

CD/PV.56  
7 February 1980  
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIFTY-SIXTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Thursday, 7 February 1980, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. D.S. McPhail (Canada)

## PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. A. BENYAHIA  
Mr. N. TERJI

Argentina: Mr. A. DUMONT  
Miss N. FREYRE PENABAD

Australia: Sir James PLIMSOLL  
Mr. A. BEHM  
Ms. M. WICKES

Belgium: Mr. A. ONKELINX  
Mr. J.-M. NOIRFALISSE

Brazil: Mr. C.A. DE SOUZA E SILVA  
Mr. S. DE QUEIROZ DUARTE

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV  
Mr. I. SOTIROV  
Mr. P. POPTCHEV  
Mr. S. STAIKOV  
Mr. B. GRINBERG

Burma: U SAW HLAING  
U NGWE WIN

Canada: Mr. D.S. McPHAIL  
Mr. J.T. SIMARD

China: Mr. YU Pei-Wen  
Mr. YANG Hu-Shan  
Mr. LUO Ren-Shi  
Mr. PAN Zhen-Qiang  
Mr. CHOU Hsein-Chueh  
Mrs. GE Yu-Yun

Cuba: Mrs. V. BOROWDOSKY JACKIEWICH  
Mr. L.A. BARRERAS CAÑIZO  
Mr. A. JIMÉNEZ GONZÁLEZ

Czechoslovakia: Mr. P. LUKES<sup>V</sup>  
Mr. JIRUSEK<sup>OV</sup>

Egypt: Mr. N. FAHMY

Ethiopia: Mr. F. YOHANNES

France: Mr. F. DE LA GORCE

German Democratic Republic: Mr. J. ZENKER  
Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI  
Mr. R. HECKEL

Germany, Federal Republic of: Mr. G. PFEIFFER  
Mr. N. KLINGLER

Hungary: Mr. I. KOMIVES  
Mr. C. GYORFFY  
Mr. A. LAKATOS

India: Mr. C.R. GHAREKHAN

Indonesia: Mr. S. DARUSMAN  
Mr. I.M. DAMANIK

Iran: Mr. D. AMERI

Italy: Mr. V. CARDERO DI MONTEZEMOLO  
Mr. M. MORENO  
Mr. C. FRATESCHI  
Mr. F. DE LUCA

Japan: Mr. Y. OKAWA  
Mr. T. NONOYAMA  
Mr. R. ISHII  
Mr. K. MIYATA

Kenya: Mr. S. SHITEMI  
Mr. G.N. MUNIU

Mexico: Mr. A. GARCÍA ROBLES  
Mr. M.A. CÁCERES

Mongolia: Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG

Morocco: Mr. M. CHRAIBI

Netherlands: Mr. R.H. FEIN  
Mr. H. WAGENMAKERS

Nigeria: Mr. T.O. OLUMOKO  
Mr. T. AGUIYI-IRÔNSÍ

Pakistan: Mr. A.A. HASHMI

Peru: Mr. F.V. BELAÜNDE  
Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO

Poland: Mr. B. SUJKA  
Mr. H. PAĆ  
Mr. J. CIALOWICZ  
Mr. S. KONIK

Romania: Mr. C. ENE  
Mr. O. IONESCU  
Mr. V. TUDOR  
Mr. T. MELESCANU

Sri Lanka: Mr. I. FONSEKA

Sweden: Mr. C. LIDGARD  
Mr. B. SKALA  
Mr. L. NORBERG  
Mr. S. STRÖMBÄCK  
Mr. S. ERICSSON  
Mrs. G. JONÄNG  
Mrs. I. SUNDBERG  
Mr. U. ERICSSON

Union of Soviet Socialist  
Republics:

Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN  
Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN  
Mr. A.I. TIOURENKOV  
Mr. E.D. ZAITSEV  
Mr. B.I. KORNEYENKO

United Kingdom:

Mr. D.M. SUMMERHAYES  
Mr. N.H. MARSHALL  
Mr. P.M.W. FRANCIS

United States of America:

Mr. A.S. FISHER  
Mr. A. AKALOVSKY  
Mr. M. DALEY  
Mr. M. SANCHES  
Mr. P. SALGADO  
Mr. J. CALVERT

Venezuela:

Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT  
Mrs. R.M. DE ADAMES

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. VRHUNEC  
Mr. D. DJOKIĆ

Zaire:

Mr. KALONJI TSHIKÁLA KAKWAKA

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

Mr. R. JAIPAL

Assistant Secretary-General  
for Disarmament:

Mr. J. MARTENSON

Mr. ENE (Romania) (translated from French): Let me first express my delegation's pleasure at being here together with our colleagues at the start of this session of the Committee on Disarmament.

I should like on this occasion warmly to welcome your arrival in the Committee as the distinguished representative of Canada, coinciding, as it does, with your country's chairmanship for the month. I wish to assure you of our full co-operation in the fulfilment of your task. Our sincere wishes also go to your predecessor in the chair, Ambassador U SAW HLAING of Burma.

May I also welcome to the Committee the other new heads of delegation, the Ambassadors of Algeria, Belgium, Hungary, Japan and Zaire, and express to them every good wish for success in their work.

I should like to take this opportunity of expressing my delegation's pleasure at seeing here at our discussions Mr. Jan Martenson, Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations and the new Chief of the Centre for Disarmament. We are convinced that the excellent co-operation which we have enjoyed with Mr. Rold Björnerstedt will continue to flourish and increase.

In warmly welcoming the participation of the People's Republic of China in the work of our Committee for the first time, I should like to underline the special significance of that presence, for it signifies that the largest State in the world, representing a thousand million of the people on our planet, is associating itself with our joint endeavour, within this Committee, to build a better and juster world from which arms and the nightmare of war are excluded. The participation of all the nuclear Powers should serve to strengthen the role of our Committee in negotiating real measures of nuclear disarmament. We wish our Chinese colleagues every success in their work and look forward to co-operating closely with them, as with all the other delegations, in the fulfilment of the tasks incumbent on the Committee on Disarmament.

In the present situation, it is more than ever necessary that we should combine our efforts -- in the Committee, in the United Nations, in our capitals and elsewhere -- in order to put an end to the escalation of armaments and achieve concrete results in the disarmament field. The extremely disquieting international political situation, in which tension is greater than at any time since the war strongly demands such action.

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

Of late, we have witnessed mounting tension at the international level, with the risk of a full-scale military confrontation and of a return to the former "cold war" policies and practices. This development, which stems chiefly from the trend towards a new division of zones of influence, and from the sharper opposition between certain States and groups of States, is the more alarming since it is happening in a world where vast stocks of armaments, capable of exterminating the whole of mankind several times over, have been accumulated.

The only alternative to the steady worsening of the world situation is to renounce the policy of force and dictatorship, interference in the internal affairs of other States, and the policy of spheres of influence and hegemony. In this context, as President Nicolae Ceausescu recently pointed out, "every effort must be made to stop the dangerous flow of tension, to reject resolutely the tendency to return to the 'cold war' policy, and to ensure, for the future also, a policy of détente and co-operation which demands unfailing respect for the national independence of every nation and every people."

I am anxious to draw attention to these grave circumstances at the start of our work, in order to emphasize that there is no more urgent task at the present time than the resumption, at all levels, of disarmament negotiations, above all those on nuclear disarmament.

In the interests of the peoples and of peace, it is of vital importance that the existing weapons should not be used. It is all the more necessary to avoid a further escalation of armaments and further steps towards self-destruction. It is more necessary than ever to arrest this dangerous course, in which military escalation and political tension go hand in hand.

The decision taken last year to site new nuclear weapons in Europe merely enhances insecurity in that part of the world and, indeed, throughout the world. We hope and wish that talks will soon begin between all those who are anxious to prevent a fresh nuclear escalation either in Europe or in other parts of the world, so that the security of each individual and military equilibrium may be assured by lowering the level of armaments, instead of raising it. In this spirit, Romania welcomed, at the time, the conclusion of the SALT II agreements, and we once again express the hope that they will be ratified in the near future.

In this same context, the Madrid meeting should mark a new stage in the development of peaceful and co-operative relations in Europe, and lead, in particular, to practical measures of military disengagement and disarmament, without which there can be no question of genuine security on the continent or

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

in the world at large. It seems to us essential that action should be taken to prevent European relations from deteriorating as a result of the present international tensions, and to ensure that European security should give an increasingly significant impulse to efforts to ensure a policy of détente and peace.

We are aware that general disarmament is a complex and long-term process. Consequently, to attain that goal, steps must be taken to carry out partial but firm and effective measures for reducing armaments and achieving disarmament, thereby demonstrating that progress in that direction, however small, is preferable to any type of arms measure. Accordingly, Romania attaches special importance to the freezing of military expenditure and to subsequent cuts in it as the first step -- concrete and immediately feasible -- in the complex of measures aimed at putting a stop to the ~~never-ending~~ escalation of the arms race. Measures such as the dismantling of foreign military bases, the withdrawal of all troops and all armaments within national frontiers, the gradual reduction of national armies and a diminution of the activities of military blocs and their elimination would also play a vital role in strengthening confidence among States, improving the general political climate and removing factors which make for interference in the internal affairs of other States, and in reducing or eliminating certain areas of tension and conflict.

Cessation of the production and of the improvement of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction, and a change-over to an effective policy of nuclear disarmament under strict international control, within the framework and under the aegis of the United Nations, would in present circumstances have a decisive impact.

These fundamental options of Romania's foreign policy were reaffirmed recently at the Twelfth Congress of the Communist Party of Romania, and it is by those political objectives that our participation in the Committee on Disarmament will be guided. A working paper we have submitted, CD/57, contains the main lines of action which it is the Romanian delegation's mandate to pursue at this session.

The Committee on Disarmament must fit its activities in with the whole body of these efforts to reduce the danger of war. The complex international circumstances in which we are resuming our work lend a new dimension to the obligations devolving upon the Committee, whose function it is to help to eliminate the material support for a policy of force, namely arms and armaments.

It is against that background that we must define the broad direction of our efforts in 1980.



(Mr. Ene, Romania)

First, we must do our utmost to ensure that the Committee on Disarmament is able to work in conditions of increased responsibility.

As one of the main results of the special session of the United Nations devoted to disarmament, the Committee forms an integral part of the United Nations machinery for safeguarding peace. It therefore belongs to us all. Every country is interested in its work and its achievements. Consequently, every State which is a member of the Committee is required to take the vital interests of the international community as a whole into account, and consequently to create the necessary conditions for constructive and effective use of the Committee.

Secondly, the main political objective of this session must be to ensure that the Committee embarks on the path of genuine negotiations. That aim should find expression in the political will of all the participants to negotiate within the Committee on concrete measures of disarmament, without waiting for solutions from outside, so that the Committee can accomplish its tasks as a forum for negotiations, and not for general and sterile discussions.

Lastly, the essential condition for any positive result, will be strict respect for the Committee's constitution and more democratic working procedures, so as to ensure that all member States can make their contribution and take part in the Committee's work on a footing of complete equality, as independent and sovereign States without regard to groups based on military alliances. We should like to think, also, that all consultations in the Committee will be guided by these requirements.

With these thoughts I should like to conclude my preliminary remarks. Our first task in coming days will of course be to organize our work. It will be essential to establish the Committee's agenda, and indeed all our activities, strictly on the basis of the rules of procedure and the United Nations resolutions.

We are anxious that the Committee should remain ever-mindful of the requirements of the General Assembly and the realities of our world; and, to that end, that it should focus its attention on the topics designated by that body as priority areas.

Accordingly nuclear disarmament continues to be a field whose absolute priority is incontestable, and the Committee should include this question in

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

a suitable manner in its agenda. We must continue or start negotiations on all the nuclear problems referred to us by the General Assembly, namely: the banning of nuclear tests; the cessation of the nuclear arms race, and nuclear disarmament; the provision of guarantees of security to non-nuclear countries; the non-use of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear warfare; and the prohibition of the production of fissionable materials for military purposes.

My delegation attaches importance, as a matter of principle, to the organization this year, in the Committee, of effective consultations calculated to lead to the start of structured, stage-by-stage negotiations on particular topics with a view to the cessation on the production of nuclear weapons and their gradual reduction.

By such action the Committee itself would for the first time be taking the initiative of opening up a new chapter of its activities in a field, moreover, of paramount importance for international peace and security.

The preparation of the detailed disarmament programme entrusted to us by the General Assembly is directly associated with the pressing need to formulate, in concrete and binding terms, a strategy and policy in the field of disarmament negotiations which could constitute an active instrument for mobilizing the efforts of all States towards disarmament. The first to benefit from such an instrument will be our Committee, which itself needs broader scope for action.

As to the organization of our work, my delegation feels, in view of the requirements I have just mentioned, that we must resolutely set our sights in the direction of the establishment of negotiating structures. The working groups which operated last year should continue their activities, and similar structures will have to be created for negotiations on other priority topics.

The Romanian delegation intends to submit its views on each problem dealt with in such negotiations and, in association with other delegations, to do all in its power to further the Committee's work.

It is in relation to the vital importance of disarmament for the progress and for the very existence of mankind in the present international situation that we shall ultimately have to assess the results of our work this year.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): It gives me very great pleasure to associate my delegation with the warm welcome extended to you, both in your capacity of Canadian permanent representative to the United Nations in Geneva and, this month, of Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament. We look forward to co-operating with you in both capacities. At the same time I want to thank Ambassador U Saw Hlaing for the tact and consideration he showed in handling our affairs during his unusually long tenure of the chair. I wish now to join others in welcoming the delegation of the People's Republic of China to the Committee. The status of our Committee is greatly enhanced by the presence of the fifth nuclear-weapon State and permanent member of the Security Council. My delegation looks forward to working with the Chinese delegation, whom we expect to make a valuable and constructive contribution to the work of the Committee. I should also like to extend a warm welcome to our new colleagues of Algeria, Belgium, Hungary, Japan and Zaire who have recently joined the Committee, and to greet Ambassador Jaipal and his team, on whose efficiency we depend so much.

At the beginning of a session when I believe that our work will have an enhanced importance, I wish to reaffirm the British Government's commitment to the search for balanced and verifiable measures of arms control and disarmament.

It is my Government's firm belief that realistic, equitable and verifiable arms-control measures will enhance national and international security by reducing risks and easing tension. However, in saying this my Government cannot ignore the wider international context in which we work. It is self-evident that progress in the arms-control field is itself dependent upon international confidence; by this we mean confidence that parties to an agreement will comply with its obligations; equally that other Governments believe in maintaining a world where States should live and let live; a world in which all States are willing to co-exist peacefully and constructively in accordance with common sense and civilized behaviour; indeed, in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

We must all face the fact that recent events have put in jeopardy the maintenance of such confidence. A major State represented in this Committee has militarily occupied a neighbouring, sovereign and independent State. The

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

overwhelming majority of Member States of the United Nations have condemned the violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan and have called for the immediate withdrawal of occupying forces. In particular, the reaction of the States geographically close to this act of expansion speaks for itself. My Government's views of what has happened in Afghanistan have been made well known and I do not propose to repeat them in more detail here because I think it more helpful in this forum to try to look forward rather than back. But we must accept that the international community has sustained a blow to confidence and security. And it is clear where the responsibility for this blow lies.

At our meeting on 5 February certain delegations took exception to statements by other members commenting on the events in Afghanistan. They claimed to believe that it was outside the terms of reference of this Committee to hear expressions of concern at military action which has heightened international tension in a sensitive part of the world. I find this surprising. This Committee's task is to enhance security among States by negotiating reduced levels of armed confrontation. It is inevitable and very proper that our discussion should take account of the effects of actual employment of armed force.

The question now, in the aftermath of these events, is what attitude we should take towards efforts to secure further control in armaments. The crisis over Afghanistan has reaffirmed the need for effective defence against external aggression. At the same time the search for ways of strengthening international security through arms control must continue; and for this reason my Government will continue its efforts to reach agreement on verifiable and balanced measures of arms control.

Accordingly, the United Kingdom has this week resumed intensive negotiations with the Soviet Union and the United States on a Comprehensive Test Ban. Also outside this Committee, it joined with its allies last December in presenting to the Warsaw Pact countries some carefully worked out and comprehensive proposals designed to improve mutual security and stability in Europe. Part of this package has unfortunately already met with a negative response, but we shall continue to hope for progress.

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

I do not want to refer to this important question in any more detail now, but there was one point in the statement by the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union on 5 February on which I think it necessary to put the record straight. He suggested that the decision to modernize western theatre nuclear forces would destroy the existing balance of forces in Europe. The facts are rather the opposite. It is the present situation which is unbalanced in a manner which is to the growing advantage of the Warsaw Pact. There is no truth at all in the suggestion that the Western allies propose to introduce weapons which would enable NATO to negotiate from a position of superiority. On the contrary, what we are trying to do is to redress in some measure a disturbing situation of inferiority-on-the-western-side.

The Committee's task at the outset of this session is to agree an agenda and programme of work. My delegation hopes that the consultations which you have already begun will lead to a consensus on both these questions. As regards the agenda, my delegation was content with the progress made by the end of our business meeting yesterday and looks forward to early agreement on the subject.

My delegation will show flexibility in the consultations on the programme of work. I believe it would be useful now to draw attention to a number of factors which we believe should be taken into account in drawing up our programme of work.

First, there is the question of the amount of time at our disposal. We have not yet agreed a closing date for this part of the session. But we have heard 24 April suggested as one possibility. If this is agreed, this leaves us some eleven weeks for this part of the session.

Second, and related, is the work programme in which many of us will be involved outside this Committee. Many delegations, for example, will be involved in the Biological Weapons Convention Review Conference which opens on 3 March and which will last for three weeks. Other delegations, in many cases, the same, will be engaged in the third session of the Preparatory Committee for the most important NPT Review Conference, which lasts for two weeks from 24 March; that is, immediately following the Biological Weapons Review Conference. My delegation does not in any way wish to suggest that the work of this Committee should be subordinated to work outside. But we should recognize the practical difficulties which will be caused to some delegations, particularly to those smaller than my own, of carrying on intensive negotiations in parallel with those in this Committee.

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

Third, there is the question of how much time we allocate to negotiate on each of the agenda items. We should aim to do full justice to the items we have before us. Therefore my delegation does not think it would be realistic to spend, as we did during the first part of our session last year, one or two days only on various of our agenda items.

This points to a programme of work for this part of the session with only a limited number of items. I think it should be clear that the selection of these items should not be seen as reflecting priorities. For example, if chemical or radiological weapons appears first in the programme it should not be interpreted as having a greater priority than, say, negative security assurances. My delegation suggests that a more useful criterion in selecting items for the programme of work is the readiness of these items for negotiation by the Committee. By this I mean items where specific texts or other material are available for negotiation.

My delegation believes that there are four items which fall within this category, namely: chemical weapons, negative security assurances, radiological weapons and the comprehensive programme for disarmament. These four items would provide a useful basis for our work in the first part of the session. The inclusion of these items and the deferment of others to the second half of the session, when in turn we would give them serious consideration, should not be seen to be according one item a priority over another. But given the time constraints, and the need to give each of our agenda items serious attention, I think that the inclusion of these four items would provide a realistic basis for beginning our programme of work.

These are my delegation's first thoughts on the work of the Committee this year and the more detailed questions of the Committee's agenda and programme of work. My Government, in negotiations both inside and outside this Committee, has honoured its obligations to negotiate in good faith. We shall continue to do so and we shall expect others to do likewise. Through our actions in this Committee, we must seek to reduce tensions and suspicion, to re-build confidence, and to re-create the conditions in which disarmament agreements can be reached. This should be our aim this year.

Mr. ONKELINX (Belgium) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, let me say first of all how sincerely pleased I am that our session is opening under the chairmanship of the representative of a country which has contributed so much to the numerous efforts and activities undertaken in the field of disarmament since the establishment of the United Nations. Canada's reputation in this field is well established and has always stood firm, and I am sure that you will ably carry on this tradition by guiding our work with all the enthusiasm and fairness necessary to its success.

It would, in our view, be a grave error of political judgement to speak today in this important forum, the Committee on Disarmament, without expressing the deep concern felt by our peoples and leaders over what has been taking place in Afghanistan since late December. Silence would not advance the cause of improving international relations and maintaining peace and security to which our Governments have decided to devote their energies. It might, rather, give rise to misunderstandings about what the majority of the members of the international community think of the events in question.

The Government of Belgium, like many others, has already condemned the serious step of using military force in the territory of another State --- a step which has, in a very short time, led to a grave worsening of the international climate.

It is in negotiating bodies like ours, whose work depends on confidence and goodwill among States, that the sadness and bitterness of the tragic events of the past month will be most strongly felt. Years of painstaking and untiring effort to advance the cause of disarmament may indeed be jeopardized by this use of armed force.

The process of détente, which Belgium and other Governments continue to value, is not at all an abstract and unchanging goal. On the contrary, it has a specific content which may at any time change in the light of developments in international relations. The events of the past month pose a threat to this process of détente.

The cause of this deterioration must be eliminated as soon as possible if the confidence that is so necessary for the success of our work is to be restored.

Disarmament and international security are too closely linked for it to be possible to hope that one can be achieved without the other.

These words spoken in all seriousness are not meant to cause controversy. They are intended only as a warning and as the expression of a hope. They come from the representative of a country that has long been devoted to the cause of détente, disarmament and arms control. And this country is still hoping that States will revert to moderation, the only guarantee of the success of our work and negotiations.

(Mr. Onkelinx, Belgium)

In times of international tension such as we are experiencing now, the role assigned to our Committee is more valuable than ever, and it is important that we should all try to contribute to the achievement of the goals which the Committee has set itself.

Recent events are all the more deplorable because 1980 promised to be a time when progress on disarmament could be made.

The international community was looking forward to the long-awaited entry into force of the SALT II agreements and to subsequent negotiations on a SALT III agreement.

There were prospects for developments in the negotiations on force reductions in Europe following the compromises made by both sides and the new proposals submitted in December 1979 by the western countries.

For the European countries, the preparations for next autumn's Madrid meeting held out hopes of possible progress, particularly on the military aspects of security and disarmament.

The 1979 session of the Committee on Disarmament had augured well. On the basis of the results of the 1978 special session of the General Assembly, it reached broad agreement on its rules of procedure and programme of work. In the statement he made at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, the Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Simonet, welcomed the progress made in the Committee's work, stating that "Questions of substance were dealt with in a constructive spirit that augurs well for the next session."

The Committee's 1980 session was to have begun auspiciously, since China is taking part in its work for the first time, and we, like other members, warmly welcome it because the Committee now thus includes all the nuclear-weapon States, which are permanent members of the Security Council.

In view of the great importance we attach to multilateral, regional and bilateral arms limitation and reduction agreements, we must preserve all these prospects as well as we can.

The Committee should, as soon as possible, make all the necessary practical arrangements for the organization of its work. Indeed, General Assembly resolution 34/83 B urges us to proceed, without any further delay, to substantive negotiations on the priority questions of disarmament on our agenda.



(Mr. Onkelinx, Belgium)

Belgium is of the opinion that the agenda and programme of work adopted at the preceding session and contained in document CD/12 should serve as a basis for the organization of our work. It is important for us to avoid long procedural debates and to draw up a programme which will include topics of concern to various delegations and lead to fruitful negotiations at the current session. Practical arrangements should be made for each topic, so that a prolonged discussion of one does not prevent the others from being taken into consideration. To this end, Belgium agrees that, in accordance with rule 23 of the rules of procedure, the Committee should decide to establish ad hoc sub-committees, working groups, technical groups or groups of governmental experts whenever such a decision would appear likely to advance its work.

In our view, the following two major concerns should be taken into account in organizing the Committee's work.

First, the need to ensure that the Committee continues to deal with all the matters referred to in the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly; and, second, the need to identify topics on which negotiations might, in the short run, lead to positive results.

The unproductive Cold War period was followed by the 1960s and the establishment of negotiating machinery and the adoption of international disarmament and arms-control instruments.

With the Committee on Disarmament, which is highly representative and whose structure is satisfactory to the international community as a whole, we have entered the third phase in the history of disarmament since the Second World War.

Our Committee must, without delay, produce concrete results, to be added to those already achieved.

It is probably in one of the following four areas that such results can be achieved:

- The prohibition of chemical weapons;
- The prohibition of radiological weapons;
- Negative security guarantees; and
- The halting of nuclear-weapon tests.

(Mr. Onkelinx, Belgium)

In the years following 1971, i.e. after it was decided to deal separately with the questions of chemical weapons and bacteriological weapons, three draft conventions on the prohibition of chemical weapons were submitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

In 1974, the United States and the Soviet Union stated that they intended to present a joint initiative. Bilateral negotiations were held for that purpose, and it appears, from the joint report submitted to the Committee last August, that, although several matters are still under discussion, including, in particular, certain international verification measures, confidence-building measures and conditions for the entry into force of the convention, important areas of agreement have been identified on the basic elements of a treaty.

The Belgian delegation has been looking forward to the results of these bilateral discussions. It has always been of the opinion, however, that the Committee should also be carrying out work on this topic. The two channels of negotiation should supplement each other, rather than stand in opposition to one another, thus improving the chances of success of the Committee's discussions. At its recent session, moreover, the General Assembly expressed its regret that an agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons has not yet been elaborated. The high-priority nature of these negotiations has been recognized by all. For nearly 20 years, efforts have been going on to prohibit the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons. Work should be initiated as soon as possible in the Committee, particularly on the basis of the joint United States-Soviet report of last August, which is contained in document CD/48, and of papers submitted at the last session on the procedure to be followed and on verification. The Committee also has before it a compilation of materials which was prepared by the secretariat and contains information on chemical weapons provided in official documents dating from 1972 to 1979.

It seems to us that all the necessary conditions have been met for an agreement to be reached as soon as possible on the procedure to be followed. In view of the concern expressed by the General Assembly, Belgium would welcome the establishment of a working group. Its terms of reference would, of course, have to be carefully defined so that, at the present stage of the negotiations, it might make a positive contribution to the identification of the basic elements necessary for the

(Mr. Onkelinx, Belgium)

elaboration of a treaty. In addition, if the experiment of the two seminars held in 1979 in the United Kingdom and in the Federal Republic of Germany were to be repeated, the Belgian delegation would propose to its authorities the sending of one or more Belgian experts.

At its thirty-fourth session, the General Assembly unanimously requested the Committee on Disarmament to proceed as soon as possible to achieve agreement on the text of a convention prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons.

In the First Committee, Belgium stated that it would spare no effort to ensure that a final text was prepared at the present session of the Committee on Disarmament.

The agreed joint USSR-United States proposal on major elements of a treaty (CD/31) would provide a good point of departure for the rapid completion of the Committee's negotiations.

Although the General Assembly did not consider that topic to be of the highest priority, radiological weapons are potential weapons of mass destruction and, as the Belgian delegation stated in the First Committee at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, the proliferation of nuclear installations in all parts of the world makes this a topic requiring urgent consideration, because the radioactive waste produced by such installations is the raw material needed for the manufacture of radiological weapons.

In addition to the joint USSR-United States proposal, the Committee also has before it a draft preamble and draft text on the review and entry into force of the treaty. Belgium would like a working group to be set up to draft a treaty on the basis of these texts.

Since the signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Belgian delegation has always taken part in the exchanges of views relating to guarantees of the security of the non-nuclear-weapon States.

Although Security Council resolution 255 (1968) of 19 June 1968 was a step in the right direction, subsequent discussions have produced no results. At the Committee's last session, the Belgian delegation welcomed the decision to include that question in the programme of work. Although the preliminary search for areas of agreement and disagreement in the Ad Hoc Working Group presided over by our

(Mr. Onhelinx, Belgium)

Egyptian colleague confirmed the complexity of the topic, it also led to a recommendation that negotiations should continue at the present session.

Work on this question at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly was disappointing because three resolutions, which could be described as competitive, were put to the vote, but no consolidated text was prepared and no further progress was made on this question.

At the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly, several nuclear-weapon States made unilateral declarations which were, in themselves, significant political acts.

The use of the procedure followed in the Security Council in 1968 in the case of resolution 255 is, obviously, a means of giving effect to such unilateral political acts.

At all events, fresh efforts must be made to find arrangements which take account of the diversity of the security requirements both of the non nuclear-weapon and of the nuclear-weapon States.

Belgium is prepared to take part in such efforts and would, if delegations so desired, be in a position to agree to the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Working Group set up at the last session.

The total stoppage of nuclear tests is one of the major demands of the international community; and, at its last session, the General Assembly reiterated its grave concern that nuclear-weapon testing continued unabated. It is a welcome fact that, starting at this session, all the States that are conducting tests are present in the Committee.

Nevertheless, until a dialogue is established between those States on this important problem, the Committee will follow with interest the negotiations being conducted by three of them.

The brief statement made in the Committee on 31 July 1979 by Ambassador Summerhayes, speaking on behalf of the three countries, showed that a broad measure of agreement had been reached on the basic principles, but that a solution was still being sought on verification procedures.

Apart from that statement and the very useful and important work carried out by the Ad Hoc Group of Seismic Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events -- a group in which Belgium plays

(Mr. Onkolinx, Belgium)

an active part -- the Committee did not hold any discussions in 1979, and the only specific contributions it received were three working papers relating to that seismological work.

We would have liked more substantial discussions to be held and the tripartite negotiations to be completed at the Committee's present session. We were happy to learn that these negotiations are to be resumed this week at Geneva.

Belgium continues to attach very great importance to the aim of stopping nuclear testing. It has always welcomed any efforts, even partial, made for that purpose.

It will closely follow developments in this field and support any procedural decision that might contribute to the positive outcome of the Committee's work.

Other matters will probably be discussed in the Committee, including the comprehensive programme of disarmament. The Italian delegation, moreover, has just submitted an interesting contribution on a subject which the Government of Belgium has always found to be of great interest, namely, the control and limitation of international arms transfers. As stated in the Italian working paper, the special session of the General Assembly included the question of conventional weapons in its programme of action. That question was also included in the agenda of the Committee's preceding session and Belgium would welcome any procedural decision that would enable the Committee to hold an in-depth discussion of that important topic, one aspect of which is dealt with in the Italian working paper.

I would not like to close without referring to a number of statements in which doubts were expressed about the willingness of the western countries to reach agreements on weapons control and disarmament in Europe.

Such assertions do not stand up to an analysis of the past 20 years of efforts and negotiations by the western countries in various places.

It is not without reason that, in recent years, these countries and, in particular, the European countries, have become concerned about the Soviet Union's enormous nuclear potential and the direct threat it poses to western Europe. These countries are mainly concerned about the steady and continuing build-up of Soviet long-range theatre nuclear weapons.

As a result of this build-up, a number of western countries decided on 12 December:

To carry out the necessary modernization of their long-range theatre nuclear weapons in order to restore the balance in that field; and

(Mr. Onkelinx, Belgium)

To make the Soviet Union an offer of negotiations for stabilizing that balance at the lowest possible level; the western countries clearly stated that they intended to take account of the outcome of those negotiations in the implementation of their modernization plan.

The components of this western negotiating offer, which takes account of the proposals made by President Brezhnev on 6 October 1979 and by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Warsaw Treaty countries on 6 December, were solemnly confirmed on 25 January, despite an initial refusal by the Soviet Union several days earlier.

Accordingly, NATO has set up an ad hoc consultative group on the limitation of theatre nuclear forces. The terms of reference of this group are to promote negotiations on such nuclear weapons between the United States and the Soviet Union and to ensure the closest allied co-operation during the holding of such negotiations. As we have done in the past, we urge the Soviet Union to reduce the number, and halt the production and use, of its new long-range theatre nuclear weapons.

I should also like to recall the unilateral initiative we took on 12 December 1979 to withdraw 1,000 United States nuclear warheads from Europe.

As I have just stated, the western countries made new proposals, in December, at the Vienna negotiations, to simplify the first phase of the agreements under consideration and to implement related measures designed, inter alia, to ensure verification of the agreement and build confidence in it.

These countries also undertook to give fresh impetus to the preparations for the Madrid meeting on co-operation and security in Europe by, for example, seeking to expand the confidence-building measures provided for in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference and to intensify disarmament efforts in Europe.

This does not seem to correspond to any alleged unwillingness to disarm. It is important that all the parties concerned should demonstrate increased willingness to work, at the European level, towards meaningful disarmament and arms-control measures. Such an attitude would have a favourable influence on the international climate, and thus improve our Committee's chances of a successful session.

Mr. VOUTOV (Bulgaria): May I first of all pay to you the sincere respects of the Bulgarian delegation and wish you a very successful chairmanship of the Committee on Disarmament for the month of February. I would also like to congratulate you on your appointment as head of the Canadian mission and to voice my conviction that the co-operation between our missions will continue in the spirit of the friendly relations between our two countries. We are pleased to note the presence of Mr. Pearson, Counsellor for Disarmament and Arms Control of the Canadian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

I avail myself of this opportunity to welcome the newly-appointed heads of the delegations of Algeria, Belgium, China, Hungary, Japan and Zaire. It is a pleasure to greet the new Assistant Secretary-General for Disarmament, Mr. Jan Martenson, as well as the Personal Representative of the Secretary-General and Secretary of the Committee on Disarmament, Ambassador Jaipal.

The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria approaches the present session of the Committee with a determination to contribute to the elaboration of concrete and effective measures for halting the arms race and for disarmament. Our peace-loving policy is founded on our attachment to the process of détente, the struggle for strengthening peace and international security, the deepening of international co-operation and the promotion of confidence and understanding. This is not a short-term policy, this is a policy guided by firm principles, stemming from the very nature of our socialist system. The First Secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party and President of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, stated recently:

"... As a socialist State ... we have a hundred reasons to strive for peace and struggle for peace throughout the world, and we have not a single reason to wish for tensions in the international situation, suspicion, hostility, 'cold' or 'hot' wars between nations. That is precisely why we put in efforts to the extent of our possibilities and work for the strengthening and deepening of détente with a view to turning it into an irreversible process. That is precisely why we put in efforts and work for real progress in the field of disarmament and in favour of building up a mutually advantageous international co-operation."

The past decade has been characterized by a steady, positive development of international relations. Due to the favourable conditions created by ongoing détente, a number of disarmament agreements have been concluded. The negotiations

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

in our Committee and in several other organs and forums, notably the special session on disarmament, played no small role in this regard. Of special importance were the agreements reached at the Soviet-United States summit meeting in Vienna in June last year, particularly the signing of the SALT II Treaty. The deliberations and the negotiations on a number of concrete disarmament issues held at the bilateral, trilateral and multilateral levels not only permitted a thorough clarification of the participants' positions but also led to bringing closer than ever their views on several questions.

Naturally, such significant achievements cannot be but the result of joint efforts by all interested parties. Nevertheless, we believe that we are entitled to single out the remarkable contributions of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, whose initiatives and untiring efforts were and continue to be an engine and a catalyst in the service both of promoting international relations and of curbing the arms race and achieving disarmament agreements. We pay a tribute at the same time to the important positive role of the non-aligned States and to realistically-minded circles in the west.

The initiatives of the socialist countries I mentioned above are well known to our Committee -- some of them have laid the foundation for issues we are to discuss at this session, such as the cessation of production of nuclear weapons, security guarantees for non-nuclear States, the total ban on and elimination of, chemical weapons, etc. The socialist countries were initiators of the Conference on European Security and Co-operation, which played a historic role in turning our continent into a cradle of détente and an example for peaceful relations between States with different social systems. The socialist countries came forward with a number of proposals on strengthening the spirit of Helsinki. On 6 October last year, the President of the USSR, L.I. Brezhnev, announced major new proposals and measures of the Soviet Union aimed at military détente and disarmament in Europe, including negotiations on medium-range nuclear missiles and a unilateral reduction of Soviet troops and effectives in the German Democratic Republic, as well as a number of confidence-building measures. At the session of the Foreign Ministers' Committee of the Warsaw Treaty held in Berlin on 5-6 December, the socialist countries came forward with a whole range of measures for deepening military détente and strengthening mutual security. To this end a proposal was made to convene a Conference on a political level dedicated to military détente and disarmament in Europe. All those initiatives form a large-scale peace programme that has won the respect and the recognition of public opinion and peace-loving forces around the world.



(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

Unfortunately, and not through the socialist countries' fault, the world is facing now a complicated international situation. Contributory to this are a number of factors which work in the direction of undermining confidence between States and bringing in confrontations. It is with deep concern that we received NATO's decision to deploy new United States medium-range missiles in western Europe, which created conditions for upsetting the existing balance of forces in Europe and in the world, and destroyed the basis for the negotiations proposed by the Soviet Union. Regrettably, this is not the only step laying the ground for a new spiral in the arms race. We are witnessing an unjustified increase in the military budgets in some western countries coupled with military preparations absolutely incompatible with the interests of peace and international security.

To explain the present difficulties, some of the preceding speakers tried to invoke the events in Afghanistan. Those events were also used as a pretext for postponing indefinitely the ratification of the SALT II Treaty, for suspending disarmament negotiations in certain areas, etc. The fanning up of the so-called Afghanistan question and its introduction in the United Nations and other international forums, combined with sabre-rattling, are meant to justify the policy of confrontation in Europe and in the whole world, promoted by certain well-known circles in the west.

The Bulgarian delegation had no intention to tackle the developments in Afghanistan because they are totally outside the Committee's mandate. Discussion on them is not going to contribute to the successful implementation of the tasks facing us. But in view of the developments here we feel compelled to make briefly the following points: It is the position of the Bulgarian Government, that the dispatch of a limited contingent of Soviet troops to Afghanistan at the request of the Afghan Government with a view to helping in the repulsion of aggressive activities from abroad is a completely lawful action, based on a bilateral Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation concluded by Afghanistan and the USSR in December 1978 and stems from the right of each State, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, to individual or collective self-defence -- a right that other States have exercised many times.

In taking such a stand, the Bulgarian Government had in mind that in April 1978 a revolution took place in Afghanistan. The people of that country took their destiny into their own hands and embarked on the road of independence and freedom. But from the very first days of the revolution they encountered gross foreign interference in

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

the country's internal affairs, and preparation for external aggression. In effect, an undeclared war was launched against revolutionary Afghanistan, because of which the Afghan leadership repeatedly asked the Soviet Union for assistance.

As is well known, both the Soviet and the Afghan Governments have declared that the only task of the Soviet contingents is to aid in repulsing the aggression from outside, and that they will be withdrawn from Afghanistan completely once the reasons for the Afghan leadership's request for military assistance disappear.

An analysis of the facts indicates that the deterioration of the international situation is not caused by the events in Afghanistan, but rather by trends in certain western countries which emerged long before them as a result of the activation of the adversaries of détente and their policy of provoking a new course of armaments. Now, it is imperative for all people who cherish peace and co-operation in the world to work for the prevention of a new round in the escalation of the arms race, to work for the stabilization and multiplication of the positive results achieved in the process of the reduction of tension and international co-operation.

Many delegations noted the fact that we are beginning the work in this session in full membership. The world public has awaited for quite some time to see the People's Republic of China taking its seat in this Committee, being aware that without China it is not possible to solve a number of disarmament problems, particularly in the nuclear field. At the same time we could not hide our disappointment with the opening speech of the head of the Chinese delegation. It is disturbing to see that the well-known positions of the present Chinese leadership, openly bent on undermining détente and increasing tensions in the world, should be presented to this forum, which has nothing to gain from going into fruitless discussions. This approach could only lead to deteriorating the business-like atmosphere of this Committee.

The Bulgarian delegation fully shares the views expressed in the message of the Secretary-General of the United Nations as well as in the statements of many delegations that in the present situation Governments should make even greater efforts than before to keep the momentum and the scope of disarmament negotiations and even try to increase them in accordance with the aspirations of humanity. The responsibility of the CD has grown even more because the Committee is to contribute now to the elimination of the artificial barriers put up on the road towards effective disarmament negotiations and to make further progress on those which are at an advanced stage for solution.

The resolutions of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly also call on the Committee for energetic action in favour of peace and disarmament.

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

Which, in my delegation's opinion, are the major issues that the CD should concentrate upon during its 1980 session?

Nuclear disarmament measures should undoubtedly occupy a central place in our work. In 1979 the Committee carried out a serious discussion on the initiative of the socialist countries to start negotiations on the cessation of production of all types of nuclear weapons and the gradual reduction of their stockpiles until their total destruction. Now, with all the five nuclear Powers participating in the Committee, the immediate beginning of consultations to clear the way to the negotiations in accordance with resolution 34/83 J seems greatly facilitated. We fully understand that the Committee faces an extraordinarily difficult task, but this is yet another reason to start as soon as possible the efforts to find, step by step, the appropriate solutions.

Another important question in the field of nuclear weapons that seems ripe for dealing with is the strengthening of the security guarantees of the non-nuclear-weapon States. The wide exchange of ideas within the framework of the Ad Hoc Working Group and in the Committee itself confirmed this in a convincing way. The debate on this question at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly indicated once again that the overwhelming majority is in favour of the elaboration of a legally binding international instrument on negative security guarantees, and that practically no one is opposed to the elaboration of a convention in this field. As to our delegation, we maintain our position, that to reach the goal it is necessary to embark upon the task of drawing up appropriate draft conventions. This view is reflected in resolution 34/84 of the last General Assembly session, adopted upon the initiative of Bulgaria and several other States. We consider that, given the necessary political will and the basis of the two draft conventions presented to it earlier, this task could be successfully carried out even during the present session of the Committee.

The issue of a general and comprehensive test ban continues to be one of the most important tasks facing the Committee on Disarmament. The years-long efforts, to which the socialist countries contributed in a concrete way, have yielded no results so far. In recent years the Soviet Union made a number of important constructive steps with a view to overcoming the obstacles to a final agreement in the trilateral negotiations on this issue. In our opinion the conditions for solving this complex problem are at hand. Hence, it is necessary that all interested parties display a constructive approach and political will. We hope that the coming new round of

(Dr. Vozdev, Bulgaria)

negotiations will complete its work successfully, thus opening the way for an early elaboration within the Committee on Disarmament of the instruments awaited by all peoples.

This year the attainment of concrete progress in the above areas acquires additional meaning in connexion with the forthcoming Review Conference of the NPT. Each success in this field is at the same time a factor strengthening this important Treaty and the whole system of measures aimed at preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and at decreasing the danger of nuclear war.

Now that the opening of this review conference is forthcoming, we would like to mark the positive fact that a number of States have recently adhered to the NPT, which brings us another step closer to its complete universalization. On the other hand, however, we cannot but take account of the fact that reverse tendencies continue to persist in some regions of the world. Characteristic examples are South Africa and Israel, which, regardless of all United Nations condemnations, keep on working for the introduction of nuclear weapons in Africa and in the Middle East. Having in mind the aggressive policies of those two States, there can be no doubt that all measures should be taken in order to avert these dangerous tendencies. In this connexion certain circles in the west should consider once again the responsibility which they take in assisting the practical realization of the nuclear ambitions of Pretoria and Tel Aviv.

Now I would like to touch briefly on two other questions related to other weapons of mass destruction.

The detailed statement on the course of the bilateral negotiations on chemical weapons made at the end of the last year's session indicated that real progress in a number of areas had been achieved and that, given the necessary will, the efforts for a final elaboration of a joint draft can be crowned with success. In this connexion we share the considerations of the Polish delegation in favour of priority deliberations on this question.

The hope for solving the problem of a radiological weapons ban at this very session are well founded. We know that this is not the most pressing problem of disarmament, but the elaboration of an appropriate convention on the basis of the joint Soviet-United States document and the additional documents submitted by Hungary and the German Democratic Republic would contribute to maintaining the image of our Committee as an effective organ for disarmament negotiations, would have a favourable effect on the general improvement of the atmosphere and on reaching progress on other issues facing the Committee.

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

We have also to deal with the general problem of a ban on new weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. In the opinion of our delegation, we should continue this year with the help of experts the efforts to find a mutually acceptable way of solving this problem, whose urgency increases with each passing year.

Finally, I would like to express my agreement with those speakers who expressed themselves in favour of a quick solution to the procedural and organizational questions, so that we could proceed promptly to a businesslike discussion and negotiations. We are facilitated in our efforts because during the last year we succeeded in laying a solid organizational foundation for our activities. On the issue of this year's session agenda, a consensus seems to be emerging on the basis of the last session's agenda.

We agree with a wide application of the method of creating special working groups in order to facilitate the negotiations on concrete questions for which conditions are ripe for solution. It is necessary, however, that the mandates of these groups should be clearly defined, thus assisting the achievement of the above-mentioned goal.

As far as the programme of work is concerned, we shall support any suggestion which has in mind the necessity for a detailed consideration of all items on the agenda. The members of our delegation will participate in other meetings of important forums on disarmament coinciding with this Committee's session, and this naturally should also be taken into account.

The Bulgarian delegation will do all that is in its capabilities to assist in keeping a businesslike atmosphere in the Committee and in reaching real progress in the solution of the vital issues facing us.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Bulgaria for his statement and for the kind words addressed to me. That completes the list of speakers inscribed for this afternoon. Does any other delegation wish at this point to take the floor? If not, I would like to return for a couple of minutes to my comments late this morning, about the conduct of our work for the next two business days.

After consultation, and I trust it was reasonably complete and full, I would like to put to you a firm proposal which I believe to be acceptable. We should meet informally next on Monday morning at 11.30. That will allow us, between now and Monday, time for consultation on the work programme. That consultation process has begun, but more is needed. As I say, I think on Monday we could then have some

(The Chairman)

general statements of positions on the work programme. We have already had some indications today of the positions of certain representatives. We would then anticipate concluding our meeting for Monday at one o'clock, and I think probably, we will want some further time then for reflection. So, I would not, at least at this stage, propose that we meet Monday afternoon. Instead, there are already seven speakers inscribed for the plenary on Tuesday, 12 February. Accordingly, I would propose to the Committee that we hold two plenary meetings on that date, at 10.30 a.m. and at 3.30 p.m. The second plenary that day (in the afternoon) could, if conditions are appropriate and time permits, be followed by a resumption of the informal meeting. We could take the temperature, find the state of progress of our discussions on the work programme. So, I put those two firm proposals to you. First, that we meet on Monday at 11.30 as an informal meeting of the Committee to discuss the work programme. Secondly, that we meet on Tuesday at 10.30 and 3.30 in plenary, and if need be, and time permits, continue that afternoon in informal session.

Are those two proposals acceptable to the members of the Committee? If there are no objections, then we shall proceed in that manner.

I have one other item of business. The Group of 21 had intended to meet on Monday at 10.30, and they have asked that we make known that their intention now would be to meet here, in this room at 10 o'clock. In respect for their session, we may have to allow for a slight delay, but I would urge them to help the rest of us to the extent possible, by agreeing to permit the Committee itself to begin at 11.30 or as close to that as possible. If there are no comments, the next plenary meeting of the Committee will be held on Tuesday, 12 February, at 10.30.

This meeting stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.