

COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.153
11 February 1982
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-THIRD PLENARY MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 11 February 1982, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Mohammad Jafar MAHALLATI (Iran)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria:

Mr. A. SALAH-BEY

Mr. M. MATI

Argentina:

Mr. J.C. CARASALES

Mr. V. BEAUGE

Miss N. NASCIMBENE

Australia:

Mr. D.M. SADLEIR

Mr. R.W. STEELE

Mr. T. FINDLAY

Belgium:

Mr. A. ONKELINX

Mr. RAEYMAEKERS

Mr. J.M. NOIRFALISSE

Miss R. de CLERCQ

Brazil:

Mr. C.A. de SOUZA e SILVA

Mr. S. de QUEIROZ DUARTE

Bulgaria:

Mr. K. TELLALOV

Mr. I. SOTIROV

Mr. K. PRAMOV

Mr. P. POPCHEV

Burma:

U MAUNG MAUNG GYI

U THAN HTUN

Canada:

Mr. D.S. McPHAIL

Mr. G. SKINNER

China:

Mr. TIAN JIN

Mr. YU MENGJIA

Mr. YANG MINGLIANG

Mr. LIN CHEN

Mr. FENG ZHENYAO

Cuba:

Mr. L. SOLA VILA
Mr. P. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. J. STRUCKA
Mr. E. ZAPOTOCKY

Egypt:

Mr. EL S.A.R. EL REEDY
Mr. I.A. HASSAN
Mr. M.N. FAHMY
Miss W. BASSIM

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. TERREFE
Mr. F. YOHANNES

France:

Mr. F. de la GORCE
Mr. J. de BEAUSSE
Mr. M. COUTHURES

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. H. THIELICKE
Mr. M. KAULFUSS
Mr. J. MOPERT

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. H. WEGENER
Mr. N. KLINGLER
Mr. W.E. VON DEM HAGEN
Mr. W. ROHR

Hungary:

Mr. I. KÖMÍVES
Mr. F. GAJDA
Mr. C. GYORFFY

India:

Mr. A.P. VENKATESWARAN
Mr. S. SARAN

Indonesia:

Mr. CH. ANWAR SANI
Mr. E. SOEPRAPTO
Mr. HARYOMATARAM
Mr. B. SIMANJUNTAK

Iran:

Mr. M.J. MAHALLATI

Mr. M. NOSTRATI

Italy:

Mr. M. ALESSI

Mr. B. CABRAS

Mr. E. DI GIOVANNI

Japan:

Mr. T. OKAWA

Mr. M. TAKAHASHI

Mr. K. TANAKA

Mr. T. ARAI

Kenya:

Mr. C.G. MAINA

Mr. D. NANJIRE

Mr. J. MURIU KIBOI

Mexico:

Mr. A. GARCÍA ROBLES

Mrs. Z. GONZALEZ Y REYNERO

Mongolia:

Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG

Mr. S.O. BOLD

Morocco:

Mr. S.M. RAHHALI

Mr. M. HALFAOUI

Netherlands:

Mr. H. WAGENMAKERS

Nigeria:

Mr. G.O. IJEWERE

Mr. W.O. AKINSANYA

Mr. T. AGUIYI-IRONSI

Pakistan:

Mr. M. AHMAD

Mr. M. AKRAM

Mr. T. ALTAF

Peru:

Mr. J. BENAVIDES

Poland:

Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. G. RUSSIN
Mr. T. STROJWAS

Romania:

Mr. M. MALITA
Mr. T. MELESCANU

Sri Lanka:

Mr. T. JAYAKODDY
Mr. S. PALIHAKKARA

Sweden:

Mrs. I. THORSSON
Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. C.M. HYLTIENUS
Mr. H. BERGLUND
Mr. G. ANDERSSON
Mr. G. EKHOLM

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. B.P. PROKOFIEV
Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN
Mr. Y.V. KOSTENKO
Mr. M.M. IPPOLITOV
Mr. G.V. BERDENNIKOV

United Kingdom:

Mr. D. SUMMERHAYES
Mr. L.J. MIDDLETON
Mr. CHICK
Mrs. J. LINK
Miss J.E.F. WRIGHT

United States of America:

Mr. L.G. FIELDS
Mr. M. BUSBY
Miss K. CRITTENBERGER
Mr. J. MISKEL
Mr. R.F. SCOTT
Miss L.M. SHEA
Mr. J. GUNDERSEN

Venezuela:

Mr. R.R. NAVARRO
Mr. O.A. AGUILAR

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. VRHUNEC

Zaire:

Mr. B.A. NZENGEYA

Mrs. C. ESAKI EKANGA KABEYA

Secretary of the Committee on Disarmament
and Personal Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. R. JAIPAL

Deputy Secretary of the
Committee on Disarmament:

Mr. V. BERASATEGUI

The CHAIRMAN: In The Name of God The Most Compassionate, The Most Merciful, I declare open the 153rd plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament.

As agreed by the Committee at our last plenary meeting, we will listen this morning to as many speakers as possible and hold another plenary meeting tomorrow morning so that members unable to deliver their statements today may do so on that occasion.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer you my congratulations on assuming the responsibilities of the chairmanship of this Committee and to assure you of the full co-operation of my delegation in carrying out your task. At the same time I wish to express our appreciation to Ambassador Sani for the firm and wise guidance he gave us both at the end of last year and at the beginning of this one. I also extend a very warm welcome to the many new colleagues who have joined us for the new session of the Committee.

My delegation shares the feeling of many distinguished representatives who have spoken before me that the session of the Committee on Disarmament which we have now begun is of special significance because it will be followed by, and is in a sense preparatory to, the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We are all most conscious that the expectations aroused by the first special session have not been fulfilled, that armed conflict continues to cause widespread suffering in many parts of the world and that the military potential of many States continues to increase.

Against this troubled background, the British Government continues to believe that its first responsibility is to preserve its country's security. In this connection, it remains committed to seeking balanced and verifiable measures of arms control and, in this, it reflects the wishes of the British people. My delegation is conscious of the magnitude of our task here and the difficulties and differences that remain to be overcome; we are aware that arms control is a field where we must be both imaginative and realistic. In this spirit, my delegation is ready to play a full and constructive part in the discussions of the Committee and of its working groups in the hope that significant advances can be achieved before the second special session opens. To fulfil this hope, it is important, in our view, to pay special attention to those areas where progress has already been made and where there seems a better prospect of coming rapidly to agreement. The agreements we all seek will have to be built on confidence and will have to ensure undiminished security for all concerned. For that reason, verification procedures, in which both sides can put their trust, remain an essential key to success in our work. The need for agreements to include adequate verification machinery is underlined by the difficulties that have faced the United Nations Group of Experts to Investigate Reports on the Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons. Its inability to produce a conclusive report at the end of its first year of investigation was due in large part to the difficulties it had faced in gaining admission to areas where the alleged treaty violations were taking place. We sincerely hope that the Group will meet with greater co-operation now that its mandate has been extended by General Assembly resolution 36/96 C.

(Mr. Sumnerhaves, United Kingdom)

There is also a wider aspect to the question of confidence. Governments, with which decisions on arms control ultimately rest, are constrained by considerations of policy at the international level. It is an inescapable fact that over the past two years, our work in this Committee has been overshadowed by the continuing military occupation of a non-aligned country, Afghanistan, and now the imposition of martial law in Poland has further contributed to tension in the world. Soviet pressure on Poland during the last 18 months has been intense and has included threatening military manoeuvres around Poland's borders, as well as encouragement of, and support for, the imposition of military rule. This is a violation of a number of internationally accepted principles including those dealing with sovereignty, non-intervention, the threat of force, and self-determination. Such violations are bound to affect our work for they undermine mutual trust, which must be the basis for progress. The fact that talks between the United States of America and the Soviet Union on limiting intermediate nuclear forces have begun is, however, a most encouraging development. My Government attaches the highest importance to progress in these negotiations. The United Kingdom believes that achievement of the zero-level for land-based INF missiles on both sides would be a major contribution to international stability and therefore to progress in other areas of arms control endeavour in which the work of this Committee should figure substantially. We also look forward to the opening of the strategic arms reduction talks with emphasis on deep cuts in the nuclear arsenals of the superpowers. We believe that these talks should get under way at an early opportunity.

My Government well understands the views put forward in this Committee and the disappointment that it has not proved possible so far to achieve a CTB. My Government will continue to seek progress on test ban issues.

I turn now to other aspects of the work of the Committee. It is clear that we have a great deal to do in a short space of time. In particular, we have little time to fulfil the responsibility, entrusted to the Committee by the first special session, of preparing a comprehensive programme of disarmament. For this reason, the United Kingdom joined with other Western States in the presentation of a draft programme, contained in document CD/205, during the summer session last year. My delegation has played an active role in the Working Group under Ambassador García Robles' chairmanship since meetings were resumed in January and we believe that these meetings have been most useful in clarifying different approaches to some of the key issues and, in particular, the problem of stages for implementation and of review mechanisms. My delegation welcomes the fact that the Group has now begun work on the drafting of texts for some of the sections of the programme, in particular the section on objectives, where there seems to be a fair degree of concordance in the working papers presented by the various groups and individual States. It is our firm intention to have a draft programme completed by the end of this spring session -- that is, in eleven weeks' time or within a space of perhaps not much more than twenty meetings of the Working Group. The task should be possible, but we shall have to keep our expectations within reasonable and practical limits if we are to accomplish it.

As always, my delegation listened with interest to the remarks made by Ambassador Venkateswaran of India in his statement of 9 February, which he devoted mainly to the comprehensive programme. Not surprisingly, there are a number of

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

points upon which we hold a different view from that expressed by the delegation of India. In particular, we are surprised to find that he considers that document CD/205 does not provide an idea of the route along which we must travel towards general and complete disarmament. In our view, document CD/205 does provide such a route, particularly for the first part of the journey. Thereafter, we have sketched out some possible paths to follow; but we do not consider that it is feasible, when the map is largely uncharted, to go further without adequate review. As I have indicated, however, we believe that the possibility of reaching agreement on the comprehensive programme does exist and that we should now concentrate our efforts in the Working Group on this aim.

Although, as I have made clear, my delegation attaches particular importance at this time to the CPD negotiations, we also believe that members of the Committee should not lose sight of the more direct contribution they can make to progress on arms control through the Committee's work on radiological weapons and, still more, on chemical weapons.

My delegation demonstrated its belief in the value of the early completion of negotiations on a final text of a convention to ban radiological weapons by its support for resolution 36/97 B at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly. We are again ready at this present session to play a constructive part in discussions aimed at achieving a generally acceptable text; success in these discussions could provide a useful, if modest, step further forward in arms control. The importance of the measure lies not so much in the likely imminence of the introduction of such weapons -- for radiological weapons would certainly be very difficult to employ -- but in the incalculable and uncontrollable nature of their effects, which could persist long after a war in which the weapons were used, thus affecting future generations. That is sufficient reason for banning this potential class of weapons. I believe that we are most likely to achieve our objective by concentrating on the specific and well-definable issues which were still to be resolved at the end of last year rather than by attempting to cast our net too wide.

I should like now to turn to the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons, which covered a great deal of ground last year under the able and energetic chairmanship of Ambassador Lidgard of Sweden. The United Kingdom destroyed its entire stock of chemical weapons more than 10 years ago and my Government remains committed, as it has been since negotiations first began in the CCD, to seeking a comprehensive, effective and adequately verifiable ban on chemical weapons. My delegation therefore very much welcomed the intensive consideration of the range of issues covered last year. The report of the Working Group showed that there is still a great deal to be done, but it also pointed to a number of areas where a convergence of views is beginning to develop. We hope that the momentum created last year will be maintained during this session; we would, in particular, think it highly regrettable if the work of this Group were in any way to be held up by procedural considerations. We look forward to further substantive progress to report to the second special session devoted to disarmament and, in this connection,

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

we intend shortly to put forward some detailed suggestions on the question of verification. The United Kingdom's views on this subject are already well-known. While the various elements of a convention are clearly bound up with each other, the purpose of the working paper, which, while focusing on verification, will be to build on the progress made on this issue since the United Kingdom tabled its views in 1976. Verification is still the central problem we face in drawing up a convention. Satisfactory resolution of this problem is the only way in which the parties to a convention can have confidence in it.

The United Kingdom considers that verification provisions would be necessary for each stage of implementation -- that is, for the declaration and destruction of stockpiles and production facilities -- and thereafter to monitor the compliance of States, including the monitoring of permitted peaceful uses of chemical warfare agents and dual-purpose agents. It is essential also that the convention should have an effective complaints procedure.

We believe that the verification of implementation of the destruction of stockpiles and production facilities must be under international control. Thereafter, verification of compliance could be by a mixture of bilateral and multilateral contacts between States parties, with an international body -- the Consultative Committee, on which we have already made detailed proposals -- having ultimate responsibility.

Among the other items of business before the Committee to which we attach much importance is a subject commended to our attention by General Assembly resolutions 36/97 C and 36/99, namely, the question of further measures of arms control in outer space. My delegation hopes that this subject is to be included in the agenda of the Committee for this session and that time will be allocated in our work schedule for discussion of the technical issues which will have to be addressed in this new area of work.

The question of our work schedule to which I have just referred brings me back to the point I mentioned in connection with the comprehensive programme of disarmament. We are faced with a formidable amount of work in a relatively short period, since, for practical purposes, I believe we should finish our session by the middle of April. I believe that we must be guided by the actual possibilities for making progress on particular items and not necessarily by the theoretical allocation of priorities to certain subjects according to their over-all importance in the disarmament field. I also suggest that we might consider reverting to a practice used to good avail during our 1980 session, namely, that of holding less than the usual number of plenary meetings, at least during the latter part of the session, to allow time for extra informal meetings, sessions of the Working Groups and so on. This might be particularly useful when we begin to prepare our reports. If we are to complete the work of this session in good order, it will be necessary to make proper dispositions even at this early stage for our special report to the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

Mr. SADLEIR (Australia): Mr. Chairman, may I offer you my congratulations on your appointment to preside over us for this important, opening month of our negotiations and on the tone of firm and friendly guidance that you have already set. I offer you the co-operation of my delegation in your difficult task.

Though, personally, I did not have the honour of working here under the chairmanship of Ambassador Sani, the distinguished representative of Australia's great northern neighbour, I also wish to express on behalf of my delegation and that of my predecessors our appreciation of the able manner in which he discharged the office of Chairman towards the end of last year's session and early this year.

May I, too, on behalf of the Australian delegation and those who have preceded me in leading it, convey to the delegation of Italy our deep and sincere sympathy on the sad loss of Ambassador Montezemolo. His wisdom and extensive experience will greatly be missed, especially at this moment in history when those qualities are sorely needed.

I take also this opportunity formally to say goodbye to Ambassador Fein of the Netherlands who, with his qualities of common sense and foresight, contributed so much to the work of this Committee. I ask the delegation of the Netherlands to pass on to him our best wishes for every success and happiness in his new work.

Finally, may I thank those who have welcomed me as a newcomer to this key body in international life. I have no illusion that the mantle I assume is easy, but it could not be more worthwhile. With the ready help and encouragement I have received from so many in all quarters of this room, I set myself to contribute to our common task.

Many of our colleagues in this room -- in fact most of them -- have already addressed this session of the Committee on Disarmament. In everything they have said I detect a common theme, and it is an important and encouraging theme, namely, the need for the Committee urgently to get down to business. All of us are sharply aware that the second session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament is almost on us. All of us know that at that session the work of this Committee will be judged. The judgement will canvass the structure of the Committee as it was fashioned at the first special session. Inevitably, the way in which the Committee has discharged its mandate, as the only multilateral negotiating body on disarmament, will also be judged. Those to take the floor before me have pointed out that, for a range of political and procedural reasons, the Committee has not realized its potential. They have also stressed, however, that it is not too late for progress. That is the theme I bring to you in this statement by Australia.

(Mr. Sadleir, Australia)

Looking to the special session, it is clear that the Committee on Disarmament has continuously sat in judgement on itself. That is evident from the manner in which the Committee has continued, from year to year, to evolve. As the Secretariat so graphically showed at the end of our last session, we have become progressively more busy, to the point where most delegations are fully stretched to staff all the meetings now scheduled. We have, moreover, been assiduous in adding to our agenda and imaginative in refining the way we work. All that is not only to be welcomed, but encouraged.

So long as the process of evolution continues so long as the Committee still has a potential to realize, there seems to my delegation to be no reason why either its membership or its fundamental structure should be changed.

Already at this session, and frequently in the past, delegations have urged the Committee to focus on items of priority in the sphere of disarmament. In so doing, delegations have urged, above all, that the Committee get down to substance. It is a sentiment I share.

It is not possible for the Committee -- and it is by no means either too small or too unwieldy a Committee -- to tackle the full range of items on the international disarmament agenda: we have no choice but to be selective. Equally, if there are to be results and, as a negotiating body, that is why we are here, we shall need to be economic in the time that we give to matters of procedure.

In the three years since the Committee on Disarmament took shape, it has developed, to an impressive degree, its diplomatic skills. Sadly, they have too often been squandered. We have been busy, but we have done little work. A different approach is needed. We should certainly not attempt to copy the First Committee in New York. We should not be impressed with quantity. We should not puff out our agenda with matters which have not the least chance of successful pursuit. What we have on our agenda we should seriously, soberly, but energetically, address. Meeting obstacles we should be ingenious and versatile. If a working group is too ponderous a frame for our negotiation we should resort to leaner and looser structures. If a mandate cannot be made precisely to fit all, we should seek something more general that allows us, nonetheless, to address substance. There is nothing I see that inherently prevents us from producing results, and concrete results, on every item on our agenda.

I shall cover briefly the main items on our agenda. I preface my remarks on the items by drawing attention to two broad aspects of international disarmament activity.

The first aspect to which I draw attention is the political climate in which such activity takes place.

(Mr. Sadleir, Australia)

Many delegations contend, and rightly contend, that substantive progress on arms control, arms reduction and disarmament can take place only if there is trust, if there is a spirit of confidence and mutual respect. In short, can only take place in the right international political climate. Other delegations assert that progress in this sensitive and crucial area can only occur if there is a political will for progress. That also is correct; but it is not different. Political climate and political will are no more than two descriptions of the same thing: agreement is only possible if circumstances and dispositions permit. Since circumstances and dispositions are determined neither by the inanimate nor the abstract, but by human beings, by you and me, Mr. Chairman, the issue is inescapably one for all of us.

Governments cannot and do not hazard their security -- and agreements to disarm or deny require an element of risk, even though that risk cannot but be reciprocal -- without substantial assurance that no harm to their interests will result. Political will is meaningless if the assurance is not there and, in the absence of that assurance, the political climate can only be stormy.

The assurance, in a world of dramatic transitions and of turbulence, is no longer there. The hopes of a decade dissolved in the agony of Afghanistan, even though those who manufactured that agony seek to present it as a kind of public spirited, even generous, contribution to international stability and security. With Afghanistan, a pattern of international co-operation was wrecked, with immediate effects on progress on arms control here in our Committee and elsewhere.

International security, the network of interlocking assurances, is seamless. The breaching of that network anywhere inevitably breaches it everywhere. The dynamics of war, as two speakers of very different standpoints acknowledged, permit no sanctuaries. The force that tatters and tortures Afghanistan continues to be applied and, in its application, damages us all.

Force of another kind, but not so very different, has also, since mid-December, been applied in an area of no less central importance, namely, Poland. The pressures and circumstances that brought about military rule in that country strike at the very heart not only of the United Nations Charter, the testament on which the modern world, its stability and progress have been built, but the Helsinki Final Act and accepted principles of human rights. In so doing, the circumstances surrounding Poland, together with continuing war in Afghanistan, open up the most serious implications for international stability and peace. Poland remains, not only for the reasons I describe, a legitimate cause of international concern, not least for Australians, who with, I venture to say, most, if not all the peoples represented in this room, paid with their lives in many hundreds of thousands in the course of two World Wars touched off by the inability, indeed the reluctance, of the States of Europe to solve their regional and domestic problems without resort to violence or, as we witness in Poland today, the half-naked threat of it. It is for these reasons that my Government states categorically and clearly that there should be an early end to military rule in Poland, the restoration of civil and trade union liberties and a rapid return to circumstances in which the people of Poland are free to solve their own difficulties on the basis of consensus and reconciliation.

(Mr. Sadleir, Australia)

If the political climate is bad and if the assurances, the prospect of security are not as firm as they might be, it is not for us here in this Committee to collapse into despair. We, above all, are charged by our Governments, by our peoples and by the United Nations system to work towards disarmament. That is a key responsibility. It is precisely when the political climate is most difficult, when the assurances each of our States seeks are most lacking, that we of the Committee on Disarmament should be making the most urgent efforts to press our responsibilities and bring forward agreement when none seems possible. I venture to suggest that one substantial achievement, only one achievement, on our part at this session would do much to restore that spirit of optimism in the international community which in recent years has so sadly been lacking.

I turn now to the items on our agenda. For Australia, the first item, the nuclear test ban, has always held special importance. Of the several dozen disarmament resolutions adopted at the thirty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly, few can be said to have much importance for negotiating disarmament. One, however, resolution 36/85, is sufficiently balanced and sufficiently constructive to show the way ahead in tackling the question of a nuclear test ban. I am happy both that Australia played a leading role in drafting this resolution and that it attracted 140 positive votes and no negative votes in plenary. The resolution stresses the indispensable role of this Committee in negotiating a test ban. It also asks the Committee to determine the institutional and administrative arrangements necessary for establishing, testing and operating an international seismic monitoring network and an effective verification system.

In the context of resolution 36/85, the Committee's attention should be drawn again to document CD/95, which my delegation introduced in 1980 and which provides an illustrative list of subjects which might, in this context, be examined by the Committee. Many delegations have, in the past, urged us to be more ambitious and to hold out for immediate, full-scale negotiations on a comprehensive test ban. Many delegations have, in the past, considered that only in the forum of a working group could substantive discussion on a CTB take place. It is the view of my delegation that rigidity will not help us in present circumstances, either as to the context or to the way we go about our work. We consider that detailed and practical consideration of the elements of a nuclear test ban can and should take place, at an early date, in one of a range of possible formal or informal sub-groups of this Committee. The Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts has long been a model of patient industry, on just one aspect bearing on an eventual nuclear test ban. There is no reason why other aspects cannot now be addressed with similar efficacy.

The subject of chemical weapons is the other agenda item of particular importance to my delegation. Here again there is a strong and valuable United Nations resolution to guide us. Here, I draw attention to resolution 36/96 A. Here again is a chance for the Committee to be imaginative in the method of its work and to avoid needlessly standing square-on and stationary before a roadblock. There is no doubt that the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons has run its course and needs revising. So long as a new mandate permits progress its precise terms should not greatly matter: the "elaboration of a chemical weapons convention" seems to us to be our task and there is no earthly use in wasting time on semantics before getting down to it.

There is absolutely no question that the need to ban chemical weapons is urgent. Because such weapons are militarily effective -- providing as they do a flexible and stunning option, particularly for surprise attack -- they are widely

(Mr. Sadleir, Australia)

deployed in Europe. The asymmetry of deployments is, unfortunately, such that we read reports of plans to add to the stockpiles and systems of chemical weapons there. How much better if the reports were instead of plans for symmetry involving a unilateral reduction of chemical weapon readiness. Since, moreover, chemical weapons are specially effective against the unprotected, there is a constant temptation to use them against less equipped adversaries. This, very likely, lies behind reports from South East Asia and Afghanistan of the use of chemical agents in conflicts there. The reports are a cause for serious distress. The ban for which we call should resolve the ambiguities and close the loopholes which mar related prohibitions, namely, the 1925 Geneva Protocol and the Biological Weapons Convention of 1972. Such a ban should, above all, be fully verifiable. Progress here in the next months towards a ban on chemical weapons is one of the achievements which could, in one stroke, both justify the existence of this Committee and constitute a tonic for the world.

Another area where progress is possible is the effort to assure non-nuclear weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. This item, the third on the Committee's agenda, was the first to be entrusted to an Ad Hoc Working Group. Although movement has been slow, a real opportunity exists now for acceleration. At the thirty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly, the delegation of Pakistan introduced a resolution, adopted as resolution 36/95, with 145 favourable votes and no negative votes, which indicates how this important issue may be managed. My delegation will co-operate with others in efforts to ensure a successful outcome on this matter. It would be appropriate if the nuclear-weapon States, whose positions, as set out at the first special session on disarmament, gave impetus to our efforts in this area, were able to advance it for recognition by the second special session.

Turning to the comprehensive programme on disarmament, I should like simply to state our belief that the time has come to start serious drafting. The Working Group spent three rewarding weeks in January thoroughly studying all major issues at stake in the projected programme. However, time is short, the general debate has nearly run its course and intensive drafting is now required. We therefore welcome the establishment of open-ended drafting groups, under the able guidance of Ambassadors de la Gorce of France and de Souza e Silva of Brazil, on those sections of the programme dealing with objectives and priorities. The establishment of the drafting groups reflects, we believe, recognition that, in this case, a working group is too cumbersome an instrument for speedily advancing the Committee's work. We suggest, accordingly, that perhaps only one formal meeting a week of the Ad Hoc Working Group on a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament would be sufficient and that the other working period allotted to the CPD should be set aside for drafting or informal consultations.

As to radiological weapons, I say only that the Australian delegation sought last year to play a helpful role in bridging the differences that have so far prevented the Committee from bringing this limited disarmament measure to a conclusion. It is a role which, on behalf of my delegation, I pledge ourselves to maintain this year.

Australia, in part because of geographical circumstance, has long been involved in the adventure of exploring outer space. It is a source of concern to us that that new frontier of man should not be abused. It was for this reason that Australia, at the recent General Assembly, co-sponsored resolution 36/97 C. We consider that, in this first half of its 1982 session, the Committee could best advance its work on the issue of outer space by engaging in a broad exchange of views on the question in all its aspects. This would enable the Committee to take, at a later stage, a more informed approach in dealing substantively with the topic.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of Australia for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (translated from Russian): Mr. Chairman, the Mongolian delegation warmly welcomes you as Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament for the month of February and wishes you success in this important task. We should like to express our appreciation to the Indonesian Ambassador Anwar Sani for his valuable contribution to the work of the Committee during the concluding stage of its last session.

We also welcome our new colleagues, representatives of States members of the Committee, and would assure them of our close co-operation.

Two decades having passed since the establishment in Geneva of the sole multilateral body for disarmament negotiations, and almost four years since the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, it is time for us to glance backward and consider what the Committee on Disarmament has achieved during this period, what are its present concerns and what they will be in the future.

In the period when a spirit of realism and co-operation prevailed in this forum, accompanied by political will and decisiveness, long and complicated negotiations were held which in the end led to concrete results. I do not intend to dwell on the over-all results of the Committee's work in the past, for those are known to all. I should merely like to observe that if at the present time it is proving impossible to work out, sufficiently effectively, one or other international agreement on partial disarmament measures, that is because of the obstructionist policy and actions of certain States.

As you know, the Committee on Disarmament, taking into account the relevant provisions of the Final Document of the first special session, and the recommendations made to it by the United Nations General Assembly at its recent sessions, has identified the particular aspects of disarmament on which negotiations should be conducted, and each year it draws up its agenda accordingly.

Numerous draft documents on almost all the items on the agenda are already on the negotiating table. It should be noted that predominant among these are specific proposals and initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. They also include a number of valuable proposals by the group of non-aligned and neutral States members of the Committee.

The socialist countries have consistently and firmly urged the earliest possible initiation of effective negotiations on the key disarmament issue ... that of the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. Their position of principle and concrete approach to the problem are set forth clearly and exactly in document CD/4, which is based on the Soviet proposal for the ending of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and the gradual reduction of stockpiles of such weapons until they have been completely eliminated.

The socialist States have frequently set forth their views on the situation in this respect, in joint statements containing a general appraisal of the results of the work of recent sessions of the Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The main point is that the Committee should embark immediately on preparations for negotiations on this top priority question for which purpose it is essential to set up an ad hoc working group with an appropriate mandate.

The socialist countries believe, in fact, that the adoption of effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war have overriding importance in the present-day difficult conditions of the international situation. The peoples of the world are profoundly alarmed at the increase in the risk of a nuclear catastrophe as a result of the unbridled nuclear arms race and the notorious doctrine of the limited or partial use of nuclear weapons.

This situation has given rise in various parts of the world, including the United States and many western European countries, to increasingly widespread mass anti-war demonstrations in which the people are energetically demanding that the danger of the outbreak of a war in which nuclear weapons are used should be averted in time.

In this connection, I should like to emphasize that the Mongolian People's Republic attaches great importance to the Soviet American talks now going on in Geneva on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe. The People's Republic of Mongolia sets a high value on the new proposal put forward by President L.I. Brezhnev at his recent meeting and conversation with representatives of the Advisory Council of the Socialist International on Disarmament. Those proposals, which are in line with the Soviet Union's consistent attitude on the question of the reduction of nuclear weapons aimed at targets in Europe, are essentially designed to promote the desired results of the negotiations on the basis of the principles of equality and equal security and the adoption of a mutually acceptable decision for the purpose of averting a nuclear catastrophe.

In this connection, too, I should like to stress the importance of the Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe, adopted at the thirty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly on the initiative of the Soviet Union. In this historic document, the United Nations solemnly proclaimed that first resort to the use of nuclear weapons constituted the gravest crime against humanity, vigorously denounced any doctrines allowing the first use of nuclear weapons as incompatible with human moral standards and the lofty ideals of the United Nations, and called upon the leaders of nuclear-weapon States to act in such a way as to eliminate the risk of the outbreak of a nuclear conflict.

This Declaration emphasizes that the nuclear arms race must be stopped and reversed by joint efforts through negotiations conducted in good faith and on the basis of equality, having as their ultimate goal the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

Such is the will of the majority of the States members of the United Nations.

The United States and its allies in NATO and other military groupings showed a negative attitude towards this important Declaration, and they are continuing to block efforts in the Committee on Disarmament to prepare for and initiate negotiations on the question of the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

At its last session, the United Nations General Assembly adopted resolution 36/92 E entitled: "Nuclear weapons in all aspects". This resolution contains a number of provisions which could serve as a basis for defining the range of questions to be dealt with by one of the subsidiary bodies of our Committee. It recommends that the Committee on Disarmament should proceed, as a first step, to the consideration of the stages of nuclear disarmament and their approximate content, and in particular the content of the first stage. It also states that the General Assembly deems it appropriate that the Committee should consider, within the framework of the discussion on the content of the measures to be carried out during the first stage, the question of the cessation of the development and deployment of new types and systems of nuclear weapons.

The Mongolian delegation, together with many other delegations in this Committee, is resolutely in favour of consultations being vigorously continued in this forum, with the participation of all the nuclear-weapon powers, so that we may embark as speedily as possible on negotiations on the substance of the question. The unwillingness of certain nuclear-weapon powers to proceed to serious negotiations on this issue is the main reason for the Committee's postponement of the elaboration of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

The situation is no better as regards the tripartite negotiations. As may be remembered, these negotiations were interrupted through the fault of the Western participants. We call upon them to emulate the readiness of the Soviet Union to resume those tripartite negotiations without delay, so as to facilitate a positive decision on other important measures in the sphere of the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament.

The Mongolian People's Republic has supported and continues to support the urgent appeal to all States which have still not done so, to accede without delay to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water and until such accession to refrain from carrying out tests in the media to which this Treaty applies. The negative attitude of China and its followers towards this appeal by the overwhelming majority of the world's States is a matter of profound concern not only to Mongolia, but also to countries in other parts of the world. This negativism should be roundly condemned.

We are firmly convinced that the Committee on Disarmament, in which all the nuclear-weapon States are represented, is called upon to make a decisive contribution towards the achievement of an international agreement on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. For this purpose it is urgently necessary to set up an *ad hoc* working group, as has repeatedly been proposed by the socialist countries and the Group of 21.

If the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom again prevent the start of negotiations on the substance of the question, the efforts of the vast majority of the members of this Committee will once again have been in vain. But the responsibility for the absence so far of any effective negotiations may be laid at the door of those who do not wish to contribute to the adoption of an important measure towards the halting of the further improvement, development and proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

In this connection, I should like to draw attention to the United States decision concerning the full-scale production and deployment of nuclear neutron weapons, the barbaric nature of which I do not need to describe to you. This reckless decision on the part of the Washington administration has aroused great alarm and anxiety among the peoples not only of Western Europe but also of other parts of the world, because these weapons constitute the greatest danger to mankind, add a new means of mass destruction to military arsenals and further escalate the nuclear arms race.

In view of this development, the United Nations General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session for the first time adopted by a majority vote (the United States and its few W. O. allies opposing) Resolution 36/52 K, in which it requests the Committee on Disarmament to start negotiations without delay with a view to concluding a convention on the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of nuclear neutron weapons.

The Mongolian delegation recommends that the Committee on Disarmament should adopt a decision to set up an ad hoc working group and get down to negotiations. The draft convention on this question submitted to the Committee by a group of socialist countries could serve as a useful basis for this purpose.

The question of the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present is another issue calling for the adoption of an immediate decision. This would help to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and would facilitate the subsequent implementation of important measures for the complete withdrawal of nuclear weapons from the territories of other States.

Unfortunately, it must be noted that the General Assembly's request to the Committee at the end of 1980 to start negotiations on this question without delay is still thrust into the background, for reasons of which we are all aware in this forum.

The Mongolian delegation would like to remind members of this Committee that at its thirty-sixth session the United Nations General Assembly adopted a similar recommendation. We do not think that there can be two opinions in this forum about the need to start negotiations as soon as possible on the substance of this issue and to adopt a decision to set up an appropriate subsidiary body.

A quarter of a century has passed since man first began to explore outer space. His concern to prevent that space from being used for military purposes dates from that very same time. More than one international agreement has been elaborated and adopted prohibiting any objects equipped with nuclear weapons or other types of weapons of mass destruction from being placed in orbit around the Earth or stationed in outer space by any other method.

However, these measures have been insufficient to avert completely the danger of the militarization of outer space. For use has been made to this end of the absence, in the relevant international agreements, of any provision

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

banning the stationing in outer space of types of weapons which do not come under the definition of 'weapons of mass destruction'. As you know, various military preparations and a whole range of programmes for conducting war in outer space are being elaborated in the United States. Such attempts to turn outer space into an arena for the arms race are fraught with far-reaching consequences for peace and international security.

In the interests of the future peaceful use of outer space for the good of all mankind, and averting the danger of an arms race in outer space, the Soviet Union has put forward an important proposal for the conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space.

In our view, the Soviet proposal is based on a comprehensive approach to the solution of the problem. General Assembly resolution 36/99 requests the Committee in unambiguous terms to embark on negotiations with a view to achieving agreement on the text of such a treaty.

It seems to us that the Committee should reach agreement on the setting up of an ad hoc working group on this question and on a clearly defined mandate for its work.

The Mongolian delegation again shares the concern of other delegations at the Committee's failure to reach agreement on a complete and effective ban on the development, production and stockpiling of all types of chemical weapons and their destruction. At the same time the continuing activities in respect of the production and deployment of new types of chemical weapons are a source of deep concern.

In this connection, I should like to stress the importance of the provision in General Assembly resolution 36/95 B which, inter alia, calls upon all States to refrain from any action which could impede negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons and specifically to refrain from the production and deployment of binary and other new types of chemical weapons, as well as from stationing chemical weapons in those States where there are no such weapons at present. We are also in favour of giving the re-established Ad Hoc Working Group a broader and more specific mandate.

In the view of the Mongolian delegation, what is necessary for the achievement of positive progress both in bilateral and in multilateral efforts towards the complete prohibition of chemical weapons is a demonstration of political will and realism, and an honest and conscientious approach to the substance of the problem, and it is these that are insufficient, if not entirely lacking, in certain Western participants in the negotiations.

Other questions which are now the subject of further consideration in this multilateral forum also call for a constructive and realistic approach. It seems to us that the difficult negotiations on the question of the prohibition of radiological weapons, and also on that of the strengthening of the assurances of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, should be continued.

(Mr. Erdenbileg, Mongolia)

The Mongolian delegation considers that, when the Committee comes to consider the agenda item dealing with new types of weapons of mass destruction, it should pay special attention to paragraph 7 of United Nations General Assembly resolution 36/69, calling upon the States permanent members of the Security Council, as well as upon other militarily significant States, to make declarations, identical in substance, concerning the refusal to create new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, as a first step towards the conclusion of a comprehensive agreement on this subject, bearing in mind that such declarations would be approved thereafter by a decision of the Security Council.

As regards the question of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, I should like to point out that the general attitude of the socialist countries is based on the principles by which they are guided in their over-all efforts in the cause of peace and disarmament, and they are in particular in favour of the idea of elaborating and adopting agreed sets of measures aimed at putting an end to the arms race and achieving genuine disarmament by stages within the framework of established time-limits. This clear and precise position was set forth in detail at a recent plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament.

We also strongly support the view that the disarmament process would undoubtedly be furthered by the implementation of practical measures to strengthen international peace and security and by the creation of a climate of trust and mutual understanding among States. The assumption by States of an undertaking strictly to implement confidence-building measures, not to use force or the threat of force, not to commit acts of aggression -- all this could be of great value in furthering the cause of disarmament.

The Mongolian People's Republic had this interrelationship very much in mind when it proposed the conclusion of a convention on non-aggression and the non-use of force in the relations between Asian and Pacific Ocean States.

The head of our State, Mr. Y. Usdenbal, in his message of 21 September 1981 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in which he offered some specific suggestions regarding the basic provisions of such a convention, in particular emphasized that "an important place must be given to provisions providing for energetic action by the participating States on such crucial aspects of the strengthening of peace and security as measures to reduce the risk of military confrontation and to curb the arms race and achieve disarmament".

We believe that this essential interrelationship should be given concrete expression in the appropriate section of the draft comprehensive programme of disarmament now being elaborated in this forum.

The Mongolian delegation intends to continue to co-operate closely with the relevant Ad Hoc Working Group, which is working intensively under the able and experienced guidance of the distinguished representative of Mexico, Ambassador Alfonso García Robles.

(Mr. Erdenbileg, Mongolia)

The present session of the Committee on Disarmament is taking place in continuing conditions of world tension. The opponents of peace, détente and disarmament, who are actively pursuing a new round in the arms race, particularly in the nuclear field, are endeavouring to achieve military superiority and to destroy the existing military parity.

It is impossible not to notice, also, the growing aggressiveness of the forces of imperialism and reaction in certain parts of the world. The United States and its main allies are not only impeding the equitable settlement of explosive situations, but are openly intensifying their expansionist policy and actions.

The Mongolian People's Republic, as a peace-loving Asian State, is seriously concerned at the marked exacerbation of the situation in the Middle East as a result of the annexation by Israel of the Syrian Golan Heights, which it has been occupying since 1967 unlawfully and in defiance of the decisions of the United Nations, including a Security Council resolution. These acts of banditry on the part of Israel were perpetrated only thanks to the military and diplomatic support of the Washington administration. It is a well-known fact that the United States veto in the Security Council prevented the adoption of the measures authorized by the Charter against this wanton aggressor and is enabling him to spread his wings even further. It is against this background of wicked mockery of the intelligence of the members of the Committee that we see the United States representative weeping crocodile tears here over the violation of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter.

In an attempt to divert attention from the actions of its protégé in the Middle East, the United States is now stirring up the so-called Polish question, although the internal events in that country do not and never can constitute any kind of international problem. However, Washington has found these events entirely suitable as a means of diverting attention from Israel's aggressive actions and from a constructive dialogue and the solution of the most urgent international problems.

The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic, together with other socialist States, firmly believes that questions relating to the sovereign rights of socialist Poland should cease to be used as a pretext for increasing international tension and diverting the attention of peoples from the solution of the vital problems of strengthening peace and security, ending the arms race and achieving disarmament.

Equally disturbing is the continued aggression of South African racists against the freedom-loving African peoples. As in the Middle East, the source of tension in South Africa would already long since have been eliminated and all Africa would have been free, had it not been for the direct assistance of the United States and other imperialistic States -- assistance which has already been repeatedly condemned by the United Nations General Assembly.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

With the coming to power in Washington of the new administration, which has no scruples about publicly proclaiming its racist sympathies, the Pretoria régime has finally cast off all restraint, as is shown, inter alia, by its suspension of plans for a settlement of the Namibia question and its ceaseless acts of aggression against Angola and other neighbouring States.

All these facts undoubtedly have an extremely adverse effect on the international climate. And I repeat the word facts, for these are not just idle conjectures and examples of a double standard like those that could be found in such abundance in the recent statement of the United States representative.

Apropos, I should also like to say a few words about that statement by Mr. Rostow. I have been participating in the work of the Committee on Disarmament for many years and am familiar with its previous activities from what my colleagues have told me. I and many others have come to the conclusion that never before in all the twenty years of the Committee's history was there a statement so gross in form and so slanderous in content as the one made by the United States representative at the last plenary meeting and directed against a whole group of States members of this Committee. That speech consisted almost entirely of a succession of varied anti-socialist and anti-Soviet insinuations.

The Mongolian delegation, together with the majority of delegations of member States, would like to see an increase in the effectiveness and an improvement in the organization of the work of the Committee on Disarmament. It is also necessary to take into account the special character of the present stage in the Committee's work in view of the forthcoming second special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament.

While it is in favour of continued negotiations in the Committee on the key problems of disarmament the Mongolian delegation together with other delegations of socialist countries considers that the emphasis in such activities should be placed on the work of subsidiary bodies. That is to say, negotiations on the substance of these questions should take place in ad hoc working groups, with a view to their elaborating the texts of appropriate agreements. To this end it will be necessary, in our view, to provide for the possibility of longer working periods for the Committee's subsidiary bodies, regardless of the scheduling of the work of other international conferences.

In conclusion, the Mongolian delegation would like to express its readiness to co-operate closely with members of the Committee during this particularly crucial session.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of Mongolia for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

Mr. JAYAKODDY (Sri Lanka): Mr. Chairman, first of all, allow me to offer the good wishes and congratulations of my delegation to you, the representative of a fellow non-aligned country, on assuming the chairmanship of this Committee. May I pledge the support and assistance of my delegation to you in your arduous task this month.

I would also like, on behalf of my delegation, to express appreciation of the service that was given to the Committee by our former Chairman, Ambassador Sani. He very skilfully and tactfully assisted the Committee in accomplishing a great deal.

Permit me to add a word of welcome to all the distinguished representatives who have taken their seats in this Committee for the first time. Our good wishes go out to them for success in their work here.

At the commencement of every session of this Committee, we are privileged to listen to authoritative assessments of the current international political situation. Since last week, that privilege has been renewed for us and there has been unanimity in the views expressed in this Committee on the worsening state of world politics. The distinguished representatives who have spoken earlier have drawn attention to the fact that tension in the world has visibly increased and there has been a steady drift away from an era of détente and relaxed relations. New shadows are appearing and the prospects for peace and security seem to be receding. My delegation is in accord with these assessments.

At the same time, we have been given various interpretations of why the current international situation has evolved in the way it has during the last year. A variety of diagnoses has been offered to us. My delegation finds it difficult to agree fully with all these interpretations. In our view, the causes that have brought about the current situation go back to over thirty years. It is our belief that international security and peace is not the product of piecemeal accommodation and limited co-operation in a few areas, but of a sustained process of détente -- a process that is not limited to the leading Powers in blocs or to blocs, but is universal in scope and functional in character. Such a process can spring to life and progress only in conditions where arms control and the will to implement genuine disarmament are at the very centre of the policies pursued.

As long as there is unremitting and unlimited reliance on baroque theories of the balance of power with its calculus of terror, there can be no lasting peace process. The limitless reliance on arms and the striving for parities and superiorities in defensive and offensive weaponry are in our view the very causes that generate and increase international tensions. This point of view has been expressed in this Committee many a time. It seems to have convinced no one. We, however, still hope that over the years new approaches to national security can be developed and accepted.

The debates in this Committee since it commenced work last week have given rise to two questions in the mind of my delegation. It will come as no surprise to me if others share the doubts that are in my own mind. The first question that has arisen, at least for me, is whether this session of the Committee will turn out to be the

(Mr. Jayakoddy, Sri Lanka)

forum for a continuing exchange of charges and counter-charges as to who caused the arms race, who is in it and who is ahead or behind. I am sure that no conclusions on this issue could be arrived at by this Committee. The fact of the matter is that there is a continuing increase in military expenditure, in the accumulation of arms, nuclear and conventional. In the light of this, what is the Committee ready to accomplish? We can debate till the end of April or beyond on the level of armaments and how rapidly they proliferate and who proliferates how much, but, at the end of the session, the volume of arms would certainly have increased and we would not have arrived at a consensus answer to the question.

The second question that troubles me is: will this Committee finally be transformed into a mere barometer that reads every nuance of temperature change in East-West relations. Will it cease to be the single multilateral forum for disarmament negotiations and become yet another forum where we shall deliberate on the current international situation, what brought it about and how it can be improved?

The word "linkages" has been used in this Committee. Whether those so-called linkages will become the most influential determinant of what takes place in the Committee in the coming weeks is a question that must surely be in the minds at least of some of us. My delegation hopes that the Committee's work will not be shackled by the so-called linkages, which, if pursued to their logical end, will surely link us all to failure in the Committee.

My delegation hopes that in the very testing times that we are passing through the Committee's efforts will be directed towards replacing polemics with persuasion that can pave the way for genuine and purposive negotiation. If we fail to achieve this spirit at this session of the Committee, we will be approaching the second special session devoted to disarmament on an unsure footing.

I speak on disarmament today from the viewpoint of a small, non-aligned developing country that is totally insignificant as far as military expenditures are concerned. Sri Lanka has held, and holds, that its national security is attained and safeguarded not by high military preparedness to deter any future adversary. We believe that the economic security of the country and all its citizens in conditions of freedom and equality is the most reliable safeguard and defence of the sovereignty of the State and the people. This security can be achieved and sustained only through a deliberate policy of development which will ensure for our millions an opportunity to work gainfully and honourably and to profit from their labours.

But our economic development is not something that we can implement successfully in a vacuum of our own. We live and work in an interdependent world. As a small island State, we are perhaps more dependent on the outside world. The international environment, political and economic, is therefore of paramount importance to us and it is a critical factor that influences and conditions the success or failure of our own efforts. As long as there are tensions, crises and conflict situations, the environment in which we make our efforts is adversely affected.

Genuine arms control and disarmament can and do affect the international climate swiftly and positively and therefore have an important link with and a bearing on our own development efforts. To us, the link between disarmament and development is

(Mr. Jayakoddy, Sri Lanka)

obvious, strong and inescapable. It is not my intention to embark on a discussion of the complex question of disarmament and development, though the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly has, in paragraph 7 of resolution 36/92 G, recommended that this Committee should take into account in future disarmament negotiations the report on disarmament and development which is contained in document A/36/356 and Corr.1 and was prepared by a Group of Experts chaired by the distinguished representative of Sweden, Mrs. Thorsson.

All I wish to do is to touch on one aspect, namely, the contribution that disarmament can make in improving the international climate in which all countries seek economic development. It is our view that it is very difficult for us to pursue our perception of national security, which is national economic development, in the context of international insecurity. The arms race, the gradual militarization of all parts of the world and the resulting insecurity affects us adversely, creating concerns and fears which detract from our domestic effort.

Let me illustrate this. Fifteen years ago, the Indian Ocean was a pacific ocean which served every maritime user of it and the littoral States of the Indian Ocean had little or no cause for concern. Since then, that ideal situation has been greatly eroded. In 1971, Sri Lanka, along with several other States, sought the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. But what has taken place? The Indian Ocean is now crowded with all manner of naval vessels bristling with conventional and nuclear weapons. Tension in the region has increased. Regional stability is undermined. We in Sri Lanka have been involuntarily catapulted into the range of a possible nuclear exchange. The sum total of all this is the emergence of new concerns and anxieties for us. These are not imaginary, but they are real ones. Such situations can be found elsewhere around the world. There are many developing countries which find that international insecurity is impairing their development efforts. In our view, it is only under conditions of great security and peace that we can fully assert our freedom and independence and achieve progress. That is our objective and a tension-free disarming environment is a prerequisite for our success in achieving it.

My delegation therefore wishes to urge the distinguished representatives of this Committee to give greater weight in their deliberations and negotiations to disarmament as a factor that is imperative for the peaceful and sustained implementation of economic development in countries such as mine.

We in this Committee may differ on various aspects of the question of disarmament and development, but, in our view, there can be no dispute between us on the link between disarmament and its impact on creating a tension-free international political environment in which development can take place.

In urging this point of view, we neither underestimate nor ignore developments in other regions of the world. What happens in East-West relations, in the security situation of one region or more of the world is of critical importance to the issue of disarmament. But, in our view, the importance attached to these factors should not be at the cost of other factors, which should also not become the sole determining influence on the scope, direction and pace of disarmament negotiations in this Committee and elsewhere.

(Mr. Jayakoddy, Sri Lanka)

I wish to express the appreciation of my Government to the Governments of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for their decision to commence and continue talks on the reduction of intermediate-range theatre nuclear weapons in Europe. In our view, this is a favourable development which we hope will end in success. We also hope that these talks will lead to a start on strategic arms reductions negotiations and that both countries will not be diverted from the course they have chosen to follow this year. Success in the current and future talks could, in our view, lead the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics away from their current strategies for annihilation towards new strategies of peace. This is what the whole world expects of them.

In exactly four months from today, the lights in this chamber will have been dimmed, the seats will be empty and the scene will have moved to New York. It is superfluous to speak on the importance and significance of the forthcoming second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We all attach great importance to it and hope for its success. It is the first special session to be held in the Second Disarmament Decade and it will be watched by millions who hope that it will turn out to be a very significant milestone on the tortuous path towards general and complete disarmament. It is not an exaggeration to say that never before in human history has there been so much pressure for the success of a meeting on disarmament. Never before have so many hopes and expectations been focused on an international forum for securing a real, genuine breakthrough on the road to disarmament.

In this context, the current session of this Committee is invested with a tremendous responsibility. Everyone in this Committee is aware of that responsibility and the thrust and rhythm of the Committee's work will no doubt reflect this awareness.

Coming to the agenda before us, my delegation is in general accord with Working Paper No. 47 that has been circulated by the Secretariat. I would like to make a few observations on some of the agenda items at this stage.

In our view, items 1 and 2 are still the highest priority items, despite our failure to set up working groups on them at the last session. There can be no lessening of the desire of the overwhelming majority of members of this Committee for such a course of action. It is our view that discussion and debate on the two items have clearly demonstrated that they are mature and ripe enough for consideration in separate working groups. This point of view was reinforced at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly and we hope the opposition to the proposal will not continue to repeat itself.

There was a proposal to join items 1 and 2 together, but the Chairman was kind enough to inform the Committee yesterday that there was no consensus for this proposal and items 1 and 2 will therefore remain as they are. My delegation feels that is the wisest decision that could have been taken.

(Mr. Jayakoddy, Sri Lanka)

The centre-piece of the second special session will be the comprehensive programme of disarmament. What is this Committee's contribution going to be in this regard? The Committee has been served with working papers by the Group of 21, a group of Western countries and, last week, by Czechoslovakia on behalf of a group of socialist countries. The Ad Hoc Working Group, under the indefatigable chairmanship of Ambassador García Robles, who has with tact, skill and many years of expertise helped to guide the Working Group, has discussed at great length the varying perceptions, concepts, measures, time-table and some of the practical problems of implementing a CPD. We fully support the working paper contained in document CD/223, which, although it does not cover all aspects, is a comprehensive presentation not of a utopian programme, but of a strategy that is oriented towards a continuing, progressive and balanced process of general and complete disarmament. My delegation agrees that the adoption of a CPD by itself will not open the flood-gates of sudden and universal disarmament. But it is a necessary instrument if we are to move decisively and progressively towards general and complete disarmament. It will help to avoid "stop-and-go" situations, which have characterized previous disarmament efforts. We see in it a solemn commitment to the systematic pursuit of disarmament negotiations.

True enough, such an instrument cannot be negotiated without difficulty. The deliberations in the Working Group have proved this to be so. The distinguished Ambassador of India has explained and clarified a number of issues that were raised in this Committee. I am sure his explanations will now contribute towards more progress in the Working Group.

The Group of 21 will present further working papers on areas not covered in document CD/223 and these, I am sure, will help the Working Group arrive at early decisions. The CPD is a novel exercise and therefore must break new ground. It necessarily calls for flexibility in our thinking and creative innovation in our approach. My delegation is confident that these attributes will not be lacking in the Working Group.

Item 7 of the draft agenda suggests that we discuss further measures to prevent an arms race in outer space. My delegation fully supports all measures designed to safeguard outer space as the common heritage of mankind that should not become the scene for an arms race the like of which we are unable to control here on earth. My delegation can therefore live with this item being on the agenda. But, we would like to underline the need for this Committee to give the highest priority to the items that have already been before us for so long. Whilst recognizing the emergence of new dangers, we must not overlook our failure to tackle serious dangers, **that** have been with us for so long. My delegation therefore hopes that we can arrive at a mutually agreeable decision on item 7 without protracted debate.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, may I touch on agenda item 3(a) -- the special report of this Committee to the second special session. My delegation is of the view that the Committee should allocate reasonable and adequate time for a discussion of this item. This is a special kind of report. It is the first of its kind. It will have to serve the second special session in its deliberations on disarmament and the question of machinery for disarmament. It can therefore not be just a narrative or cataloguing of the success or failure of the Committee's work. It has to be evaluative at least to some extent.

(Mr. Jayakoddy, Sri Lanka)

The report should, in our view, give a clear profile of how the Committee functioned in relation to the mandates that were given to it. The format and contents of the report should reflect adequately and accurately the functioning of the Committee. We are all interested in improving the machinery of multilateral disarmament negotiations. Our report can be supportive of the quest for the optimum machinery towards that end.

In conclusion, even at the cost of generalizing, may I say the following. When His Holiness Pope John Paul II was in Hiroshima, he said that: "In the past, it was possible to destroy a village, a town, a region, even a country. Now it is the whole planet that has come under threat. This fact should finally compel everyone to face a basic moral consideration: from now on, it is only through a conscious choice and through a deliberate policy that humanity can survive". We are in this Committee because our Governments have made that choice and adopted the deliberate policy of support for disarmament. Our task is to implement what our Governments have opted for. Whether this millennium ends in war or in peace will depend to some extent on whether we contribute to the disarmament process. My delegation is here to assist this Committee in its tasks because we in Sri Lanka want peace for all, East, West, North and South. This, we believe, is the commitment of all of us in the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of Sri Lanka for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

Mr. KOMIVES (Hungary): Mr. Chairman, as I am taking the floor for the first time at a plenary meeting, I wish to congratulate you as Chairman of the Committee for the first month of the 1982 session and offer you the full support and co-operation of the Hungarian delegation. Our words of appreciation are addressed to Ambassador Anwar Sani of Indonesia who held the chair with success from the beginning of August 1981 to the opening of the present session. When I extend my sincere welcome to our new colleagues, I wish to assure them that my delegation stands ready to maintain the good relations it had with their predecessors.

A significant part of the statements made so far have been devoted to an assessment and evaluation of the international situation. The general tone of the evaluations, I must note with regret, is dark and heavily loaded with worry and disappointment. The alarming trend which had been characteristic of the last years is still prevalent today. The international climate continues to worsen and the danger of war is growing. The attempts of extreme imperialist circles, aimed at upsetting the balance of forces and attaining military superiority, have caused another escalation of the arms race, thus increasing tensions in the world, particularly in Europe. The rude and hostile propaganda campaigns of those circles, their continued interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States, the mounting anti-Sovietism and anticommunism poison the atmosphere, destroy confidence and thus hamper the solution of the most important political problems and conflicts. This trend of events, as a direct consequence, renders more difficult than ever the conduct of negotiations on arms limitation and disarmament.

(Mr. Kömives, Hungary)

In the last few days, this Committee was subjected to a barrage of lectures whose sole purpose was to divert attention from the real intentions of certain circles and to distort facts that have long been part of history books. For the sake of those who may have forgotten the hard facts of the history of the arms race and who want to create a scare concerning Soviet military threats, may I be allowed to recall briefly which side was the first in the post-war period to introduce various new weapons and systems of such weapons, which side launched new waves of the arms race and which side was forced to respond:

the atomic bomb was introduced in 1946 by the United States and only four years later by the Soviet Union;

the hydrogen bomb was introduced in 1953 by the United States and one year later by the Soviet Union;

the strategic bomber: introduced in 1953 by the United States, four years later by the Soviet Union;

the intermediate-range ballistic missile (IRBM): in 1953 by the United States, four years later by the Soviet Union;

the tactical nuclear weapon: in 1955 by the United States, one year later by the Soviet Union;

the intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM): in 1955 by the United States, two years later by the Soviet Union;

the nuclear submarine: in 1956 by the United States, six years later by the Soviet Union;

the submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM): in 1959 by the United States, nine years later by the Soviet Union;

the anti-ballistic missile (ABM): in 1960 by the United States, one year later by the Soviet Union;

the MRV warhead: in 1964 by the United States, six years later by the Soviet Union;

the MIRV warhead: in 1970 by the United States, five years later by the Soviet Union;

the cruise missile: in 1976 by the United States;

the neutron weapon: in 1981 by the United States.

The list of uncontestable facts speaks for itself.

The history of multilateral disarmament negotiations, on the other hand, proves that relations between the Soviet Union and the United States and the conduct of serious talks between them on arms limitation and disarmament questions have a direct influence on multilateral negotiations. We must note therefore with the deepest regret that the United States has halted or frozen all such previous talks and persists in blocking their renewal. Since such talks directly affect the security of all States, the Hungarian Government urges the earliest possible renewal of Soviet-American negotiations, especially those on the limitation of strategic arms.

(Mr. Kömivás, Hungary)

We recently noted with satisfaction the reopening here in Geneva of the Soviet-American negotiations on the problem of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe and sincerely hope that they will lead to the expected results in the near future.

As I represent here the Government of a European State, may I be allowed to make a brief remark in connection with the reopening of the Madrid meeting. Despite the attempts of the NATO countries to poison the atmosphere right from the start, we still have some hopes that the participating States will be able to overcome the difficulties they face. The Hungarian Government attaches outstanding significance to the decision expected from the Madrid meeting, which would call for the earliest possible convocation of a conference on military détente and disarmament in Europe.

The sense of urgency relayed by the massive demonstrations and public actions in favour of peace and disarmament also was manifest at the last session of the United Nations General Assembly. The overwhelming majority of the Member States clearly expressed their determination to preserve the results achieved so far and to proceed with new initiatives for meaningful negotiations.

The representatives of the Hungarian People's Republic at the thirty-sixth session explained in detail the position of my Government on all the major items and contributed actively to the adoption of several important resolutions. I can therefore limit myself today to a few questions which we consider, at this juncture, to be of outstanding importance. At later stages of our debates, we shall return to them and to other items on our agenda with more details and, whenever possible, with practical suggestions.

The question of the highest priority for the Committee continues to be that of halting the nuclear arms race, eliminating the threat of nuclear war and providing for a decisive turn to measures of nuclear disarmament. The resolutions adopted by the General Assembly bear witness to that urgency.

Among the resolutions adopted at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, one of the most significant is the Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe. On the initiative of the Soviet Union, the General Assembly proclaimed the first use of nuclear weapons the "gravest crime against humanity", for which there cannot be and "will never be any justification or pardon". In the view of the Hungarian Government, the nuclear-weapon States must fulfil the "supreme duty and direct obligation" expressed in the resolution to conduct negotiations "in good faith and on the basis of equality" leading ultimately to the "complete elimination of nuclear weapons".

Numerous proposals have been made to that effect, such as the one presented in 1979 by the group of socialist delegations in this Committee. According to the programme contained in document CD/4, business-like negotiations should be started without delay on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually

(Mr. Kórmives, Hungary)

reducing their stockpiles until their complete destruction. Subsequently, it was also proposed that an ad hoc working group should be established to provide the appropriate framework for the negotiations. In my delegation's view, these proposals are still valid, topical and timely, as confirmed by General Assembly resolution 36/92 E.

One of the most urgent aspects of nuclear disarmament is the general and complete prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests. My delegation, like the vast majority around this table, has long been advocating the establishment of an ad hoc working group entrusted with the elaboration of a treaty on the subject. That has become even more pressing since the trilateral negotiations are not likely to be resumed in the foreseeable future, due to the obstinate position of the United States and the United Kingdom.

In the field of nuclear disarmament, the question of the prohibition of nuclear neutron weapons calls for urgent attention. Delegations of the socialist group therefore made a proposal last year to set up a subsidiary body with the task of working out an international instrument for that purpose. The General Assembly in resolution 36/92 K called on this Committee "to start without delay negotiations in an appropriate organizational framework". An ad hoc working group would, in our view, constitute that framework and a solid basis for its activity is provided in the draft convention submitted by the socialist delegations in 1978.

Still in the domain of nuclear disarmament, the Hungarian delegation suggests that the Committee should pay appropriate attention to such aspects as the non-stationing of nuclear weapons in the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present and to the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

In this connection, let me refer to the proceedings of the Committee of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, where special emphasis was placed "on the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the European continent, including Northern Europe and the Balkans". In the context of the negotiations on the problem of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, participants in that meeting favoured "ultimately making Europe totally free of nuclear weapons."

The problem of negotiations on the prohibition of other weapons of mass destruction is of equally great importance because the ongoing new round of the arms race would have very dangerous consequences. Reports on plans to start the production of a new generation of chemical weapons, known as binary chemical warfare agents, and to deploy them in Europe have caused great alarm on our continent and elsewhere. Such steps may destroy the results achieved so far.

(Mr. Kömíves, Hungary)

My delegation considers that the work on a treaty to prohibit the production and stockpiling of chemical weapons should be greatly intensified this year. We have a solid basis for a substantial advance, provided by the Ad Hoc Working Group entrusted with that task last year. The Working Group should therefore be re-established at the earliest possible date with an appropriately revised mandate, which should envisage raising our activities to a qualitatively new level to start the elaboration of at least some of the provisions of the future treaty.

Resolution 36/96 B adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in the context of the prohibition of the production and stockpiling of chemical weapons contains at least two new elements which should be kept in mind by the Working Group. The resolution "calls upon all States to refrain from any action which could impede negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons and specifically to refrain from production and deployment of binary and other new types of chemical weapons, as well as from stationing chemical weapons in those States where there are no such weapons at present".

The Committee on Disarmament has to pay proper attention to the question of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. The General Assembly, in resolution 36/89, requested the Committee "to intensify negotiations, with the assistance of qualified governmental experts, with a view to preparing a draft comprehensive agreement ... and to draft possible agreements on particular types of such weapons". Taking into account the positive results of our proceedings conducted in the framework of informal meetings with experts, my delegation proposes that the Committee should consider the holding of similar meetings also this year. In the course of such meetings, thought might be given to the possible mandate of a group of governmental experts to be set up, we hope, in the near future.

The holding of such meetings would be beneficial also from the point of view of the implementation of paragraph 3 of resolution 36/89 calling upon "the States permanent members of the Security Council, as well as upon other militarily significant States, to make declarations, identical in substance, concerning the refusal to create new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, as a first step towards the conclusion of a comprehensive agreement on this subject; bearing in mind that such declarations would be approved thereafter by a decision of the Security Council". The Committee could consider concrete formulations for such a declaration, taking into account all existing proposals and future initiatives. The Hungarian delegation is prepared to present at a later stage further details in that respect.

(Mr. Kovács, Hungary)

Beyond the substantive importance of the problem, I, as a former Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Radiological Weapons, feel strong personal attachment to the subject. However, I do not wish to go into details, but to reiterate my conviction that the Committee is in a position to reach agreement on the subject in a few months, given greater flexibility by certain delegations. In our view, the problem of the protection of civilian nuclear facilities, which is undoubtedly an important and timely one, should be handled and solved separately. That is the way to achieve results in both respects. That is the way to fulfil the duty described in General Assembly resolution 36/97 C.

The provisional agenda of the Committee has been enlarged this year to include a new item in accordance with the recommendation contained in General Assembly resolution 36/99. The Hungarian delegation fully supports the inclusion of the item and suggests that the Committee should decide without delay to set up a subsidiary organ to be charged with the consideration and elaboration of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space.

Before turning to the last subject of my intervention, I wish to make a few short comments on some organizational matters. Contrary to what we succeeded in achieving at a very early stage of our spring session last year, we have been so far unable to reach consensus, or even to identify the bases of such a consensus, on our agenda and programme of work. Unfortunately, no signs of speedy results are visible on the horizon in respect of the establishment of working groups.

This is really a serious phenomenon because we must, this year more than before, considerably intensify our efforts at negotiations. We must speed up the informal discussions on organizational and procedural matters and make full use of the precious time we have at our disposal so that the report we are to submit to the second special session will not be an admission of total impotency.

As we have stated on various occasions, the Hungarian Government attaches great importance to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In our view, that session will have to be a source of new momentum for disarmament efforts by all States. It should encourage the preparation of realistic proposals, promote negotiations on such proposals and create the constructive atmosphere which is so necessary to the solution of numerous problems.

We are looking forward to an action-oriented session and want to contribute to its success. We want to assure that the results achieved at the first special session are preserved and further developed. We want to promote the

(Mr. Kömíves, Hungary)

maintenance of the principles enshrined in the Final Document and, on that basis and in accordance with the programme of action contained therein, we want to be instrumental in the preparation and adoption of a comprehensive programme on disarmament — a programme which is realistic, properly balanced and also capable of mobilizing massive public support. Our position on the details of such a programme was presented at the opening meeting by the representative of Czechoslovakia; therefore, I need not repeat them now.

Before concluding my statement, I wish to make a few remarks on a very dangerous trend which started at the very beginning of this session. On the pretext of evaluating the international situation, the representatives of certain Governments allowed themselves the liberty of using this Committee as a platform for political invectives. The Hungarian delegation rejects most categorically every attempt at interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State, as well as allegations concerning "outside pressure and campaign".

I am convinced that I express the feelings also of the other socialist delegations when I consider it even more regrettable that some representatives did not content themselves with a simple exercise of throwing slander and accusations at other States. They went further and tried to pass judgement on the nature of a social system which others, including the members of a number of delegations around this table, consider as their own.

The statement delivered by Mr. Rostow of the United States was a most outrageous one, unprecedented in the history of this Committee. Instead of giving us a detailed description of the disarmament policy of the new United States administration, which the Committee has long been waiting for, he devoted about two-thirds of his time to attacks on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, including my own. My delegation rejects that attempt, which can only poison the atmosphere in the Committee and only serves to hinder our work in a situation where the vast majority around this negotiating table is ready to do its best to achieve tangible results.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of Hungary for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

We have exhausted the time available to us this morning. We will therefore continue with the list of speakers tomorrow morning.

The representative of the United States wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I therefore give him the floor.

The representative of the USSR has asked for the floor on a point of order.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): We have not yet heard all the representatives whose names are down to speak at this meeting and I therefore see no ground for giving the floor for a reply. On Tuesday of last week you refused that right to a delegation which had asked to speak in the morning. The decision which the Committee took yesterday signified the following: if all those whose names are on the list of speakers do not manage to speak today — the list includes the delegations of the United Kingdom, Australia, Mongolia, Sri Lanka, Hungary, Pakistan, Canada, Peru, Cuba and Kenya — then we will continue to hear the speakers according to this list tomorrow morning because, this afternoon, it is intended to hold a meeting of the Working Group on a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament. As far as I recall, Pakistan is sixth on the list. The representative of Pakistan was unable to speak this morning. Consequently, when we have heard all the speakers on the list, beginning with the representative of Pakistan, then we can go on to statements in exercise of the right of reply.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to ask the representative of the United States whether he is prepared to wait until the end of the list of speakers — in other words, until tomorrow morning?

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I do not wish in any way to disrupt the procedures of this body, as we mean to deliberate. My purpose, of course, would be to respond to a rather vicious attack, unparalleled, I think, in my short memory in this body, but my longer memory in international bodies dates back some 20 years. I would prefer to reply to the charges made by another delegation in such a vicious manner while they are still fresh in people's minds and they understand what I am replying to. However, I would be happy to abide by the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Since the hour is late, we may adjourn the meeting now. The representative of Japan has the floor.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): Not in exercise of the right of reply, but to rectify a small error that slipped — most inadvertently, I am sure — into the statement just made by my dear friend and most distinguished colleague, Ambassador Kőmives.

The first atomic bomb used against human beings was dropped on 6 August 1945.

The CHAIRMAN: The next plenary meeting of the Committee will be held tomorrow, Friday, 12 February, at 10.30 a.m. Immediately afterwards, we will hold an informal meeting on the organizational matters under consideration by the Committee.

The meeting stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.