adopts the text that I have just read out to you?

It was so decided.

Now here is the text concerning the date of the next plenary meeting.

"At its sixth plenary meeting, the Committee on Disarmament decided that the next plenary meeting will be held in the Council Chamber on Thursday, 1 February 1979, at 10.30 a.m."

May I take it that the Committee adopts this text which I have just read out to you?

It was so decided.

We have now completed the inaugural part of the work of the Committee on Disarmament. Without wishing to refer to matters which are foreign to its vocation and present structure, I think I may say that there is new breath, a more deeply felt concern and the expression of a clearly affirmed will to intensify and accelerate efforts to achieve substantial progress on the road to disarmament.

Allow me to say now in my turn that while this part of the first session of the Committee on Disarmament seems to have got off to the start that was wished

(The Chairman)

for by each member of the Committee, this is mainly due to the effort to achieve mutual understanding which was apparent at the preparatory phase and is still being maintained among us here in the Committee on Disarmament.

I would like to express my delegations thanks for the valuable support and co-operation shown to it by all delegations. It should also be said, and I would like to stress this point, that the Secretariat, particularly through its eminent representatives at our side, has brought a special dimension to the quality of our work. If there are no further speakers, I declare the sixth plenary meeting closed until Thursday, 1 February 1979.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.