CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.340
18 February 1986

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND FORTIETH PLENARY MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 18 February 1986, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. R. Butler (Australia)

GE.86-60410/0953E

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria:	Mr. A. BELAID
Argentina:	Mr. M. CAMPORA Mr. R. GARCIA MORITAN
Australia:	Mr. R. BUTLER Mr. R.A. ROWE Ms. M. LETTS Mr. J. OKELY
Belgium:	Mr. C. CLERCKX
Brazil:	Mr. QUIEROZ DUARTE
Bulgaria:	Mr. K. TELLALOV Mr. V. BOJILOV Mr. P. POPTCHEV Mr. R. DEYANOV
Burma:	U TIN TUN U MYA THAN U HLA MYINT AYE AYE MU
Canada:	Mr. J.A. BEESLEY Mr. R.J. ROCHON
China:	Mr. QIAN Jiadong Ms. WANG Zhiyun Mr. HU Xiaodi Mr. SUO Kaiming Mr. SHA Zukang Mr. YANG Mingliang Mr. LI Daozhong
Cuba:	Mr. C. LECHUGA HEVIA Mr. P. NUNEZ MOSQUERA
Czechoslovakia:	Mr. M. VEJVODA Mr. A. CIMA
Egypt:	Mr. S. ALFARARGY Mr. M. BADR Mr. F. MONIB

Ethiopia:	Mr. F. YOHANNES
France:	Mr. J. JESSEL Mr. H. RENIE
German Democratic Republic:	Mr. H. ROSE Mr. W. KRUTZSCH Mr. F. SAYATZ
Germany, Federal Republic of:	Mr. H. WEGENER Mr. F. ELBE Mr. H. PETERS Mr. W.-N. GERMANN
Hungary:	Mr. D. MEISZTER Mr. T. TOTH Mr. F. GAJDA
India:	Mr. A.S. GONSALVES Mr. S. KANT SHARMA
Indonesia:	Mr. S. SUTOWARDOYO Mr. N. WISNOEMOERTI Mr. A.M. FACHIR Mr. A. MASBAR AKBAR Mr. F. QASIM Mr. R.I. JENIE
Islamic Republic of Iran:	Mr. N. KAZEMI KAMYAB Mr. A. SHAFII
Italy:	Mr. R. FRANCESCHI Mr. F. PIAGGESI Mr. M. PAVESE Mr. E. SIVIERO Mr. G. ADORNI BRACCESI
Japan:	Mr. R. IMAI Mr. M. KONISHI Mr. K. KUDO Mr. T. ISHIGURI
Kenya:	Mr. D. AFANDE Mr. F. JOSIAH
Mexico:	Ms. Z. GONZALEZ Y REYNERO Mr. P. MACEDO RIBA

Mongolia:	Mr. L. BAYART Mr. G. GONGOR
Morocco:	Mr. O. HILALE Mr. S. BENRYANE
Netherlands:	Mr. R.J. van SCHAIK Mr. J. RAMAKER Mr. R. MILDERS
Nigeria:	Mr. B.O. TONWE Mr. B.A. ADEYEMI Mr. A.A. ELLA
Pakistan:	Mr. K. NIAZ
Peru:	
Poland:	Mr. S. TURBANSKI Mr. J. CIALOWICZ Mr. J. RYCHLAK
Romania:	Mr. I. VOICU Mr. G. CHIRILA Mr. V. FAUR
Sri Lanka:	Mr. J. DHANAPALA Mr. P. KARIYAWASAM
Sweden:	Mr. L.-E. WINGREN Ms. E. BONNIER Mr. H. BERGLUND Ms. A.M. LAU
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN Mr. B.P. PROKOFIEV Mr. G.V. BERDENNIKOV Mr. E.K. POTYARKIN Mr. G.N. VASHADZE Mr. L.A. NAUMOV
United Kingdom:	Mr. R.I.T. CROMARTIE Mr. R.J.S. EDIS Mr. D.A. SLINN

United States of America:	Mr. D. LOWITZ Mr. T. BARTHELEMY Ms. L. BRONSON Mr. R. GOUGH Mr. R. LEVINE Mr. B. TUA Mr. J. GRANGER Mr. R. NELSON Mr. R. LUACES
Venezuela:	Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT Ms. J. CLAUWAERT GONZALEZ
Yugoslavia:	Mr. K. VIDAS Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC
Zaïre:	Mr. O.N. MONSHEMVULA
Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General:	Mr. M. KOMATINA
Deputy Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament:	Mr. V. BERASATEGUI

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 340th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

In conformity with its programme of work, the Conference starts today its consideration of items 1, "Nuclear Test Ban" and 2, "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament". However, in accordance with rule 30 of the rules of procedure, any member wishing to do so may raise any subject relevant to the work of the Conference.

In accordance with the timetable of meetings for the present week, after we have exhausted the list of speakers, I intend to convene an informal meeting of the Conference to deal with a request from a non-member State to participate in our work, as well as to consider some organizational questions.

The list of speakers for today includes the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany, Sri Lanka, Argentina, Nigeria and Kenya.

I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, Ambassador Henning Wegener.

MR. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): Mr. President, as is our pattern, many delegations have again devoted the opening period of the annual session of the Conference to a general assessment of the overall political situation in which we have resumed our work. This stocktaking has proved very useful. My delegation notes with satisfaction that it has generated a certain amount of common views. All delegations agree that the new year has started under favourable new circumstances for the arms control process and that progress towards a more stable and co-operative relationship between the two important military systems, but also, generally, progress towards a more peaceful world less dependent on the massive accumulation of armament appears now possible. Delegations have also agreed that these opportunities must be actively seized, and that a particular and considerable task awaits the Conference on Disarmament. We are called upon to do substantive work in appropriate organizational formats on as many of our agreed agenda items as is feasible.

As last year, many delegations have dwelt upon the role of the multilateral arms-control process at a time when much immediate attention is focused upon the on-going bilateral negotiation process. Indeed, my delegation agrees that our assignment in this initial phase of our annual work should be to define more clearly and more actively the relationship between bilateral arms control and multilateral disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament. Foreign Minister Genscher, when he spoke at this Conference last year, called for a constructive parallelism of both, recognizing the necessary juxtaposition and mutual reinforcing role of both aspects of disarmament. It is not difficult to find rational objective criteria by which the multilateral domain can be defined and delineated from its bilateral complement. Global security issues need global solutions. There are domains where, by the very nature of the subject matter, it is clear that only global regulation can provide durable solutions. The negotiations on the global and effective elimination of chemical weapons are, as we all agree, very much a case in point.

There are other global arms-control concerns to which the members of the Conference on Disarmament must make a significant contribution in 1986. Among these the question of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban looms particularly

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic of Germany)

large, -- because of its real significance in military terms, but also because of the symbolic significance for the disarmament process which is often attached to it. Since this is the first plenary session in 1986, according to our programme of work, on the question of a nuclear-test ban, I would like to devote my statement to this topic, thus testifying to the importance which the Federal Government attaches to it, and clarifying again our overall approach to the issue.

In essence, the position of the Federal Government has remained unchanged over the years. A comprehensive nuclear-test ban is and remains an objective to which we attribute major significance in the framework of our arms control negotiations. The commitment to this objective is unequivocal and has been so formulated in many statements in the United Nations General Asembly and in this Conference. It has been confirmed as recently as 9 January, 1986 by Chancellor Kohl. The Chancellor stated that the Federal Government "had for a long time documented its fundamental interest in a comprehensive test ban". The Chancellor then, in the same statement, gave his view that there are now improved opportunities for coming to terms with this problem.

In advocating a solution to nuclear testing, we have always stressed that a nuclear test stop must be seen in connection with Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Profileration of Nuclear Weapons, which commits the nuclear-weapon States to negotiate in good faith on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and general and complete disarmament, under strict and effective international control. In its arms-control perspective, the obvious purpose of the Non-Proliferation Treaty is not only a test ban, but the reduction of nuclear armaments. The link between the cessation of tests and the elimination of nuclear weapons has also clearly -- and jointly -- been recognized by the States participating in the recent Third Review Conference. It is important to keep these complex and interdependent processes clearly in mind. Chancellor Kohl, in the statement from which I have cited, explicitly affirmed "that a test-ban treaty could not be a substitute for a substantial reduction of existing arsenals of weapons".

Nor are the two equivalent. The conclusion and implementation of a comprehensive test ban, highly desirable and indeed vital as it is, is not the same as the reduction of nuclear weapons, or as the desired degree of strategic stability and balance.

There is now a good prospect that all these objectives can be promoted in unison. My Government hopes that the bilateral nuclear negotiations in Geneva which aim at the reduction of nuclear arsenals can also enable a comprehensive test ban treaty to play, in the near future, a stabilizing role such as we all expect from it. One can infer from General Secretary Gorbachev's proposals of 15 January -- proposals which we deem significant and which contain important elements of substance -- that the Soviet side also recognizes this relationship. The General Secretary speaks of the connection between reduction of nuclear weapons and a test ban. We must expect from the two major Powers that in the course of their arms-control dialogue they also address with appropriate attention the question in which phase of the envisaged reductions a comprehensive test-ban treaty can unfold its stabilizing effects.

A second criterion for a meaningful comprehensive test-ban treaty is, as we all know, effective international control. My Government has noted in this

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic of Germany)

connection that the recent proposals by General Secretary Gorbachev indicate some possible movement in the field of verification and indicate, in particular, that verification would not be allowed to be an obstacle to the cessation of nuclear-weapon testing. It should be noted specifically that the Soviet Union would now also appear to accept on-site inspections for the monitoring of tests or for the verification of their absence. We hope that these new openings will develop further momentum. It is equally encouraging that the Six Heads of State and Government from four continents, in their recent declaration, have also offered seismic control measures, thereby underlining their positive disposition towards the necessity of making a reliable international control mechanism an integral part of a future test-ban agreement.

The importance of adequate verification, tailored to the purposes, scope and nature of disarmament agreements, is now universally recognized. United Nations General Assembly resolution 40/152 0 testifies to this welcome evolution and to the increasing conceptual clarity with which verification matters are viewed. It now hardly needs argument anymore that disarmament agreements that dodge the verification issue and do not contain appropriate provisions for the monitoring of compliance are incomplete and may, in case of controversy, tend to wreck the mutual confidence of States rather than enhance it. This issue will be placed squarely before many delegations when the Bacteriological Weapon Treaty will come up for its next review later this year. Resolution 40/152 0, however, also makes it quite clear that verification is not an abstract purpose by itself, but subservient to specific arms control purposes. Excessive demands on verification are therefore self-destructive aned may generate the suspicion that the proponents are less interested in the conclusion of a disarmament agreement than its avoidance. The important and responsible task for negotiators is to define precisely the levels of confidence that are needed for the effective monitoring of compliance of a given agreement and to determine, on the basis of full knowledge of the state of art of verification techniques, how these can be achieved and maintained.

Verification of a comprehensive test-ban treaty is not an easy task and nobody should proclaim that the inherent technical issues are reliably resolved. Those who tend to quote statements to this effect from earlier periods are oblivious to the rapidly changing technological environment in which both nuclear testing and verification can be operated, not to speak of the evolution, potentially equally rapid, of various evasion techniques.

It is in the spirit of such a responsible search for an adequate negotiated verification system for a future test ban that my delegation last year introduced two Working Papers, CD/612 and CD/624. Both -- one illuminating the political aspects, the other more oriented towards technical solutions -- proposed the gradual establishment of a permanent global seismic monitoring network. The intention of this initiative is to contribute in a concrete and practical manner to the work on a comprehensive test ban. This initiative has been based on the recognition of the fact that verification models are complex and need a period of elaboration and further evolution. It is therefore necessary that the work, with a clear finality link to the future treaty, be taken in hand at an early juncture so that no time be lost and all scientific methods be used in a purposeful manner to achieve the desired result at the appropriate time.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic of Germany)

Significant progress in the application of seismic technology has been made, in particular in recent years. Four areas, however, can be identified which require further practical work and refinement before a global network can perform in a reliable manner.

The establishment of a comprehensive test ban régime necessitates the installation of a global seismic network in order to ensure worldwide compliance with a treaty which for obvious reasons should have universal adherence. The physical establishment of an effective global network will, however, take time somewhere in the order of several years depending on the intensity of efforts and the amount of financial resources applied. If a comprehensive test-ban treaty were concluded tomorrow, the necessary seismic installations to guarantee reliable verification of compliance on a worldwide scale at an appropriate level of confidence would be lacking.

A second consideration relates to the level of development, the state of the art of seismic technology. Although a wide range of questions concerning the detection and identification of nuclear explosions have been theoretically solved and some of the individual components and systems of seismic installations have been tested and operated, a number of open questions remain, in particular with a view to possible evasion scenarios such as, for instance, the muffling or even decoupling of seismic signals generated by a nuclear explosion tested in a large underground cavity. The search for practical and reliable solutions to these crucial issues is still underway in the scientific community.

Thirdly, the question of operationability of a complex worldwide system of seismic data collection, communication, and processing has to be addressed. Although individual seismographic stations might work effectively, the task of operating smoothly and reliably an interlinked system of 50 to 100 seismic stations based in different countries and parts of the world and operated by many nations and the communication of data to and from international data centres has not yet been satisfactorily resolved as the upcoming report of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts (GSE) on the technical test run in 1984 will demonstrate.

Finally, available seismic technology has heretofore only been applied and tested on a worldwide scale during the past test runs executed by the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts and these test runs were limited in scope. Advanced technology such as, for instance, high-performance data acquisition systems, Level II-data, fast real-time data communication, and automated seismic installations have not yet been installed and tested within the setting of a global network.

It is on the basis of these considerations that the Federal Government introduced the proposal to gradually establish a global seismic monitoring and verification system already before the conclusion of a CTBT in order to make use, in a most effective manner, of the available time span prior to the functioning of the treaty. In order to set such a process in motion the international seismic data exchange system, as tested in the 1984 GSE test run, should be put into a continuous operating mode. While in operation the system would be geographically expanded and technically upgraded with the objective of implementing a global seismic network which would meet the degree of sophistication desired for monitoring and verifying a CTB on a global level. The proposed project would give scientists the opportunity to resolve,

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic of Germany)

in a learning-by-doing process, remaining problems of monitoring and verification and to increase, progressively, the system's capability to detect, locate, and identify explosions. In a dynamic process of scientific research and practical application the global seismic network would mature over time and would be available and operational whenever needed.

The establishment and continuous operation of such a network needs to be embedded in an institutional framework. It is, therefore, suggested that during the transitional period, i.e. during the pre-treaty phase, the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts should be assigned the task of supervising the establishment and continuous operation of a global network and to make recommendations for its further improvement. Seismological facilities and data centres would be operated, as during the 1984 experiment, by participating states. The GSE would, as in the past, submit its recommendations and reports to the Conference on Disarmament as the political decision-making body. Upon conclusion of a test-ban treaty the global network and its terms of operation would immediately become part of the treaty provisions.

The proposal that I have outlined is geared exclusively to the establishment of a multilateral and worldwide seismic network. As the technical study which my delegation introduced in document CD/624 concludes, a global seismic network utilizing the most advanced technology could be brought to a standard of performance which would allow for detection and identification of explosions down to a bodywave magnitude of 4.0. This measurement is approximately equivalent to an explosion yield of 5 to 10 kt in dry unconsolidated rock or to a yield of about 1 kt for explosions in wet hard rock. An appropriate number of additional in-country networks would be required which would significantly improve the capability to detect and identify explosions and which would make the testing of low yield explosions and successful evasion by cavity-decoupling a rather difficult and risky undertaking.

I would like to emphasize that the intention of this initiative is in no way to detract from the importance of other work that needs to be done in connection with the resolution of outstanding issues related to a CTB. As stated before, my Government attaches great importance to the continuation of the work on a CTB in the Conference on Disarmament. The proposed project offers an opportunity to the Conference to engage in practical and concrete work on the central issue of verifying a nuclear test ban which needs to be done in any event. The establishment of a global seismic monitoring network will contribute significantly to this task. My delegation stands ready to resume the work in an Ad Hoc Committee on a Comprehensive Test Ban and hopes that this concrete and practical proposal will find a positive and supportive and detailed reaction from delegations in this Conference.

This task could not be performed in our previous session, which was reaching its completion when the two aforementioned documents came before delegations. I am confident that they have in the meantime found the necessary attention on the cost of experts and administrations. I would therefore appeal to colleagues to focus on this proposal and to provide the opportunity, during our current session, for it to be discussed in depth, both in its political and technical aspects, both in the appropriate working body of this Conference and within the GSE.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic of Germany)

This leads me on to the difficult organizational choices which appear to be before us at this time. My delegation is avid to see the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban re-established at the earliest possible point. On the basis of our policy on a comprehensive test-ban treaty, which I have once more clarified in this statement, we wish to embark on the necessary practical work as soon as possible without, to be sure, losing sight of the negotiating perspective without which such work could not fully unfold its usefulness. It appears imperative to my delegation that the technical and institutional prerequisites for a future Test Ban Treaty be fully discussed and solved, on the shortest possible time-scale. The position of my delegation on the mandate necessary for initiating the work of an appropriate ad hoc committee is clear and has been expressed on several occasions, in unison with the views of other members of the Western group of delegations. The early and pragmatic initiation of the necessary work process would best be undertaken on the basis of draft mandate CD/521, in conjunction with the elaborate work programme contained in CD/621, documents that have been before the Conference for some time. However, my delegation is also prepared to examine closely any other documents that would seem to serve the same purpose and to have the potential of meeting with approval by all interested delegations. Differences in specific language cannot be an unsurmountable problem, as long as the effectiveness of a text in satisfying security concerns remains the same. I would wish you, Mr. President, early success in the ongoing process of consultations on this organizational issue. My delegation wishes to be as helpful as possible with a view to swift establishment of the required working organ. You will find us open for proposals from other delegations who share our fundamental interest in a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

Referring to your own active role in consultations on this subject, let me take this opportunity Mr. President, to express the warm gratification of my delegation at seeing you preside over the Conference this month. The dynamic, competent representative of a country that makes a dynamic and important contribution to disarmament at the present time serves the Conference well in this beginning phase of our annual work.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished representative of the Federal Republic of Germany for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the President. I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of Sri Lanka, Ambassador Dhanapala.

Mr. DHANAPALA (Sri Lanka): Mr. President, an Australian Presidency of our Conference is a matter of particular satisfaction to the Sri Lanka Delegation which shares so many links with you, including our membership of the Commonwealth. Your own presence in the Chair gives me a personal satisfaction because of our association that goes back two decades and your strong commitment to the cause of disarmament. Among the auspicious portents for disarmement in 1986 is the fact that you preside over our Conference this month. After the unprecedented adoption of our agenda and work programme and the establishment of two Ad Hoc Committees in the very first week of our deliberations, we look forward to similar despatch in the establishment of the other Ad Hoc Committees with appropriate mandates, especially on the nuclear items of our agenda, so that the Conference will negotiate on disarmament instead of negotiating on negotiations.

(Mr. Dhanapala, Sri Lanka)

Our thanks are due to Ambassador Cámpora of Argentina for his Presidency in the month of August 1985 and for the skilful manner in which he guided the Conference. My delegation would also like to welcome the distinguished Ambassadors of Algeria, Belgium, Burma, India, Italy, Kenya, Morocco, Peru, Venezuela and Zaire to the Conference.

Many distinguished speakers before me have referred to the hopeful climate ushered in by the November 1985 Summit between President Reagan of the United States and General Secretary Gorbachev of the USSR -- the leaders of the two countries which possess 95 per cent of the world's total nuclear arsenals. This climate has been enchanced by the far-reaching proposals made in January this year by General Secretary Gorbachev. We share these hopes and expectations. However, as we did last year we must again sound a note of caution that so much hope is pinned on so tenuous a basis. In doing so my delegation does not belittle the enormous significance of the declaratory principles and good intentions contained in the Joint Statement of the Geneva Summit or the proposals of General Secretary Gorbachev. They remain general principles and proposals with the promise, and not the certainty, of concrete results. The perspective of my delegation is that of a developing, non-aligned nation which remains bewildered by and fearful of the arms race and the threat of a nuclear war which continues unabated after the Summit meeting of November 1985. The Conference of the Foreign Ministers of Non-aligned countries held in Luanda in September last year concluded in its Final Document, "For almost 40 years the survival of mankind has been hostage to the perceived security of a few nuclear-weapon States and their allies and most notably of the two major nuclear-weapon States ... The Ministers therefore find it unacceptable that the security of all States and the very survival of mankind should be held hostage to the security interests and State relations among a handful of nuclear-weapon States. Measures for the prevention of nuclear war and of nuclear disarmament must take into account the security interests of nuclear weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States alike and ensure that the survival of mankind is not endangered.".

On the eve of the Geneva Summit last year and in pursuance of a proposal made to the 40th anniversary session of the United Nations General Assembly by Prime Minister Premadasa of Sri Lanka my delegation together with Yugoslavia co-sponsored a resolution on bilateral negotiations which was adopted without any votes being cast against it. The resolution -- No. 40/18 -- expressed the hope that the Geneva Summit "will give a decisive impetus to their current bilateral negotiations so that these negotiations produce early and effective agreements on the halting of the nuclear arms race with its negative effects on international security as well as on social and economic development, reduction of their nuclear arsenals, prevention of an arms race in outer space and the use of outer space for peaceful purposes". The resolution also reaffirmed that the vital interests of all peoples, including those of the two negotiating parties, were at stake in the negotiations. Important principles on the need for a linkage between bilateral and multilateral disarmament negotiations are asserted in the resolution. The series of bilateral negotiations set in motion by the Shultz-Gromyko Joint Statement of 8 January 1985, which aimed at "preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on Earth" with the ultimate goal of achieving the complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere yielded no concrete results in 1985. Despite the decision at Summit level to accelarate and intensify these negotiations we have no information to believe that the round of negotiations which began in Geneva on 16 January this year is proceeding any better than

(Mr. Dhanapala, Sri Lanka)

last year. Instead we hear from both sides that proposals have been presented and that responses are awaited. A world in which the two nuclear super-Powers are talking to each other is undoubtedly better than a world situation where there is no dialogue between them. But are we so skewed in our scale of values, where "in the land of the blind the one-eyed man is King", that we must rest content and even acclaim a set of declaratory principles and proposals as having ushered in a new era in disarmamemt?

My delegation does applaud the agreement on principles that is reflected in the United States-USSR Joint Statement of 21 November 1985, and especially the agreement that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought -- that any war between them whether nuclear or conventional should be prevented and that neither will seek to achieve military superiority. To my delegation, perhaps in the naive innocence of a small non-nuclear non-aligned nation, we see as a logical corollary to these statements immediate and practical steps to dismantle the weapon systems of the two military alliances. The agenda on the disarmament Conference table -- both bilateral and multilateral -- has never been bare. Today, basing ourselves on publicly-available information, it has a greater specificity with the proposal for a 50 per cent reduction in nuclear arms, an interim INF agreement and the range of proposals contained in General Secretary Gorbachev's proposals of 15 January which seek to implement paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We hope that before the next summit, scheduled for this year, concrete progress will have been made on the implementation of these proposals. The majority of States of the world and the survival of humankind can no longer be held hostage to the security interests of the major Powers. The Secretary-General of the United Nations in his recent message to us in the Conference recognized that the task before us remains undiminished.

> "The general improvement in the international climate, however, in no sense decreases the size of the task of reaching tangible agreements which still lies before us. The dangers stemming from the existence of large arsenals of nuclear weapons have not diminished and to these are added the ever-increasing stocks of conventional weapons. In many places, the use of force continues to bring destruction and death and to hold in jeopardy the needed increase in international confidence, the growth in global military expenditures has not yet been halted, while vast areas of the world suffer a serious lack of resources for development."

While these bilateral negotiations go on the urgent need for us is to proceed with multilateral negotiations. Outside the Conference on Disarmament we look forward with great hope to the Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, to be held, appropriately, in Paris in July this year, bringing to fruition the proposal of the distinguished President of France. The preparations for this Conference are going forward in a purposeful and business-like manner. We earnestly hope there will be universal participation and that after the plethora of statements upholding the United Nations system in its 40th anniversary last year the principle of multilateral co-operation for peace and development will be strengthened by concrete action taken at this Conference. A recent study on the United Nations system reveals that expenditure in favour of peace, political problems and security was less than one tenth of a day's expenditure on armaments. As we approach the twenty-first century many crises afflict the

(Mr. Dhanapala, Sri Lanka)

world but the security crisis which affects the survival of humankind ivolves the militarization of economies and societies and the diversion of scarce resources from the satisfaction of basic needs to military purposes. We have an opportunity to retard, if not halt that diversion now.
Prime Minister Premadasa addressing the fortieth session of the United Nations General Assembly said:

> "Beyond the elemental wrongness of these outlays are three derivative concerns. They are the fatality of weapons accumulation, the concentration of destructive power in the hands of a few nations and the diversion of scarce resources and talents into the industry of death. All these could result in the extinction of human life and add to human deprivation. Mahatma Gandhi expressed this in the following words: 'Bombs will not be destroyed by counter-bombs, even as violence cannot be destroyed by counter-violence'."

The ordering of priorities in the field of disarmament is not a subjective matter if we are guided by the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. And yet we hear frequently the voices of those who urge us to be practical and realistic. What is practical and realistic to some is the acceptance of the status quo. To others it means acquiescing in a situation where one or two delegations adopt fixed positions on issues refusing to follow the path of discussion and compromise which is the only way to multilateral co-operation and agreement. My delegation will oppose this advocacy of unequal exchange in whatever forum it is advanced.

In South Asia, a developing region with one-fifth of humanity, the Summit meeting of the South Asian Association for Regional Co-operation [SAARC] held in Dhaka on 7 and 8 December last year declared that the Heads of State or Government of the seven countries were "alarmed at the unprecedented escalation of the arms race particularly in its nuclear aspect. They recognized that mankind today was confronted with the threat of self-extinction arising from a massive accumulation of the most destructive weapons ever produced. The arms race intensified international tension and violated the principles of the United Nations Charter. The leaders called upon the nuclear-weapon States for urgent negotiations for a comprehensive test-ban treaty leading to the complete cessation of testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons".

We are deeply conscious of a fresh and irresistible surge of world opinion on this important question of nuclear testing. A major impetus was provided by the Final Document of the Third Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons which recorded the view of the overwhelming majority that the nuclear-weapon States Parties to the Treaty should resume trilateral negotiations and that all the nuclear-weapon States should "participate in the urgent negotiation and conclusion" of a comprehensive multilateral nuclear test-ban treaty as a matter of the highest priority in the Conference on Disarmament. Alternative approaches towards the same goal are being pursued with the support of non-government organizations and international groups.

Statements have already been made since we opened the 1986 session of the Conference on Disarmament on the need to make progress on Item 1 of our agenda, "Nuclear Test Ban". The unilateral extension of the USSR moratorium

(Mr. Dhanapala, Sri Lanka)

on nuclear testing up to 31 March lends an urgency and demands that we act speedily. The two resolutions adopted in the last session of the United Nations General Assembly appealed to us here in the Conference on Disarmament to carry out negotiations on the complete cessation of nuclear test explosions and recommended flexible approaches to this. The absence of any mention in the Joint Statement of the Geneva Summit of this crucial item on the global agenda for disaramament is regrettable. We in the Conference on Disarmament cannot betray the hopes of the people of the world. Nor can we undermine our role as the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament by failing to act on an important issue in which we have had a group of scientific experts working so successfully on the related issue of verification. We are alarmed at the shifting arguments of those opposed to a nuclear-test ban. When the argument on verification proved to be unconvincing because of scientific developments in verification techniques and the political decision of some countries to permit on-site inspection if necessary, fresh reasons were advanced to resist the demand for a comprehensive test ban. These include the importance of testing in the development of new weapons and the need to test and modernize existing arsenals. If deep and verifiable reductions of nuclear weapons arsenals are considered the higher priority surely testing to develop new weapons and maintain existing weapons is a non-sequitur. Logic and reason have seldom characterized the arguments of those who want bigger and better bombs. A test ban is a beginning. It is not an end in itself. We are gratified that the impact of world public opinion in favour of a nuclear-test ban has resulted in a decrease in the number of tests detected in 1985. The Conference must commence work on negotiating a nuclear-test ban and there would be nothing more appropriate than if we did so under the Presidency of one whose country has been at the vanguard in seeking such a ban.

By common consent the prevention of an arms race in outer space has become an urgent issue so as to ensure that another part of our Universe is not embroiled in the arms race we have been witnessing and is instead used exclusively for peaceful purposes. The Sri Lanka delegation has been actively associated in the discussion of this item and we were glad once again to be associated with the delegation of Egypt in co-sponsoring resolution 40/87 which received an overwhelming vote of 151 votes for with none opposing as the only resolution on the subject in the General Assembly. Last year despite similar success at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly we delayed action here in the Conference until March when through the commendable efforts of Ambassador Taylhardat of Venezuela as President, we achieved agreement on a mandate in order to establish an Ad Hoc Committee. The Report of the Conference for 1986 concluded that our work had contributed to clarifying the complexity of a number of problems leading to a better understanding of positions. It also urged that substantive work on the agenda item should be continued in the 1986 session. "Substantive work" implies progress and not repetition. Resolution 40/87 in operative paragraph 9 contains clear and unambiguous guidance for our work in an Ad Hoc committee this year and the fact that 151 nations supported this must weigh with those who plead for realism. My delegation will speak at greater length on this item later in our session. At this point our main focus of attention is the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee with an adequate mandate for substantive work to be concluded.

My delegation is conscious that the area in which some progress has been registered is in the field of a chemical-weapons ban. We would like to congratulate Ambassador Turbanski of Poland of having chaired the

(Mr. Dhanapala, Sri Lanka)

Ad Hoc Committee so successfully and for the useful inter-sessional work he conducted. We now have a basis for further progress in ridding the world of this repulsive form of weaponry effectively and finally. We were glad therefore that in the very first week of our 1986 session this Ad Hoc Committee has been re-established with Ambassador Cromartie, whom we wish well, as Chairman. We are negotiating an all-encompassing and comprehensive chemical-weapons ban to prohibit the development, manufacture and use of all forms of chemical weapons that could be employed in hostilities including those intended to strike at the sources of mankind's sustenance and the ecological system that nourishes the human environment. The speedy conclusion of this work will be a credit to the Conference on Disarmament but it cannot be the only area in which we must show results.

The Group of 21 has repeatedly proposed mandates for items 2 and 3 out of a conviction that these nuclear issues must be acted upon in the Conference. The recently concluded Third Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, in which three nuclear-weapon States participated as depositories to the Treaty, in its consensus Final Document urged the Conference on Disarmament to proceed to early multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament in pursuance of paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. However, that undertaking has yet to be implemented. It is important to note that continued non-compliance with Treaty obligations erodes confidence and jeopardizes the effective operation of Treaty régimes. My delegation calls upon this Conference to set up a subsidiary body on Item 2 with an appropriate mandate. We were close to agreement on Item 3 -- Prevention of a Nuclear War during the 1984 session and what we have witnessed since then is a sad regression from that situation. A redoubled effort can and must bridge the gap.

We look forward to continued work being done in an Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons and we are sure that under the wise and experienced leadership of Ambassador García Robles of Mexico the work in the Ad Hoc Committee on a Comprehensive Programme on Disarmament will be brought to a successful conclusion. My delegation pledges its fullest co-operation to achieve this end. We hope that consideration will be given to re-establishing an Ad Hoc Committee on Negative Security Assurances.

Our tasks are by no means simple or easy but our responsibility to proceed with our work is an awesome one. In its seventh year of existence as the 40-nation body for negotiations on disarmament we have to measure up to what is expected of us. In doing so practical expediency must be sacrificed for the greatest good of the greatest number. The security of nations is of serious importance but more so is the collective survival and security of the world. In the International Year of Peace, the Conference on Disarmement must lead the way. If we are, around this table, merely the sum of governmental postures then the result is zero because some postures cancel each other out. If on the other hand we genuinely seek compromise to achieve agreements in the pursuit of general and complete disarmament the result must be a positive one.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished representative of Sri Lanka for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the President. I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of Argentina, Ambassador Mario Cámpora.

Mr. CAMPORA (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): The Argentine delegation, through its Minister of Foreign Affairs, has expressed to you its best wishes for success in the important task you are performing as President of the Conference on Disarmament at the beginning of the 1986 session.

I should therefore like to repeat those wishes and also offer you my personal co-operation, in the certainty that your political and diplomatic firmness and intelligence will make a very positive contribution to vitalizing the action of this single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum.

The Argentine delegation welcomes the new delegates who have joined the Conference, Ambassador Franceschi of Italy, Ambassador Gonsalves of India, Ambassador Clerckx of Belgium, Ambassador Kerroum of Algeria, Ambassador Afande of Kenya, Ambassador Tin Tun of Burma, Ambassador Taylhardat of Venezuela, Ambassador Mariátegui of Peru, Ambassador Benhima of Morocco and Ambassador Kama Budiaki of Zaire. We offer them all our close co-operation and wish them every success in this delicate task.

We would like particularly to address ourselves to the Swedish delegation to express to Ambassador Ekéus our sorrow at the passing away of Mrs. Alva Myrdal, whose contribution to the cause of peace will remain engraved in the history of international relations of our time.

We would also like to express our sympathy to Ambassador Lowitz over the accident to the space shuttle Challenger and the sacrifice of its crew in an enterprise which propels man towards new frontiers of space.

The Conference on Disarmament begins its work every year in the month of February. In other words, this is sowing time, just as the month of August is harvest time, when the Conference, in its annual report, gives an account of the results of its negotiations, and of what has been agreed upon in the area of disarmament. The importance of this issue exceeds that of any other in contemporary international relations, since the existing nuclear arsenals have the capacity to make the human race extinct. In these first weeks, we devote ourselves chiefly to organizational matters; that is, we are concentrating on establishing the way in which we will treat each of the nine items appearing on the Conference's agenda. We have already taken an important step in adopting, at the first meeting, both the agenda and programme of work; this represents an encouraging determination in our opinion. We have also constituted the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons and elected as its Chairman the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom, Ambassador Cromartie, whom we wish the greatest success in his functions. Furthermore, in accordance with the spirit prevailing in the Conference, we have entrusted the eminent representative of Mexico, Mr. Alfonso García Robles, with the leadership of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, as we have from the outset.

Today we are holding the 5th plenary meeting of 1986, and the above-mentioned objectives have been met. You should be satisfied, Mr. President with all these results.

In addition, you are carrying out an intensive schedule of consultations to advance in the treatment of the remaining items on our agenda. These consultations, which you are undertaking with so much commitment and dedication, have our complete support and will enjoy our entire co-operation. The Argentine delegation will do its utmost to keep the work of the Conference

(Mr. Campora, Argentina)

moving onwards, since this forum offers the sole institutional framework for negotiations in which the question of disarmament emerges from the closed and exclusive circle of the nuclear Powers. Here, in this Conference, the organized international community composed of the member countries of the United Nations defends and reaffirms its competence to conduct multilateral negotiations on disarmament.

At this stage of the organization of work, we would like to refer to the other items of the agenda, taking into consideration each one's possibility of being suitably considered by an ad hoc committee with the appropriate mandate and programme of work.

We believe item 1 on the nuclear test ban to be of the utmost urgency and priority. In addition, international circumstances are favourable for beginning serious and final multilateral negotiations which will lead to the conclusion of a nuclear-test-ban treaty. Most particularly, consideration of this very important item is faciliated by the moratorium which the Soviet Union has imposed since 6 August and which will last until 31 March according to the statement by the Soviet Government.

We have not lost the hope that the United States will join in that moratorium, so that it can be extended until a treaty is concluded permanently banning nuclear tests for all States. Furthermore, we believe that elaboration of a mandate on that question is within the current possibilities of the Conference if there is the corresponding political will. This mandate should say that an ad hoc committee is being established to hold multilateral negotiations on a nuclear-test-ban treaty.

It is also our opinion that item 5, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, is at an extremely interesting stage. We believe that the ad hoc committee on this item can be re-established at an early date to continue analysing a vital field in relations between States. Drawing up the rules to prevent the militarization of outer space represents a new task which should necessarily begin with a description of the military activities which should be prohibited in order for outer space to be used for exclusively peaceful purposes.

We welcome the beginning of bilateral negotiations on this subject. but from our point of view a restricted circle cannot be a substitute for the multilateral treatment of an item which affects the security interests of all States.

If, as I deeply hope, at the end of your Presidency the subsidiary organs which I have mentioned have been established, I believe that this month of February will be remembered as an extremely fruitful moment in the work of the Conference.

Item 2 and item 3, although they are different, are linked by a common and negative fate, i.e. the lack of consensus to begin to deal with them in the proper manner.

Item 2, which concerns cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, was given superficial consideration last year as in previous years.

(Mr. Campora, Argentina)

For one group of delegations, this is a question that can only be treated appropriately in bilateral negotiations. Those delegations are currently using the argument that while the United States and the Soviet Union are carrying out bilateral negotiations to reduce their nuclear weapons, it is not suitable to treat this item in the Conference on Disarmament.

The holding of bilateral negotiations is not a valid argument for not dealing with item 2 in this Conference, since there are not only two nuclear-weapon States, but five, and they are all represented in this Conference. In other words, as we have heard in statements by other representatives of nuclear-weapon Powers, the bilateral discussions will later have to take into account the points of view of the other three Powers represented here.

Our objective observation of the international situation has led us to acknowledge that nuclear disarmament depends on the will of the nuclear-weapon countries. From this point of view, only those countries with nuclear weapons can make the elimination of nuclear weapons a reality.

The Republic of Argentina, which, like the vast majority of the countries comprising the international community, does not possess nuclear weapons, and whose nuclear policy is directed exclusively towards the peaceful use of nuclear energy, cannot actually destroy nuclear weapons it does not possess. Obviously, nuclear weapons can only be destroyed by the States having the dubious privilege of possessing nuclear weapons.

However, Mr. President, my country, like the vast majority of countries, can carry into effect its declared abhorrence of nuclear weapons, demand their elimination and claim the right to participate in that process.

We therefore find ourselves unable to deal with this highly important item. On the one hand, there is no consensus to set up the ad hoc committee whose establishment and mandate were once again requested by the General Assembly in resolution 40/152 P adopted by 131 votes in favour. Neither is item 2 being given a thorough consideration in the plenary meetings. In situations such as this one, the consensus rule inevitably prompts one to wonder about whether it would be desirable for it to be applied flexibly in procedural aspects.

Under these circumstances, it would appear to be time for the Conference on Disarmament to consider the possibility of inviting the delegations of the United States and the Soviet Union to present a report to this multilateral body on the progress of the bilateral negotiations. We would venture to suggest that both delegations will experience a feeling of relief when they share with the rest of the international community the tribulations that I do not doubt are felt in countries burdened with nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction. We believe that this is indeed the psychological mainspring of the famous statement made by their two highest leaders, that "a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought".

This expression contains an explicit recognition of the fruitlessness of nuclear weapons. If it means to its authors what it actually says, we have no doubt that the bilateral negotiations on disarmament will make progress. The opposite would mean that they consciously accept the rule of injustice.

(Mr. Campora, Argentina)

Fortunately, the international community possesses this single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum which operates within the United Nations system, in which countries not belonging to the two major military alliances can make proposals designed to further negotiations on disarmament. We believe that this special point in time, characterized by the resumption of the dialogue between the United States and the Soviet Union, should be accompanied by a stepping-up of the multilateral negotiations. It is necessary and fitting to give a political boost to the discussions and negotiations on disarmament in this Conference.

The President of my country, Mr. Raul Alfonsín, and the heads of State or Government of Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania put forward proposals on the need to suspend nuclear tests and prevent the arms race in outer space which have met with wide acceptance at the highest level in government levels and international public opinion.

It is obvious that the proposals of the six countries I have mentioned, are a result of deep concern in view of the growing risk of nuclear war. This concern was also clearly reflected at the most recent session of the General Assembly, when resolution 40/152 "Q", on the prevention of war which is item 3 of the Conference agenda, was adopted by 136 votes in favour.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Argentina, Mr. Dante Caputo, in his statement on 6 February, spoke of those who posit mistrust as the point of departure of relations among the great powers, and he added that "the vast majority of the nations of the international community favour the creation of a growing climate of trust which will strengthen possibilities for a durable peace".

Progress could be made on item 3 with the adoption of concrete measures, as long as there is a climate of trust among the nuclear-weapon Powers.

We hope that the consultations being carried out by the Chairman will yield concrete results in the near future.

With regard to item 6 on negative safeguards, we continue to hope that four nuclear-weapon States will revise their position. Until this occurs, the Conference on Disarmament will be nothing more than a platform for those States and their allies to highlight the supposed virtues of unilateral declarations which, as the Argentine Foreign Minister said in 1984, are "permissible scenarios for the use of nuclear weapons".

With regard to the item "New types of mass destruction weapons and new systems for such weapons", we believe it is time for the Conference on Disarmament to treat that item by identifying such weapons and weapons systems. In the area of radiological weapons, we hope that the Ad Hoc Committee on that item will be re-established quickly.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguised representative of Argentina for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the President. I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of Nigeria, Ambassador Tonwe.

Mr. TONWE (Nigeria): Permit me, Mr. President, to express my delegation's pleasure at seeing you, the distinguished representative of Australia, a country with which Nigeria has historical ties and most cordial relations, presiding over the work of the Conference on Disarmament at the beginning of its 1986 session. The experience and wisdom you bring to this office are guarantees that you will conduct us successfully through this usually crucial month of February. I wish to assure you of the Nigerian delegation's full support and co-operation during your Presidency.

I would also like to express my appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Mario Cámpora, the distinguished representative of Argentina, for the very skilful manner in which he guided the work of this Conference during the closing month of the 1985 session.

May I also extend a warm welcome to our new colleagues, Ambassador Kerroum of Algeria, Ambassador Clerckx of Belgium, Ambassador Tin Tun of Burma, Ambassador Gonsalves of India, Ambassador Franceschi of Italy, Ambassador Afande of Kenya, Ambassador Benhima of Morocco, Ambassador Mariategui of Peru, Ambassador Budiaki of Zaire, and last, but not least, our colleague and friend, Ambassador Taylhardat of Venezuela, with whom we already had fruitful co-operation last year. I sincerely look forward to working closely with everyone in the pursuit of the noble objective of this Conference.

It is with a heavy heart that I learnt of the death of Mrs. Alva Myrdal, Minister of State for Disarmament of Sweden and Nobel Peace Prize Laureate. Some 18 years ago, I had the fortune of working in these chambers with this great lady of Sweden, and I was greatly impressed by her indefatigable dedication and her unswerving commitment to international peace and disarmament. I was even more struck by her patience and tolerance. Her death constitutes a major loss, not only to the people of Sweden, but also to the entire international community. I would request the delegation of Sweden kindly to transmit the condolences of the Nigerian delegation to the family of Mrs. Alva Myrdal and to the Swedish Government.

May I also take the opportunity to express my delegation's condolences to the delegation of the United States of America on the tragic loss of seven heroes and heroines of our time who perished when the space shuttle "Challenger" exploded in flight last January. The Nigerian people shared the shock and sorrow of the American people in that tragic hour. We would request the delegation of the United States kindly to convey the Nigerian delegation's condolences to the families of the heroes and heroines.

This session of the Conference on Disarmament begins at a time when major developments in the relations of the great military Powers would appear to leave room for cautious optimism regarding the future of our work.

In November last year, we witnessed here in Geneva, the historic meeting between the leaders of the World's principal nuclear-weapon States, President Ronald Reagan of the United States and General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev of the Soviet Union. In their joint statement issued after that meeting, the two leaders lent their collective weight to that now famous and irrefutable statement that "A nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought". Although from the point of view of our work, not much was achieved in concrete terms during that meeting, an important step was taken by the two Powers, towards the relaxation of international tension, which deserves our encouragement.

(Mr. Tonwe, Nigeria)

My delegation welcomes the declared intentions of the leaders of the two great countries to break with the past, which was characterized by fear, suspicion and mistrust. The lack of mutual confidence between the two great military Powers over the years had unnecessarily fuelled the nuclear arms race, with its attendant consequences for world peace, including stagnation in the work of this Conference.

As the Secretary-General of the United Nations stated in his address to the Stockholm Conference on Security- and Confidence-Building Measures "a lack of mutual confidence among States, ... like a nervous finger on a trigger, increases the danger of explosion". The Nigerian delegation would therefore like to see a consolidation of the gains of the recent top-level contacts between the major Powers and would hope that these will be quickly translated into genuine disarmament measures designed or endorsed by this Conference.

While acknowledging the importance of the developments in the bilateral front between the major military Powers, my delegation believes that the question of disarmament must remain the concern of all countries. Bilateral efforts should therefore be seen only as complementary to the efforts of this body, the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum representing the will of mankind. The major military Powers, therefore, owe it as a duty to the international community to ensure that the intrinsic qualities of this body are fully utilized for the purpose of securing concrete disarmament measures.

Last year, at the fortieth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, virtually all delegations expressed their deep concern at the continued threat to the survival of humanity by the massive build-up of nuclear weapons by the major military Powers and other nuclear-weapon States. Everyone spoke of the urgent need to prevent a nuclear war, reduce international tension and promote international peace and security. This common desire for peace and harmony led to the adoption by the General Assembly of a number of resolutions which should serve as the basis of the work of this Conference. Furthermore, by proclaiming 1986 the "International Year of Peace", the General Assembly was, in a way, stressing the need to produce some major disarmament agreements during this session. My delegation believes that the mandates of the General Assembly of the United Nations and the reduction of the tension among the major military Powers should spur this Conference to respond positively to the plea of mankind.

My delegation's position on the question of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty is very well known to this Conference. We firmly believe that a comprehensive nuclear-test ban is the first and most urgent step towards a cessation of the nuclear-arms race. The impact which such a ban would have on the nuclear-arms race is clearly underlined in paragraph 51 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which says, inter alia, that "It would make a significant contribution to ending qualitative improvement of new types of such weapons and preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons".

A comprehensive ban would consequently lead to a reduced reliability of nuclear-weapon stocks and make sure that nuclear weapons actually become obsolete. Over 50 resolutions have been passed by the United Nations General Assembly urging action in this domain. The nuclear-weapon States

(Mr. Tonwe, Nigeria)

undertook to act under the Partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963, and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons of 1970 imposed a concrete obligation on them.

The argument, or perhaps excuses, which were advanced for delaying a comprehensive test ban, verification and mutual confidence are now unconvincing. Authoritative scientific reports have confirmed for some time that national technical resources are adequate. Secondly, reliable neutral and non-aligned States have assured us that they can organize a satisfactory verification system for an agreement. And with regard to mutual confidence, the major military Powers are concluding agreements in other areas which are as sensitive and require a comparable level of mutual confidence. So what we need is the political will, that very common factor which is so rarely demonstrated in international relations without ulterior motives.

How long should the world wait for what the vast majority recognize as the first genuine step to nuclear disarmament? The Nigerian delegation believes that this Conference can move ahead, by setting up an ad hoc committee in the next few weeks, with a mandate to commence negotiation on a comprehensive nuclear-weapon-test-ban Treaty. In this connection, we would like, once again, to express our appreciation of the moratorium on tests which the Government of the USSR has unilaterally observed for some months. The Nigerian delegation would appeal to other nuclear-weapon States to emulate this significant example.

The logical collateral measure to a comprehensive test ban is a freeze in the development, manufacture, stockpiling and deployment of nuclear weapons. If we are to believe the opponents of this policy, the balance of terror is today the guarantee against nuclear war. So there is some balance, and it is precisely that balance that the Nigerian delegation would like to see preserved at the stage preceding negotiated reductions in nuclear arms.

We can all see that walking the nuclear-weapon tightrope, and nuclear-weapon brinkmanship, is as unnerving for the major military Powers as they are ominous for the survival of non-nuclear-weapon States. The consequent frantic efforts of nuclear-weapon Powers to match one another in newer, bigger and more efficient weapons and systems, have themselves become the main driving force behind the nuclear-arms race. This has made the quest for superiority a disastrous illusion. There is no doubt that we need to exercise some control over the development and deployment of new weapons, and that a freeze is a natural step forward. It is not enough, as some seem to think, to jettison obsolete weapons, or substitute quality for quantity.

While this Conference focuses on the paramount question of nuclear disarmament, it should also seek to elaborate a binding international instrument which will prohibit the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. This assurance, which is for us the least nuclear-weapon States can expect to give in exchange for the commitment by the other States under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The Nigerian delegation cannot, therefore, understand the vacilations that have surrounded proposals to concretize this assurance in a manner that will render irrelevant the diverse reservations that are now placed on it. The Nigerian delegation sincerely hopes that an ad hoc committee, duly mandated, will be set up early in this session to elaborate the desired legally binding international instrument.

(Mr. Tonwe, Nigeria)

In dealing with the question of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, it is important for my delegation that this Conference fully realize that it is not merely trying to stop vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons among the nuclear-weapon States, nor horizontal proliferation among the normal run of States, which respect a minimum standard of international behaviour, but that it is, above all, concerned with keeping the bomb from the hands of the fringe States, such as the desperate racist régime in South Africa, which practise State terrorism inside and across their borders, and use any means to achieve their diabolical ends. It is not only South Africa's neighbours but the entire Conference which should be anxious to stop the racist régime from further developing its nuclear-weapon capability.

The horrendous dangers which the accummulation and refinement of nuclear weapons pose to human survival are now well known to everyone. Reputable scientists from both sides of the ideological divide have given us vivid descriptions of the intensity of destruction and human suffering which a major nuclear war would entail for the entire planet. The most favourable post-nuclear-war sceanario is too disastrous to contemplate! And yet the view that nuclear weapons guarantee peace is still strongly held in some quarters. Those who hold this view also claim that the major military Powers are not likely to use the weapon against each other. The Nigerian delegation finds these arguments totally contradictory and unconvincing. In fact, we believe that it is because the major military Powers can conceive the use of nuclear weapons to gain national advantage, that they strive ever so hard to achieve military superiority over their rivals.

This research for superiority has taken the nuclear arms race to outer space and has further complicated disarmament negotiations and reduced the chances of significant nuclear disarmament measures. During the last few years, we have all heard the arguments for and against the deployment of weapons in outer space. The Nigerian delegation remains unconvinced that the decisive weapons superiority over rivals which some States have sought unsuccessfully on Earth for centuries will now be permanently had in outer space. There is every reason to believe that the vision of any such superiority in a high-tech age can only be illusive. If the protagonists of nuclear deterrence and the theories justifying the unbridled arms race are right, why, one might ask, would any State with the necessary resources deny itself that security guarantee?

Extending the nuclear-arms race to outer space is, in our view, too dangerous and too costly to be condoned. The several hundred billion dollars which the world spends on arms at present will be further increased as more and more countries intensify their development of space weapons or defensive systems. This will only lead to greater insecurity and misery for mankind and should therefore be stopped through negotiations. We hope that the Ad Hoc Committee on Outer Space will be set up early to seriously consider this matter.

Nothing we have said in this statement is intended to diminish the importance of space technology. Indeed, while the Nigerian delegation deplores any attempt to use outer space for military purposes, we warmly congratulate all States which have advanced and are continuing to advance the frontiers of human knowledge through space probes.

The question of elaborating a multilateral convention for the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of

(Mr. Tonwe, Nigeria)

chemical weapons is one to which my delegation attaches great importance. Next only to nuclear weapons, chemical weapons constitute the most dangerous weapons of mass destruction.

The General Assembly in its resolution on the issue last fall "Urges the Conference on Disarmament to intensify the negotiations in the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons with a view to achieving accord on a chemical weapons convention at the earliest possible date and, for this purpose, to intensify the drafting process of such a Convention for submission to the General Assembly at its forty-first session". My delegation welcomes the early re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons and is pleased to note that the body has already begun work, under the Chairmanship of one of our most competent colleagues in the field, the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom, Ambassador Ian Cromartie. We are impressed by the considerable progress so far made in the negotiations and would appeal to all members of this Conference to do their utmost to ensure the early conclusion of a convention prohibiting chemical weapons. Such a breakthrough will certainly have a positive influence on negotiations in other areas, and to achieve that breakthrough, the draft convention must recognize the sovereign equality of all States, and the similarities in their security requirements. The convention must not seek to create categories of "have and have-not" States which characterized the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1970.

General Assembly resolution 40/152 D urged the Conference on Disarmament to resume work at the beginning of the 1986 session, on the elaboration of the comprehensive programme on disarmament, with the firm intention of concluding that task and submitting a complete draft of the programme to the General Assembly at its forty-first session.

My delegation notes with pleasure the decision of the distinguished representative of Mexico, Ambassador García Robles, to continue to serve as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament. It is our belief that for negotiations on partial measures of disarmament to be effective and complementary, the path of the Conference on Disarmament must be charted and its pace ahead of new weapons technology. My delegation therefore pledges its full support for the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament.

Mr. President, it is a heavy schedule for the Conference on Disarmament in 1986. We do not expect miracles. It will be a long haul, and nothing will be achieved unless all members demonstrate the political will and the courage to make concessions. It is not impossible to extricate the world from the vicious circle of mistrust and an arms race. The billions of dollars which are today spent on arms, especially nuclear arms, if diverted to productive ends, would greatly reduce international greed and release funds to finance trade and development and social justice in every country, poor or rich alike. Only then would we have directed our attention to the real causes of the arms race: poverty of the mind and of the body, greed and megalomania.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished representative of Nigeria for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the President. I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of Kenya, Ambassador Afande.

Mr. AFANDE (Kenya): Mr. President, It is with great pleasure that I address, for the first time, a session of the Conference on Disarmament during your Presidency. I warmly congratulate you for presiding over the Conference at the start of its 1986 session. You represent a Commonwealth country with which my country, Kenya, a member of the Commonwealth, enjoys close and friendly co-operation in many fields. Australia's outstanding contribution in the Conference on Disarmament is well recorded. I take this opportunity to thank you for your warm welcome extended to me. In pledging my co-operation, and that of my delegation, with you, I am confident that with your skill, experience and devotion, you will ably advance the work of this Conference. You have succeeded another able and experienced personality -- Ambassador Campora, the distinguished representative of Argentina, who guided the Conference during the month of August 1985, and with the same devotion continued with his presidency until the beginning of February 1986.

I also wish to thank my other distinguished colleagues for their warm welcome extended to me. I look forward to their guidance and close co-operation in our deliberations. I will, undoubtedly, benefit from their knowledge and long experience in the disarmament work. Similarly, I look forward to establishing close links and fruitful co-operation with my distinguished colleagues who are also participating for the first time in the Conference on Disarmament, namely, Ambassador Kerroum of Algeria, Ambassador Clerckx of Belgium, Ambassador U Tin Tun of Burma, Ambassador Gonsalves of India, Ambassador Franceschi of Italy, Ambassador Benhima of Morocco, Ambassador Mariátegui of Peru, Ambassador Kama Budiaki of Zaire and Ambassador Taylhardat of Venezuela -- who is, however, not new to the Conference's work.

Allow me to thank the secretariat of the Conference on Disarmament for the general services and assistance its staff offered to the Kenya delegation before a permanent mission of Kenya was established in Geneva.

I convey to the delegation of Sweden my delegation's condolences for the passing away of Madame Alva Myrdal, a distinguished Swedish diplomat and Nobel peace-prize winner whose dedication to disarmament has left a lasting mark. I also convey my delegation's deep condolences to the delegation of the United States of America for the tragic loss of its distinguished citizens in the space shuttle Challenger.

Nineteen hundred and eighty six is the International Year of Peace whose theme is to safeguard peace and humanity. The year has begun with hopes of new opportunities to deal constructively with problems which threaten international peace. We are, therefore, happy to participate in this very important negotiating body with a renewed sense of urgency in dealing with the difficult work of disarmament. We are profoundly but sadly aware of the reality of the extremely limited progress that has been achieved despite the fact that disarmament has been a subject of international deliberations and negotiations since 1932. It is, in my Government's view, a matter of urgency for this Conference to pursue concrete negotiations aimed at yielding the results that would enable all States, big or small, developed or developing, to live in peace and not under threat or fear.

This year's session of the Conference on Disarmament is starting in an atmosphere of expectations and hopes aroused by the results of the summit meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev in Geneva in November 1985. Happily this meeting, as my other colleagues have indicated, produced more than rhetoric. Detailed and substantive proposals and counter-proposals were made, reflecting, a desire of both sides to agree on

(Mr. Afande, Kenya)

major reductions in the respective nuclear arsenals as a first step toward implementing the agreed negotiated objectives. My delegation recognizes that the negotiations are likely to be long and time-consuming and that to expect prompt, comprehensive results on the many outstanding issues would be unrealistic. We, however, urge the two parties to continue their negotiating efforts with all the determination, skill and patience that the importance of the subject matter demands. In our opinion, the essence and seriousness of the ongoing negotiations is summed up in the following sentence of the Joint Communiqué of 21 November 1985. "A nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought". Much as we appreciate the resumption of the United States/USSR arms-control talks, it is the view of my delegation that the talks are only complementary to the multilateral negotiations conducted in the Conference on Disarmament and should, therefore, supplement them in order to facilitate the work of the Conference.

Kenya and other peace-loving African countries follow with keen interest the deliberations of the Conference on Disarmament and hope that this multilateral negotiating body will achieve meaningful results soon. We are concerned over the lack of political will by some governments to be party to the treaties or régimes which can facilitate disarmament. The delay in making substantive progress in disarmament creates opportunity for South Africa, whose policies of apartheid do not promote peace, acquiring devastating arms including nuclear-weapon capability. It is towards this end that Kenya fully supports the objectives of the declaration on the denuclearization of Africa as was envisaged in July 1964 in Cairo by the summit meeting of the Heads of State of the Organization of African Unity. South Africa's nuclear capability frustrates the declaration and poses a direct threat to regional and international security. It is regrettable that some countries continue to collaborate with South Africa in the nuclear field.

We continue to experience mounting tensions in several parts of the world. The socio-economic problems currently afflicting the world cannot be viewed in isolation from the escalating military build-up supported by record-breaking military budgets. It is, indeed, sad that even the third-world countries, buffeted by lagging economic development, are allocating over 12 per cent of their declining national products to the purchase of arms. This unfortunate military build-up is occurring at a time when the necessary adequate resources are not being made available for social welfare and economic development of the poverty-stricken majority of the world's population.

In the interest of promotion of peace, stability and co-operation in the Indian Ocean region, Kenya fully shares the view that the first step towards the establishment of the zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region is the convening of the much-awaited international conference. Kenya believes that the conference would harmonize the viewpoints of the littoral States of the region, the Major Powers and maritime users. The success of the conference would largely depend on a firm and resolute commitment by the countries of the region, the Major Powers and maritime users of the ocean to the principles of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

The agenda before us this year contains a host of critical important issues vital to the future of humanity and linked to the overall objective of disarmament and security. The question of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban treaty, to which my Government attaches great importance, has always been

(Mr. Afande, Kenya)

inscribed on the Conference's agenda as an item of highest priority. It has, however, unfortunately become one of the more contentious items. The intensity generated by this item shows the inherent acquisition of more nuclear weapons as a strategic policy of major world Powers, particularly the super-Powers, and the profound public anxieties arising from an awareness of the massive destructive power of such weapons. While recognizing that real and potential difficulties stand in the way of the conclusion of acceptable treaties to reduce the danger of vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons, I wish to reaffirm my Government's strong belief that a negotiated verifiable comprehensive agreement limiting nuclear tests would be a logical step in that direction. Since the partial test-ban Treaty came into force some 20 years ago, there have been no meaningful results achieved towards reaching agreement on a comprehensive test-ban which would be an effective barrier against the development of a new generation of nuclear systems, and thereby strengthen efforts to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear war. Although initially believed to be of historic significance, the emergence of the partial test-ban treaty has not slowed down the nuclear-arms race among the major nuclear Powers. On the contrary and tragically, the Treaty seems to have served as a licence for accelerating nuclear testing despite the existence of numerous General Assembly resolutions against such testing. We share the view that verification arrangements can be adequately negotiated and accommodated in a final treaty. The cessation of testing could significantly reduce the qualitative aspects of the nuclear-arms race and encourage an end to the development of nuclear weapons and the reduction of existing stockpiles. My delegation welcomes the decision announced by China to participate in the NTBT negotiations this year. I wish to reaffirm Kenya's position that it attaches great importance to the efforts of the Conference on Disarmament on the question of effective international arrangements to protect non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons constitute the greatest and the gravest threat to humanity, and as in the case of nuclear-test ban, the question of security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States has been the subject of various resolutions and discussions by the General Assembly and this Conference. I therefore reiterate the call of my Government to the nuclear powers to re-examine their unilaterally declared policies and positions relating to arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. We consider it an obligation on the part of the nuclear-weapon States to provide such unqualified concrete and legally binding assurances to all non-nuclear-weapon States. However, my country believes that under the present circumstances, until nuclear weapons are totally eliminated, the only real political and morally justifiable security arrangement is the prohibition of nuclear weapons as a step parallel to the joint or unilateral declarations of the nuclear-weapon States. My delegation also calls for full adherence by all non-nuclear States to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

In this connection, my delegation acknowledges the deliberations of the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty confirming that the non-proliferation régime is of special importance to international peace and security. For the first time in 10 years, the Conference achieved a consensus agreement on certain vital issues. Such an agreement would have been impossible without the political will and co-operation needed to reach it. My delegation hopes that the States concerned will view the successful outcome as an example to be followed and a precedent for agreements on vital disarmament issues. We hope that the

(Mr. Afande, Kenya)

resolution of the Conference will give momentum to the efforts being made to formulate measures that would halt stockpiling of nuclear weapons and initiate a genuine process of nuclear disarmament.

The effective prohibition of chemical weapons has been on the agenda of the Conference for a number of years now, and although considerable progress has already been achieved on the technical issues relating to a ban on chemical weapons, there are some areas that need to be resolved. My delegation shares the optimism that a comprehensive convention which would outlaw the development, production, stockpiling, storage and use of those weapons and provide for destruction of existing stocks can be effectively concluded. It is our earnest hope that the Conference will overcome the major political difficulties and resolve the divergent views that have emerged in the crucial area of verification. We thank Ambassador Turbanski, the distinguished representative of Poland, for his skill and ability in guiding the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons during the Conference's 1985 session and welcome the decision to re-establish the Ad Hoc Committee during the 1986 session under Ambassador Cromartie, the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom. Being aware that even developing countries can manufacture chemical weapons on a large scale, Kenya supports measures which can bring about the earliest conclusion of a convention to prohibit them and will, in this regard give Ambassador Cromartie our maximum co-operation in his challenging task. My delegation also notes, with satisfaction, the continuation of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament under Ambassador García Robles, the distinguished representative of Mexico. My delegation pledges to give him the necessary co-operation and urges others to do the same in order to enable the Ad Hoc Committee to complete its work this year, as scheduled, with a view to leading to a general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

The realm of outer space and the rules to apply to its peaceful uses is another important item on our agenda in which there is a widespread legitimate public anxiety. In the preamble to the Outer Space Treaty, the international community has proclaimed mankind's common interest in the progressive research and uses of space for peaceful purposes. Today, however, it has become apparent that there is an overriding necessity to arrest the process of militarization of outer space from assuming irreversible proportions. The adoption of steps effectively to block all possible channels for the militarization of outer space and progress towards the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons would serve as the starting point for solving the task of preventing nuclear war. It is, therefore, regrettable that the consideration of this matter by the Conference has met with apparently insurmountable difficulties, especially in reaching an understanding over the framework of the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee on the item. This impasse only postpones any chance of reaching acceptable and binding legal instruments that would ensure that outer space is preserved as the common heritage of mankind and not another arena of military competition. The international community is legitimately interested in preserving outer space for peaceful purposes. Consequently, I trust that the Conference will be able, in its deliberations, to contribute to the achievement of mutual understanding and agreement. My delegation is of the view that consideration of this subject, like that of nuclear war and nuclear testing, illustrates very clearly the close linkage between bilateral and multilateral disarmament negotiations at the present time. Everything should be done to ensure that the approaches in one, strengthens the prospects of progress in the other. The statement which

(Mr. Afande, Kenya)

has been made so often in the Conference that an arms race in outer space will end on Earth is not a hypothetical phenomenon but a statement of fact. No country, organization or individual is competent to announce the winner of the race -- in a game which has neither rules nor a designated point as its end.

In conclusion, I cannot conclude my statement without referring to the question of the relationship between development and disarmament. I am aware that the subject is not on the agenda of this session of the Conference on Disarmament. As a developing country, Kenya desires to take every opportunity available in its general development of the country as well as the social and economic development of its people. We cannot realize this if, as I stated earlier in my statement, both developed and developing countries are spending a substantial part of their resources on the manufacture and purchase of arms. The effects of military expenditures on national and international economies are of great concern to developing countries. The world can either continue to pursue the arms race with characteristic vigour or move consciously and with deliberate speed toward a more stable and balanced social and economic development within a more sustainable international economic and political order. It cannot do both. In many resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly, the world body has often expressed its concern for reducing and restraining military expenditures and for creating increased possibilities for re-allocating released resources towards those of socio-economic development, particularly for the benefit of developing countries. It is in this context that Kenya attaches great importance to the international conference on the relationship between disarmament and development which is due to be held in Paris this year. My delegation hopes that the Conference on Disarmament will offer the necessary support in facilitating a meaningful achievement and success of the Conference.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished representative of Kenya for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the President.

Distinguished delegates, that concludes the list of speakers for today. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor? I give the floor to the distinguished representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. KAMYAB (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. President, as this is the first occasion that my delegation has taken the floor in the course of the present session of the Conference on Disarmament, I would like to congratulate you on your assumption of the Presidency of the Conference for the month of February. I wish you every success. I also take this opportunity to express my appreciation to your predecessor, the distinguished Ambassador of Argentina, and to offer my words of welcome to our new colleagues in the Conference on Disarmament.

It was not my intention to take the floor at our meeting today, but unfortunately some extremely sad developments concerning the use of chemical weapons prompted me to seek the floor in order to inform the Conference as a matter of urgency of these developments. According to information that I have received from my capital, the Iraqi Régime, once again, has engaged in a massive use of chemical weapons against the civilian and military sectors of the population of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The scale and frequency of this use of chemical weapons are both large and numerous. Most recently, on

(Mr. Kamyab, Islamic Republic of Iran)

12 and 15 February, during the course of the present military operation (which has been named VALFAJR-8) Iraq resorted to repeated massive employment of chemical weapons which resulted in many new victims. On one day alone, 12 February, the use of chemical weapons led to 1,700 persons being killed or wounded. On 13 February, chemical weapons were used by Iraq against the civilian population of Abadan City, which resulted in the death of 20 civilians and injury to more than 100 persons.

Of course, these recent incidents were not isolated. On 25 and 26 January 1986, Iraq several times used chemical weapons in Yibis area. On 27 January Iraq twice launched attacks using chemical weapons in the Aine Khosh area. On 30 January in two different places, Iraq more than eight times resorted to the use of chemical weapons. We are getting more information concerning the kinds of gas which have been used and other details with regard to recent incidents. As soon as this information is available we will make it known to interested delegations in the Conference on Disarmament. Of course I am referring here to the most recent occasions on which chemical weapons have been used by the Iraqi Régime. As the distinguished members of the Conference are well aware, during the course of the past two years, Iraq has employed chemical weapons on numerous occasions, some of which were brought to the attention of the Conference.

Some of the persons who have been wounded in the recent series of attacks employing chemical weapons have arrived in Europe for medical treatment and some others will arrive shortly. While sincerely thanking the countries which have received these wounded persons and have provided medical assistance for them I would like to request any other countries which find themselves in a position to provide medical care in such cases to let it be known.

I may bring to the attention of the Conference that on 12 February 1986, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran sent a note to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in which, while raising the alarm with regard to the serious danger in the use of chemical weapons for the international community, it was requested that a mission be sent to Teheran immediately to carry out an on-the-site inspection and verification of the facts regarding this employment of chemical weapons. This request of the Islamic Republic of Iran still stands and it is a cause for regret that such a mission has not been despatched to the area to date.

We feel that these repeated violations of principles and objectives of the 1925 Geneva Protocol by Iraq should meet with the strong condemnation of the international community. We also hope that these unfortunate developments will prompt the Conference on Disarmament to accelerate its negotiations on the convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for his statement. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor?

If that is not the case, I now intend to suspend the plenary meeting and convene, in five minutes' time, in accordance with the timetable for the present week, an informal meeting of the Conference. The plenary meeting is suspended.

The meeting was suspended at 12.50 p.m. and reconvened at 1.15 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The 340th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament is resumed.

I now put before the Conference for decision Working Paper CD/WP.219, 1/ dated 12 February 1986, dealing with a request received from Austria to participate during 1986 in plenary meetings of the Conference and in the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons.

If I hear no objection, I shall consider that the Conference adopts the draft decision. I see no objection.

It was so decided.

The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 20 February, at 10.30 a.m. The plenary meeting stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

1/ "In response to the request of Austria (CD/669) and in accordance with rules 33 to 35 of the rules of procedure, the Conference decides for the present to invite the representative of Austria to participate during 1986 in the plenary meetings of the Conference and in the subsidiary body established under item 4 of its agenda."