

CD/PV.59
14 February 1980

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIFTY-NINTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 14 February 1980, at 10.00 a.m.

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

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. A. BENYAHIA
Mr. S. BENDJABALLAH

Argentina: Mr. A. DUMONT
Mr. C.A. PASSALACQUA

Australia: Sir James PLIMSOLL
Mr. A. BEHŪ
Mrs. M. WICKES

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

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

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. B. GRINBERG
Mr. I. SOTIROV
Mr. P. POPCHEV
Mr. K. PRANOV

Burma: U SAW HLAING
U NGWE WIN

Canada: Mr. D.S. McPHAIL
Mr. G.A.H. PEARSON
Mr. J.T. SHIARD

China: Mr. YU Pei-Win
Mr. YANG Hu-Shan
Mr. LIANG De-Fen
Mr. YANG Hing-Liang
Mr. PAN Zhen-Qiang
Mr. XU Liu-Gen

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

Czechoslovakia: Mr. M. RŮŽEK
Mr. P. LUKES^V
Mr. E. ZÁPOTOCKÝ
Mr. J. JIRŮSEK^{OV}

Egypt: Mr. O. EL-SHAFEI
Mr. M. EL-BARADEI
Mr. N. FAHMY

Ethiopia: Mr. T. TERREFL
Mr. F. YOHANNES

France: Mr. M. COUTHURES

German Democratic Republic: Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. H. GRACZYNSKI
Mr. KAULFUSS

Germany, Federal Republic of: Mr. G. PFEIFFER
Mr. H. MÜLLER

Hungary: Mr. I. KÖLLIVES
Mr. C. GYÖRFFY
Mr. A. LAKATOS

India: Mr. S. SARAN

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

Iran: Mr. D. AMERI

Italy: Mr. V. CORDERO DI MONTEZEMOLO
Mr. M. IORENC
Mr. C. FRATESCHI
Mr. F. DE LUCA

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

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

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

Mongolia: Mr. D. ERDENBILEG

Morocco: Mr. H. CHRAIBI

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

Nigeria: Mr. O. ADENIJI
Mr. T.O. OLUMOKC

Pakistan: Mr. A.A. HASHMI

Peru: Mr. F. VALDIVIESO BELAÚNDE
Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO

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

Romania: Mr. T. IIELESCANU

Sri Lanka: Mr. I.B. FONSEKA
Miss M.L. NAGANATHAN

Sweden: Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. L. NORBERG
Mr. S. STRÖMBÄCK

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN
Mr. V.I. USTINOV
Mr. A.I. TIOURENKOV
Mr. E.K. POTYARKIN

United Kingdom: Mr. D. SUMNERHAYES
Mr. N.H. MARSHALL

United States of America: Mr. A.S. FISHER
Mr. A. AKALOVSKY
Mr. H. SANCHES
Mr. P. SALGADO
Mr. J. CALVERT
Mr. M. DALEY

Venezuela: Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT
Mrs. R. HUGICA DE ADAMES

Yugoslavia: Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIĆ

Zaire:

Secretary to the Committee on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General: Mr. R. JAIPAL

Mr. EL-SHAFEI (Egypt) (translated from Arabic): It gives me great pleasure to talk to you today in Arabic, on the occasion of its use for the first time as a working language of the Committee on Disarmament. The use of the Arabic language in the United Nations Committees concerned with matters of disarmament, and in particular in this Committee, enables Arab readers to acquaint themselves with the activities of those bodies and to follow their progress.

At the beginning of my speech, I would like to express to you, Mr. Chairman, the full satisfaction of my delegation at your assuming the chairmanship of the Committee during the month of February. Your acknowledged competence and long experience are qualities which guarantee that your mission will be crowned with success. In this connexion, I would also like to extend my thanks to the Committee's former Chairman Ambassador U Saw Hlaing. The objective and constructive way in which he conducted the work of our Committee at a critical time is fully appreciated by my delegation. I feel it is perhaps my duty to present at the beginning of my speech my compliments to the delegation of the People's Republic of China on the occasion of its participation in the work of our Committee and on taking the seat reserved for its country. The opinion of my country has always been that the participation of all nuclear countries in the negotiations on disarmament is not only desirable but also necessary if such negotiations are to lead to universally applicable, effective and balanced results.

The delegation of my country would also like to present its compliments to the new heads of delegations, including ambassadors Salah-Bey of Algeria, Onkelinx of Belgium, Kómives of Hungary, Okawa of Japan and Kakwaka of Zaire, and to wish them every success in their work.

Perhaps you share my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that the meetings of our Committee are taking place at an extremely critical and delicate period. International détente is facing violent convulsions which threaten to undermine its foundations and those of international security. In view of the present tension in international relations, détente is going through a difficult testing period. The latest events and the resulting flagrant violations of international law, and of the provisions of the United Nations Charter relating to non-recourse to the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of States and to non-intervention in their internal affairs cannot be ignored or overlooked. If such acts continue, they could undermine the very foundations of international peace and security, violate the principles and bases of peaceful co-existence and international co-operation, and threaten human society with serious dangers. I

(Mr. El-Shafei, Egypt)

deem it important, in this regard, to call attention to paragraph 34 of the Declaration contained in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, which reads as follows:

"Disarmament, relaxation of international tension, respect for the right to self-determination and national independence, the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the strengthening of international peace and security are directly related to each other. Progress in any of these spheres has a beneficial effect on all of them; in turn, failure in one sphere has negative effects on others."

It is perhaps this realization of the close relationship, both in its positive and negative aspects, between disarmament and international peace and security which makes me hasten to say that our prime objective here, as seen by my delegation, would be to make an attempt to repair the damage and build confidence by adopting specific, prompt and effective measures in the field of disarmament.

This in the view of my country is the practical and realistic alternative available if we are to stem the tide of armaments and contribute to the efforts being made to maintain the strengthening of international peace and security. As well as exposing the fragile foundation on which international relations are based, recent events have revealed the need for taking prompt, concrete and essential measures in the field of disarmament.

Nuclear disarmament is perhaps one of the first subjects which presents itself for consideration owing to the threat posed by nuclear weapons to humanity and its very survival. Hence, it is natural and logical that the Final Document of the special session should provide that effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war have the highest priority. Accordingly, my country has endorsed the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its last session which requests the Committee on Disarmament to initiate, as a matter of high priority, negotiations, with the participation of all nuclear-weapon States, on the question of the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 50 of the Final Document, of the tenth special session, in view of the fact that the Committee on Disarmament is the most suitable forum for the preparation and conduct of such negotiations. The same resolution also requests the Committee to undertake preparatory consultations on such negotiations at its present session.

(Mr. El-Shafei, Egypt)

It is the belief of my delegation that such consultations should aim primarily at determining the requirements and elements of the negotiations as well as their scope, stages and time schedule. My delegation is confident that the participation of the People's Republic of China in the work of our Committee has removed one of the main obstacles and paved the way for opening the negotiations on a practical and realistic basis.

Committed to the process of nuclear disarmament, my delegation cannot but express its deep concern at the developments in the international situation. One of their effects is the absence so far of any sign that the Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT II) is about to enter into force. We consider such agreements as a basic step and an essential condition for continued progress in the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union towards a concrete reduction and limitation of the quantity of strategic weapons and of their qualitative improvement. The delegation of my country, recalling the special responsibility in the field of nuclear disarmament assumed by the two States having the two most important nuclear-weapons arsenals, hopes that suitable conditions for enforcing the SALT agreements will be created very soon, and that negotiations on this subject will continue. It may be useful, in this context, to refer to what has been mentioned in the Joint Statement issued by the United States and the Soviet Union concerning subsequent negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms, which affirms that "early agreement on the further limitation and further reduction of strategic arms would serve to strengthen international peace and security and reduce the risk of outbreak of nuclear war".

My delegation considers it a duty to express its deep regret and frustration at the Committee's failure so far to open negotiations concerning an agreement on the total prohibition of nuclear tests in spite of the repeated requests made by the United Nations General Assembly at its successive sessions to give this subject the highest priority. It is unreasonable that the only alternative available to the Committee in this regard should be to stand by and await the outcome of the trilateral negotiations between the United States, Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, without being able to initiate multilateral negotiations on such an agreement, and without even knowing anything about the progress of the trilateral negotiations or the difficulties encountered in them. The perpetuation of such a situation, which

(Mr. El-Shafei, Egypt)

clearly disregards the demands made by the international community, is incompatible with the duties of the Committee to such an extent that is unacceptable, both politically and legally.

There is no doubt that non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is an essential basis for the efforts being made to put an end to the nuclear arms race and to achieve nuclear disarmament. My country considers that non-proliferation of nuclear weapons should be based on a delicate balance of responsibilities and duties of the nuclear Powers on the one hand and those of the non-nuclear Powers on the other. It is not sufficient to make efforts to prevent the emergence of new nuclear Powers. Such efforts must be combined with and must run parallel to a reduction of nuclear weapons aimed at eliminating them completely. The achievement of such a balance is an essential condition for the possibility of arriving at a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons of universal application. In addition, the nuclear Powers' continued development of their nuclear weapons both qualitatively and quantitatively, and the ever-present nuclear threat, raise serious doubts as to the justness of the request made to all the non-nuclear States to abandon the nuclear option, and as to the applicability of such a request. Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons should in no case mean violation of the free exercise by any State of its right to develop and implement its programmes for the peaceful use of nuclear energy for economic and social development according to its needs, interests and priorities.

In spite of my country's strong conviction that nuclear disarmament and the total elimination of nuclear weapons are the most effective safeguards against the danger of nuclear war and the use of nuclear weapons, we are equally strongly convinced that until such time as we have achieved this objective there are many measures to be taken and many agreements to be concluded, especially on the non-use of nuclear weapons and the prevention of a nuclear war.

The removal of the threat of a nuclear war is the most urgent task at the present time. On this occasion, I would like to call attention to the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session which calls on our Committee to take into consideration the views of States concerning the non-use of nuclear weapons, avoidance of nuclear war and related matters, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its next session. The time has come for eliminating the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons from the equation of the balance of

(Mr. El-Shafei, Egypt)

powers and theories of strategic superiority. My delegation cannot but emphasize that the nuclear Powers have the greatest responsibility in this respect.

Non-use of nuclear weapons is undoubtedly the most effective safeguard at the present stage for non-nuclear States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against them. Yet, until such an urgent demand is met, and as a first step, the nuclear Powers should be responsible for giving non-nuclear States effective international safeguards against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

I would like here to express the satisfaction of my delegation at the initiation of negotiations on this subject by our Committee. In spite of the short period of time at its disposal for starting negotiations, the ad hoc Working Group that was established to deal with this subject has nevertheless been able to achieve some limited progress. In particular, I would like to underline the wide acceptance which has become apparent of the urgent need for reaching an agreement on effective international action to protect non-nuclear States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, and the necessity of continuing the search for a joint formula to be contained in a legally binding international document. My delegation has noted with satisfaction that there is no objection in principle to the idea of concluding an international treaty in this connexion, since that, in my delegation's view, is the most suitable legal form for obtaining such safeguards. The reconstitution of the Working Group, with a clearer and more accurate definition of the powers to be delegated to it, would be the most appropriate way of continuing negotiations on this subject.

The failure to remove tension from our area and the continuation of the acute confrontation between the conflicting Powers emphasize more than even before the need for making security arrangements and taking measures to achieve disarmament at the regional level, and confirm our conviction of the rightness of our previous affirmations of that need. Besides being a positive contribution to the efforts to achieve universal disarmament, such security arrangements and a major step in the process of building confidence in the area, such as would constitute an important element in the process of reaching a peaceful and durable settlement of most of the problems existing there.

(Mr. El-Shafei, Egypt)

The problems of the Middle East should under no circumstances be used as a pretext for introducing nuclear weapons into the region. Such a measure, if taken, would result in aggravating and complicating the existing problems to an extent which it is difficult accurately to determine, and in sabotaging all the efforts aimed at a settlement of those problems. The existing differences and the danger of widening them should rather give an additional impetus to the search for proper security arrangements to ensure the non-introduction of nuclear weapons into the area.

On this basis and with this realization in mind, Egypt has for some years supported efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Such a step has been endorsed by the international community in paragraph 63 (d) of the Final Document of the special session, which provides that pending the achievement of that objective the States of the region should solemnly declare that they will refrain on a reciprocal basis from producing, acquiring or in any other way possessing nuclear weapons and nuclear explosive devices and from permitting the stationing of nuclear weapons on their territory by any third party, and agree to place all their nuclear activities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. At the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, the international community emphasized this request, with the approval of all States except Israel. There is no doubt that Israel's refusal is new evidence of its intransigent policies and inflexible stand, which constitute a stumbling-block to compliance with the request for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Israel's policy of refusing to accede to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and to place its nuclear activities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards, could expose the entire area to unlimited dangers. In view of this stand taken by Israel, it was natural that the United Nations General Assembly should review its request to all States to put an end to any co-operation with Israel which may assist it in acquiring and developing nuclear weapons. The General Assembly also called on all States to take all necessary measures to prevent the transfer to Israel of fissionable material and nuclear technology. On the other hand, the General Assembly condemned any attempt by Israel to manufacture, acquire, store or test nuclear weapons or introduce them into the Middle East.

Egypt is awaiting with great interest the study which the General Assembly has commissioned the United Nations Secretary-General to prepare on Israel's nuclear armament.

(Mr. El-Shafci, Egypt)

In pursuance of the same policy and with the same considerations in mind, Egypt has adopted, in conjunction with the African States, the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. This Declaration dates back to the summit meeting of the Organization of African Unity held in July 1964, which my country had the honour to host. The latest rumours that the racist régime of South Africa has carried out a nuclear explosion and its continuing close co-operation with Israel and other States in the field of nuclear armament cause my country to feel gravely concerned at such developments and to denounce them in view of the direct threat they pose to international peace and security in general and to the security of the African States in particular, and of their effect on the proliferation of nuclear armaments. We therefore call on all countries to adhere to and respect the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

In this context, I would like to refer briefly to the Egyptian proposal to make the Red Sea a peace zone. This proposal is based on the principle of reaching a formula for joint work and co-operation with the countries overlooking the Red Sea, and for establishing and ensuring security in that area. In addition, the proposal is aimed at keeping the Red Sea free from nuclear weapons and foreign military bases, and out of the conflicts of the Superpowers, their show of strength and military parades.

These are some of the initiatives taken by Egypt with regard to disarmament issues and security measures which have a direct bearing on its national interests and which stem from its deep conviction of the importance of making security arrangements and of taking disarmament measures at a regional level. These issues will be dealt with once again when the Committee discusses the items relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament and to the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

Our interest in measures of nuclear disarmament does not diminish our interest in other areas of disarmament. The total and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all kinds of chemical weapons, and their destruction, are one of the most urgent measures of disarmament. Egypt has stressed more than once at the previous session of the Committee that the time has come for the Committee to start negotiations on a draft agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons on a high-priority basis and in compliance with the General Assembly's request in this connexion. The bilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States should complement those taking place in the Committee, and should be conducted in

(Mr. El-Shafei, Egypt)

co-ordination with them rather than impede them. The delegation of my country still holds the conviction expressed by it last year and shared by the Group of 21 as to the need for establishing a working group to start negotiations immediately. The fairly detailed report on the progress of the bilateral talks which was submitted to the Committee last year, and the points of view exchanged on the subject, clearly showed the need for and the possibility of starting negotiations within a working group. Although the Committee could not reach a consensus on this proposal at the last session, in spite of the increasing support given to it by a large number of members, we still believe that the establishment of a working group at this session is a basic and necessary condition for achieving any progress toward reaching an international agreement on the total and effective prohibition of the development and production of chemical weapons, and on the destruction of stockpiles.

As to weapons of mass destruction, the Soviet Union and the United States submitted at the Committee's last session, as you know, a joint proposal on major elements of a treaty prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons. Like most delegations, we asked for enough time in which to give the proposal the serious consideration it required. My delegation is willing to start negotiations on the above draft treaty at the present session, with a view to reaching agreement on its text. In spite of our conviction that an agreement on the prohibition of any existing or potential kind of weapon would be a major achievement and a step in the right direction, we hope that negotiations on such an agreement would not be at the expense of agreements on the priority items on the Committee's agenda or an excuse for postponing them. We also hope that the joint proposal submitted by the United States and the Soviet Union would be a prelude to other joint initiatives concerning the weapons stored in military arsenals.

General and complete disarmament under effective international control will always remain the ultimate objective of the efforts of all States in the field of disarmament. In this context, the General Assembly has entrusted our Committee with the task of initiating at the present session negotiations on the comprehensive programme of disarmament, the elements of which have been defined by the Disarmament Commission.

(Mr. El-Shafei, Egypt)

In the hope that the Committee will complete its work before the start of the second special session devoted to disarmament, and without going into details of the various elements of the Comprehensive Programme, I would like to mention some of the basic principles governing our position, which we share with the rest of the delegations of the non-aligned countries. These are:

- (1) The comprehensive programme should consist of a series of comprehensive and coherent measures which could lead the international community towards general and complete disarmament.
- (2) The comprehensive programme should be implemented in stages, with an agreed time schedule for carrying out each stage. In the first stage, the arms race will be halted, and the process of real disarmament will then begin.
- (3) The comprehensive programme must provide for establishing an agreed framework for sustained international action in the field of disarmament, including negotiations on concrete measures to be taken at all levels — bilateral, regional and international.
- (4) The United Nations must continue to play a leading role in studying, approving and implementing the comprehensive programme.

The present tension in international relations has reaffirmed the need for a disarmament committee and the role such a committee can play as a negotiating body representing the will of nations as a whole, which by virtue of its balanced composition and the powers vested in it is more capable than any other negotiating forum of taking the initiative and of giving impetus to sustained negotiations.

This leads me to speak about the role of our Committee as seen by my delegation and the Group of 21. The task of this Committee, considered in the light of the powers delegated to it by the international community, is to conduct, with the participation of all countries, real and concrete negotiations on measures for achieving disarmament. Its task should not be confined to holding general discussions, which by their very nature do not fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee as a negotiations body. Similarly, any negotiations proceeding outside the Committee should in no circumstances have the effect of obstructing the multilateral negotiations taking place in the Committee, but should rather support and supplement them. In addition, the participation of the Committee at all stages of negotiations on the items included in its agenda is governed by the principles of equality of the members, and by the realities of collective responsibility.

Mr. SHITEMI (Kenya): Mr. Chairman, allow me, on behalf of my delegation, to extend to you a warm welcome to the CD, both in your capacity as the new Canadian permanent representative to the United Nations in Geneva, and as Chairman of the Committee this month. We want to assure you of our full co-operation. At the same time I want to thank Ambassador U Saw Hlaing of Burma for the tact and consideration he showed in dealing with the affairs of the Committee during his tenure of the chair.

I would also like to take this opportunity to welcome warmly the delegation of the People's Republic of China to the Committee. China, as a permanent member of the Security Council and as a nuclear-weapon State, brings to the Committee wisdom and experience that will doubtless enhance the work of the Committee. I also extend a warm welcome to Ambassador A. Sallah-Bey of Algeria, Ambassador A. Onkelinx of Belgium, Ambassador Imre Kőmives of Hungary, Ambassador Yoshio Okawa of Japan and Ambassador Kalonji Kakwaka of Zaire, who have recently joined the Committee. We also extend our gratitude to Ambassador Jaipal, Secretary and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General to this Committee and his efficient and hard-working team, who have shown considerable efficiency in helping to serve this Committee.

Humanity is at a crossroads, and the choices have been narrowed down to two: either we choose to develop détente and, through it, minimize mistrust and tension ushering in a period of peace and mutual trust, or take the path of intrigue, confrontation, arms build-up and war and the destruction of human life as we know it. This is the serious dilemma facing all nations, the degree of responsibility carried by each nation varying in accordance with how much destructive power it has at its disposal-- the more power you have the more superlative being the terms used to describe your status. We are at the stage of Superpowers and it looks as if we shall soon move up the ladder of destructive power to maxi-Superpower: those at the mini-Superpower base will then of course move up to assume the status of Superpowers. Those entrusted with the exercise of this power are only human, and some have in recent months shown quite clearly

(Mr. Shitemi, Kenya)

how they might use some of that power if provoked. The Kenyan Government has stated quite clearly its opposition to the military incursion into Afghanistan by one of the Superpowers -- this incursion into Afghanistan by the nation that for many years has always championed and consistently supported the cause of the oppressed people in Africa, has left many of us puzzled as to whether this incursion signals a definite change in that country's foreign policy. We are looking for reassurance and the best reassurance would be that country's immediate, total and unconditional withdrawal from Afghanistan.

We cannot pretend we can continue to deliberate on issues regarding disarmament without at the same time reflecting on the factors that lead nations to arm themselves. We in Africa are deeply concerned at the way the white minority Government of South Africa continues to ignore international opinion against the criminal policy of apartheid. This racist régime cannot be defended on any moral ground and yet, as I speak today, that country continues to arm feverishly, and it is feared that it might have exploded a nuclear device, thanks to the technical and economic support it continues to enjoy from certain countries in the world. When I addressed this Committee at its last summer session I referred to the evidence that a certain country with verification capacity had made available to the world about South Africa's intention to explode a nuclear weapon device in the Kalahari desert. Since then we have now been told by United States newspapers that in fact what appears to have been a nuclear weapon explosion took place on 22 September last year. What makes this very likely is the way South Africa behaved when the news of the alleged event was released by United States newsmedia. As soon as that news was released, South Africa flatly denied it. Within 24 hours South Africa had changed its story and was telling the world that there might have been an accident in a Russian submarine. The reaction of the United States to this was commendable for it discounted this possibility; nevertheless, it was intriguing that it took United States news media

(Mr. Shitemi, Kenya)

over a month to come up with the story. South Africa with or without a nuclear weapon is facing inevitable civil war of the worst kind. You cannot use a nuclear bomb in a situation like that, for the bitterest opponents of the apartheid system are within the country itself.

South Africa's attainment of nuclear capability will lead to the likelihood of an arms race, including the acquisition of nuclear capability by African States. They would be reacting to the realities of the technical as well as the political aspects of nuclear proliferation in that continent. When President Carter addressed the United Nations in 1977 he gave both these aspects of proliferation their due weight and he recognized the important moral connexion between efforts to stop the spread of atomic weapons and efforts at arms reduction, and I quote from his statement:

"We have little right to ask others to deny themselves nuclear weapons ... unless we can demonstrate meaningful progress toward the goal of control, then reduction and ultimately elimination of nuclear arsenals".

South Africa must be prevented from any further nuclear explosion adventure; if not, that would be the surest way to encourage proliferation in Africa. Within that decade of the 1970s, the manufacture of nuclear weapons escalated; this was reported to us by the able Under-Secretary of State Mrs. Inga Thorsson and I quote: "to summarize these disgusting statistics: a total of 421 nuclear explosions were reported during the 1970s, of which the Soviet Union made 191, the United States 154, France 55, China 15, the United Kingdom 5 and India 1."

Last year was easily one of the worst in this escalation of nuclear explosions. Reports from the Swedish Seismic Observatory showed 28 Soviet underground nuclear tests, 15 by the United States, 1 by the United Kingdom, none by China-- and we do hope China will keep that record-- and 9 by France-- a total of 53. That is more than one nuclear explosion every week for that whole year. This is a very gloomy prospect for humanity, for we are diverting desperately needed resources for economic development to manufacture those weapons of unimaginable destructive

(Mr. Shitemi, Kenya)

capacity. When my President, the Hon. Daniel Arap Moi was addressing a delegation of overseas businessmen in Nairobi recently, he said "If the colossal sums of money spent on armaments were used for the welfare of mankind, the world would be a paradise" (Standard, 23 January 1980). We must join all men of goodwill to bring about a better world for all.

The stockpiling of nuclear weapons as a deterrent would be convincing if we could explain why, even after it has become quite clear that the Superpowers have reached overkill a thousand times over they still continue to produce more terrible weapons. "It isn't important anymore to come out on top; what matters is to be the one who comes out alive" (B. Brecht - In the Jungle of Cities). The chances of being one who comes out alive have been reduced to almost zero, and if one lived through a holocaust one would count oneself most miserable, considering the quality of life one would lead under those conditions. Nature would be even more indifferent to the survival of the human species under those conditions.

Within this century the world has witnessed two wasteful and horrible world wars, both started in Europe, and since that time Europe has remained a continent with fewer incidences of war than any other continent. The fact that the highest concentration of armies and weapons in the world is in Europe is a real cause for alarm. We urge the countries involved to heed the call for disarmament and détente; the very survival of the human race depends on how they respond to this call.

I would now like to address myself to some items on our 1980 annual agenda. The urgency and importance of negotiating an international convention prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons was stressed by all members of this Committee last year. The only area of disagreement noticed was the method of work to bring about the desired convention. Those opposed to the formation of an ad hoc working group have not given us convincing enough reasons to persuade us to change our minds. The very idea of manufacturing these deadly weapons hatched, as it must have been, from hell itself is repugnant to say the least, and to find excuses and rationalizations placed in the way of negotiating a convention in an ad hoc working group, and thereby cause further delay, is disquieting.

(Mr. Shitemi, Kenya)

As distinguished delegates will recall, the Committee on Disarmament established, for the duration of its second part of the 1979 annual session, an Ad Hoc Working Group open to all States members of the Committee to consider and negotiate on international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The Ad Hoc Working Group met under the chairmanship of the delegation of Egypt and although it did not have much time available to it, it managed to begin consideration of some of the elements to be included in international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. We would like to see further efforts made in this area, and would support a move or the Committee's decision to set up an ad hoc working group for its 1980 session to continue the consideration of this item.

For the past several years, the comprehensive nuclear test ban has been the subject of intensive discussion both at the United Nations General Assembly and in several other international forums. Although this Committee attaches the highest priority to the question of a nuclear test ban, a review of the Committee's consideration of the item during its 1979 annual session clearly shows that the Committee was unable to make much progress. We all know where the problem lies. 1979 was a frustrating year for those delegations who left their capitals with high hopes of reporting some progress in this area. And although the annual session ended without much progress, we have, once again, come with high hopes of making some progress, and it is our wish and hope that this year the Committee's report to the General Assembly will show positive achievements in at least some areas of our negotiations.

As we all know, the Second Review Conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty is just a few months away. Given the importance of preventing, or at least slowing down, nuclear weapon proliferation, this Conference will be a crucial event in the field of disarmament. This Conference, like the first one, is intended to review the operation of the Treaty, with a view to ensuring that the purposes of the preamble and the provisions of the Treaty, as well as the recommendations of the Treaty, and the recommendations of the First Review Conference are being realized. The Final

(Mr. Shitemi, Kenya)

Declaration of the First Review Conference confirmed that articles I and II, relating specifically to the objective of averting the further proliferation of nuclear weapons, had been faithfully observed by all parties to the Treaty. But much concern has been expressed about the failure of the nuclear-weapon States to meet their obligations under article VI of the Treaty. While we appreciate the conclusion of SALT II, the implementation of this is temporary. We nevertheless feel that the agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States does not satisfy the obligations under article VI of the Treaty. The SALT II agreements are not a disarmament measure as their provisions do not provide for a substantial reduction of nuclear arsenals.

I raise these issues because my delegation is deeply concerned about the inability of the international community to make even moderate progress in the field of nuclear disarmament. This Committee cannot afford to spend another year deliberating instead of negotiating. We must concentrate our efforts on those items on which we consider it possible to achieve concrete results. My delegation is of the view that, if the Committee is determined and if the nuclear-weapon States are sincere in their pronouncements, it is possible to negotiate and make some concrete progress, particularly in the areas of chemical and radiological weapons. We are also convinced that this Committee can hope to make further progress in the discussion of a comprehensive test ban treaty. But this is possible only with the co-operation of the nuclear-weapon States, particularly the two Superpowers.

The nuclear-weapon States should clearly commit themselves to reversing the nuclear arms race. They should start fulfilling their part of the NPT obligation by halting nuclear weapon tests, as well as undertaking to reduce their nuclear armaments, both strategic and tactical, by significant amounts, and stopping or slowing down the qualitative improvement of these weapons.

The obligation not to assist others in the manufacture of nuclear weapons should apply not only to non-nuclear-weapon States, but to all States without exception. Exports of nuclear materials and equipment to non-nuclear-weapon States should also be subject to IAEA safeguards with a view to preventing their use for weapons purposes.

Mr. TERREFE (Ethiopia): The Ethiopian delegation wishes to extend its welcome to you as the new representative of Canada to the Committee on Disarmament and also to congratulate you on your assumption of the chairmanship of our Committee for this month. We wish you success in continuing the task of guiding the work of this Committee which you have so ably carried out since the beginning of this session. I would also like to welcome the distinguished representatives of Algeria, Belgium, Hungary, Japan and Zaire, who are participating here for the first time.

I also extend our appreciation to the outgoing Chairman, the Ambassador of Burma, for the excellent work he has done in the past month. We express appreciation also to Ambassador Jaipal, the Representative of the Secretary-General and the Secretary of this Committee, for his continued guidance in the work of our Committee.

The participation of all the nuclear-weapon States in the Committee on Disarmament is finally realized. My delegation, therefore, welcomes the presence of the People's Republic of China and hopes that it will exercise its responsibility as a nuclear-weapon State and contribute to the Committee's work in a constructive and positive manner.

As we commence the work of our 1980 session we have before us many issues of an urgent nature. The United Nations General Assembly has, in various resolutions, requested the Committee to consider certain issues which are viewed to be of high priority. The difficulties of attaining the goals and objectives of these decisions constitute a challenge which we must all meet with determination and concerted action. My delegation, therefore, strongly shares the view expressed by many speakers at this session that this Committee must seriously begin to negotiate on the substantive issues and not spend too much of its time on procedural and deliberative questions. Our agenda is not an inventory of issues inscribed for some symbolic reason. After all, if we do not use this "negotiating machinery" effectively there would be less justification for its existence, and we would not make any meaningful headway in our task of disarmament. Therefore every effort needs to be made to initiate and continue the negotiating processes that would advance common solutions to the urgent issues that are before us.

The views of my Government on the main issues on our agenda are well known, and I shall refrain from repeating them at this time. However, I would like to state in general the overriding importance we attach to the six substantive items of the draft agenda, concerning which you, Mr. Chairman, and the Committee as a whole have been conducting a series of consultations, and on which we have nearly reached consensus. The question of a nuclear test ban, cessation of the nuclear arms race

(Mr. Terrefe, Ethiopia)

and nuclear disarmament, as well as chemical weapons should be tackled most urgently. On the question of the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, one cannot fail to mention South Africa's nuclear armament. I need hardly emphasize the grave threat it presents for international peace and security, and in particular to the African states. Perhaps the consequences may not be apparent to some of us now, but if we do not bring about immediate and effective measures against the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the unfortunate may happen.

My delegation does not wish here to dwell upon the shameful history of western collaboration with the racist régime of Pretoria in the manufacture and development of nuclear weapons. We voiced our concern in this Committee last year together with an overwhelming majority of States in connexion with document CD/17, and also at the United Nations with an over-all majority of States. The question is whether the racist régime of South Africa has the capability of developing and in fact, has already developed a capability for nuclear weapons. Regrettably, our fears have now begun to be confirmed. In view of South Africa's nuclear armament, the urgency of concluding a comprehensive test ban treaty becomes quite apparent. My delegation eagerly awaits the results of the tripartite negotiations between the United Kingdom, the United States and the USSR. Since the cessation of all nuclear-weapons tests is the concern of all nations, the three States cannot expect to continue with this present arrangement indefinitely.

I would like to quote briefly on the subject of disarmament from the message that the Ethiopian Organizing Committee for the Observance of United Nations Disarmament Week addressed to the United Nations Secretary-General. The message expresses the concern of the people and Government of Ethiopia regarding nuclear disarmament:

"The broad masses of the Ethiopian people who have gone through manifold trials and tribulations as victims of interventionist and aggressive wars which have entailed enormous sacrifices in life and destruction of property, fervently yearn for a world in which freedom, justice, equality and peace prevail. At this historic juncture of their revolution, they are stronger than ever before in their determination to exert every effort towards the achievement of the noble objective of disarmament. They are more than ever convinced that the security of nations and peoples can be best assured, not by a balance of terror, but rather by everyone's abiding commitment to uphold peace and stability.

"The armaments race is the very antithesis of mankind's aspirations for genuine peace and a creative life. With the ever-increasing stockpile of weapons of mass destruction, their sophistication and perfection, the very survival of mankind is at stake with each passing day. The prospects for establishing a new and just social and economic world become illusive, for this

(Mr. Terrefe, Ethiopia)

massive build-up of arms devours the diminishing natural resources brought to fruition by the sweat and labour of oppressed peoples and diverts staggering amounts of financial resources to destructive purposes that negate human life.

"We are very well aware of the difficulty and complexity involved in any process of disarmament. But the major stumbling block resides not in the technical problems that human integrity can overcome once the necessary political will is generated and becomes the determining factor. The major obstacle to disarmament is the policy of diktat adopted by those who pursue policies designed to stem the ever-rising tide of the forces of liberation struggling for freedom, equality, justice, democracy and socialism. Hence, the process of disarmament, is inextricably linked with the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, apartheid, hegemonism and expansionism."

As we move into the Second Disarmament Decade, the arms race shows no sign of abatement. On the contrary, we are currently witnessing an escalation of the arms build-up and the development of new doctrines and war strategies. The extent to which war preparations are being orchestrated is clearly illustrated by ominous developments which are taking place in many parts of the world.

The increased militarization of the Indian Ocean and the increasing number of military bases and facilities being established in adjacent regions by the United States, all of these should be viewed as a grave threat to international peace and stability and to the detriment of the process of détente and peaceful co-existence. Developing countries view this development with concern as they struggle for genuine independence, peace and democracy.

This manifestation of military power is designed partly to frustrate the process of change in some of the States in the region and to stifle their development. The aspirations of the people of the region who are seeking to attain political, economic and social progress in a climate of peace must be respected. It is our hope therefore, that all States will undertake to promote the objectives and purposes of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

It is evident from recent developments that fundamental changes are taking place in many parts of the world. Here we are speaking of peoples who are justly struggling against oppression, exploitation, racism, imperialism and expansionism. These countries are also defending and safeguarding their national unity and territorial integrity.

During our general debate, a number of speakers have made some reference to a particular international situation and they seem to have missed the undercurrents of these developments that I just mentioned. Without going into detail, I would only like to state the position of my delegation, that we do not share their characterization of the situation.

Mr. VALDIVIESO (Peru) (translated from Spanish): The delegation of Peru would first like to welcome you as the new Permanent Representative of Canada to the organizations of the United Nations system at Geneva and, at the same time, congratulate you on presiding over this important stage in the work of the Committee on Disarmament. Your country, which has, for many years, been involved in these negotiations, gives proof, in you, Mr. Chairman, of its unflagging concern for the achievement of positive and concrete results during these difficult discussions on general and complete disarmament.

Peru also notes with satisfaction the participation in the Committee's work of the People's Republic of China, which, as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, was anxiously awaited in this body. The presence of the People's Republic of China, a country which became a nuclear-weapon Power in only a few years and whose population is far larger than that of any other country in the world, is, in our opinion, of particular significance. China's participation in the Committee on Disarmament will increase the value of the contributions made with a view to securing tangible benefits from this exercise, which has, until now, been peripheral, and its international stature, combined with the individuality it has maintained and blended with the wisdom it has gained over the ages, will complete the international framework in which all the problems that constitute this pressing topic must be approached and, ultimately, solved.

The delegation of Peru would also like to extend a warm welcome to the representatives of Algeria, Belgium, Hungary, Japan and Zaire who have arrived in Geneva since our last session and are now taking part in the Committee's work. Our congratulations also go to Ambassador Saw Hlaing, the representative of Burma, for his able guidance of the Committee's work at its 1979 session.

Until the nuclear era, disarmament was a topic that was studied and discussed by countries on an individual and bilateral basis and by the Inter-Parliamentary Union, the Hague Conference held before the First World War, the League of Nations and specialized multilateral conferences held in the years between the First and Second World Wars. The untiring efforts made at the subregional, regional and international levels to establish a balance of conventional weapons were, however, overtaken and, I might add, nearly forgotten as a result of the development of the atomic bomb, which was decisive in putting an end to the Second World War.

(Mr. Valdivieso, Peru)

As a result of the cruel experience of Hiroshima, people began to have some idea of the real importance of disarmament which, until the development of nuclear energy, was regarded as an exercise in rhetoric because, in the final analysis, conventional weapons entailed very few risks for the population of the world as a whole.

The development of nuclear or atomic science paralleled that of science in general, but then gained in importance with the possibility of military conflicts generated by ultra-nationalistic claims to universal hegemony. That stage, which was the one that gave rise to the use of atomic weapons, was followed by an interlude lasting until the nuclear monopoly was broken. The nuclear parity established a few years later was unfortunately the result not only of scientific know-how, but also and, in particular, of antagonism of a political and philosophical nature. Two opposing ideas about most human activities clashed both from the theoretical point of view and from the military and, in particular, nuclear-power point of view.

It is out of that confrontation that the idea of nuclear disarmament grew. The term "nuclear disarmament" should be modified by the adjective "mental", because it is pointless to speak of disarmament if we cannot see any mutual respect among the nuclear-weapon Powers for the political, philosophical and economic ideas they advocate. Only recognition of the free will of every State to adopt a particular way of life and system of government will enable them and the non-nuclear-weapon States to co-exist peacefully. Accordingly, any attempt by either of the conflicting ideologies to subjugate, infiltrate or sabotage other régimes has implications for the topic with which we are dealing in our work. Disarmament is not an abstract idea or a pastime for theoreticians. It is the sequel to a cold, calculated and reciprocal confrontation between the two ideological currents which now divide the world and for which the most powerful nations stand.

The distinguished Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China rightly stated that it is pointless to speak of nuclear disarmament until those who possess nuclear power begin to disarm. The Committee on Disarmament may be the forum to which the results of disarmament achieved by the

(Mr. Valdivieso, Peru)

Superpowers come for final approval, but it is wishful thinking to believe that the solution to the problem of nuclear disarmament will be found in the Committee. Until the two Superpowers and the other nuclear-weapon States reach political understandings which ensure mutual respect and respect for the ideological, religious and economic beliefs of other States, the idea of disarmament will be nothing more than a mere abstraction, brilliant perhaps, but totally lacking in practical effect.

It is thus quite clear that national policies must not be subject to any factors other than those born, without foreign interference, of the will of the people. Indeed, any policy change that reflects any other will has the effect of increasing international tension. In this connexion, it should be stressed that all political doctrines are universal, that their authors come from many different countries, and that the practices they entail are not always suited to conditions in the countries that have adopted them. Hence the existence of what is known as "ideological pluralism" and the need to recognize the inviolability of States, to ensure respect for human rights -- that is to say, for awareness of national identity -- and to recognize that might does not make right. Until these principles are fully recognized at the international level, neither nuclear nor conventional disarmament will be possible. Military disarmament must first pass through the absolutely necessary stage of spiritual or conceptual disarmament.

As a logical consequence of what I have just said, I would like to add that the delegation of Peru, which is clearly non-aligned in the strictest sense of that term, considers it highly appropriate, or, if you like, practical, to deal with the topic of "effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", which are commonly known as "negative guarantees". General and complete disarmament, which led to the establishment of this Committee, should be the first topic with which it deals, but there is every indication that it will be the last. The main thing that must be understood and borne in mind by the nuclear-weapon States is that their power of destruction should not be used to subjugate or threaten the rest of mankind. After all, the very small number of nuclear-weapon States cannot arrogate

(Mr. Valdivieso, Peru)

to themselves the right to act as supreme judges with power of life and death over the rest of mankind. The existence of more than 140 nations cannot be subordinated to the desire for power of any one country or ideology. We consider it essential rapidly to elaborate a convention on this topic to guarantee the security of the vast majority of nations and their safety from the destruction that may be caused by a nuclear conflagration.

If I have referred first to the topic of "negative guarantees", it is because I think that the nuclear-weapon Powers should have no objection to it, unless, of course, one of them has insane and hidden aspirations for power. If that is in fact the case, this Committee should, for that very reason, be the forum in which this is made clear, the world court in which a clear idea is given of the gloomy prospects faced by mankind eagerly trying to stay alive, procreate and improve its standard of living.

We consider that only if we are surrounded by such guarantees against the threat of use of nuclear weapons will we be able to sit down at a table to discuss topics that affect mankind as a whole. The non-nuclear-weapon States members of this Committee have assumed the responsibility of looking after the security interests of the other countries in the same position, and their participation in the Committee's work would be futile if it was limited only to discussions of aspects of disarmament which are, in the last resort, beyond their control. What this implies is not any lack of interest in such aspects, but, rather, an accommodation to what is permissible and feasible at this point in the dialogue with the Superpowers.

The fact that negative security guarantees are considered as a vital and, therefore, priority matter by non-nuclear weapon and non-aligned countries like ours, which are in the majority, in no way implies any lessening of our support for the position of the Group of 21, of which Peru is a member, with regard to the Committee's programme and timetable of work. We are accordingly of the opinion that the highest chronological priority should be given in the programme of work to the question of a nuclear test ban. In this connexion, the view expressed by the General Assembly merely reflects the international community's impatience with the slow progress being made in the tripartite negotiations, on which scant information has been made available to this negotiating body. We express the

(Mr. Valdivieso, Peru)

hope that China's membership in the Committee on Disarmament, like that of France last year, will have a catalytic effect on the tripartite efforts that are being made and enable us to proceed through the mechanism of a working group, to the substantive consideration of a draft convention.

In this same vein, we consider that, once a ban on all nuclear weapon tests is well on its way to being achieved, we should focus, without delay, on another of the substantive problems on which neither vertical nor horizontal progress has been made, namely, the cessation of the nuclear armaments race and nuclear disarmament. In view of the commitments made in more than one arms limitation treaty and, in particular, in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the nuclear-weapon Powers have an outstanding debt to the international community.

Once we have focused on the priority topic of negative guarantees through the establishment of an ad hoc working group, we should establish similar machinery, on the basis of consultations that should be initiated right away, to deal with chemical weapons and radiological weapons, which are of primary importance in the category of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. This is justified by the existence of a new document on the topic.

I should also like to draw attention to the importance which my delegation attaches to the Committee's decision to include in its programme, in response to the General Assembly's request, the question of the "comprehensive programme of disarmament", which might, in our opinion, be one of the key items to be discussed in 1981 at the next special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Peru acted as host to a meeting of eight Heads of State or their representatives on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the battle of Ayacucho, which confirmed Latin America's independence. On that occasion, we undertook to promote and support the elaboration of a permanent system of peace and international co-operation and to create conditions which will make for effective arms limitation and put an end to their acquisition for offensive military purposes, with a view to devoting the resources released in that way to the economic and social development objectives of our countries. In recent years, we have held preliminary conversations on this topic with neighbouring countries, and hope to make a constructive contribution to the work of this negotiating body with a view to achieving concrete results on this topic when it is dealt with by this Committee.

Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka): May I begin by congratulating you, Mr. Chairman, on your assumption of the office of Chairman of our Committee in this first month of our new session. One need hardly say that your country, Canada, has had a long and distinguished record in the field of disarmament and peace-keeping. You have already demonstrated your ability on the day you took charge of the Committee. I am confident that during this month we are in good hands.

May I also extend my congratulations to your predecessor, Ambassador Saw Hlaing, of Burma, who guided our work in the last month of the last session. I would also like on behalf of my delegation to extend a welcome to the five new heads of delegations who have joined our Committee this year. I have in mind the heads of delegations of Algeria, Belgium, Hungary, Japan and Zaire. Then I extend a welcome to the delegation of China. I have personal knowledge from another time of both the distinguished leader of the delegation, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs Zhang Wen-Jin, and the distinguished deputy leader, Ambassador Yu Pei-Wen. As many delegations have emphasized, the entry of China into this Committee is no ordinary occasion. It was the reconstitution of this Committee which made it possible, last year, for the delegation of France to take its place, and this year we have China. We also welcome China as a permanent member of the Security Council from the Asian region, where the burden of arms control and disarmament is no less important than in other parts of the world.

May I conclude this preamble by extending our good wishes to Ambassador Jaipal and his colleagues in the Secretariat, on whom we depend so much. They can only be as productive and as efficient as we, the members of the Committee, allow them to be.

A number of delegations have spoken of the inauspicious circumstances under which our Committee commences its work this year. As for what has been described as the immediate cause of this, some have referred to it directly, others obliquely and some not at all, at least not so far. As far as the attitude of the Government of Sri Lanka is concerned, and I refer here to the recent events in Afghanistan, I shall only quote very briefly from the statement that was made on 3 January this year. That statement said, "The Government of Sri Lanka is strongly opposed to the interference of the Soviet Union or any other country in the internal affairs of Afghanistan." The statement concluded by calling upon the Soviet Union to withdraw its military contingents from the territory of Afghanistan. The next step, as you know, was the resolution in the General Assembly. Sri Lanka did not co-sponsor that resolution, but we voted for it.

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

Our concern over what has happened in Afghanistan is motivated by the reasons which have been referred to by a number of delegations here. Delegations have referred to that country as a small country and a non-aligned country. We come within both of these qualifications. It is therefore only proper that we take cognizance of events there. But it seems right that we should also, as the distinguished delegate of Mexico who opened our discussions in this Committee said, take into account that such events have their roots, and I would add that they are not without precedents.

This Committee, this meeting, is not an occasion for my delegation to give you a catalogue of all the aggressions, interventions, military and non-military, that have taken place since the inception of the United Nations. There have been interventions by great Powers, and by others not so great. However, if military intervention with foreign troops is the distinguishing factor, I can recall off-hand at least five other such military interventions in 1979. Seemingly, those others have not made as much of an impact. As to why that is, the distinguished members themselves should be able to find the answer. But if I may divert for a moment, I did see a rather interesting comment in a British newspaper two Sundays ago, which has some relevance. The editor was discoursing on the relation of morality to politics and he reminded me of something. He drew a parallel or a comparison between the fates that overtook Hafizullah Amin and Ngo Din Diem of the then South Viet Nam. Perhaps it is significant that there has been no lamenting of the passing of either.

In mentioning the relation of morality to politics, I am obliged to refer to other manifestations of this relationship that have emerged or surfaced. I might say it is a sort of fall-out of what has happened in our part of the world during the last few weeks. I have in mind the controversy or the question that is being addressed to countries as to whether or not they should participate in the forthcoming Olympics. One might say that the Olympics are of no relevance to this Committee, but it does have some relevance to what I have been saying now, the relationship between politics and morality.

Members will recall that on the eve of the 1976 Olympics, which took place in your Country, Mr. Chairman, certain other countries called for a boycott because of the sports links that existed between certain countries and South Africa. Those who thought otherwise then, pointed out that one should not mix politics with

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

report. I am obliged to ask what is the difference in the situation between then and now. This is the kind of fall-out or repercussion that we have to face when an event like that which has taken place in Afghanistan occurs.

Speakers have referred here to other events, developments, that have clouded the proceedings of this Committee. Speakers have mentioned developments in the European area. They have spoken of the deployment of new medium-range missiles. The same thing has been described by others as modernization. Reference has been made to the withdrawal of as many as 20,000 troops and 1,000 tanks from the European area, the absence of a reciprocal response and the consequences of that for the work of this Committee. An answer to that is difficult. It is like trying to get an answer to the proverbial question of which came first, the chicken or the egg. But I think, considering that references have been made to the events in Afghanistan by a number of delegations, we can ask the question as to whether the work of this Committee would have been different if what took place in Afghanistan had not happened. Each member of the Committee must furnish his own answer to that question.

I spoke of the repercussions or the fall-out which takes place when an event like this occurs. For us in Sri Lanka, this has had implications, repercussions which I must refer to here. I have in mind the proposal which Sri Lanka has been advancing over the years, since 1971, and that is for an Indian Ocean Zone of Peace. Now, until November last year, as recently as November last year, we had grounds for some optimism that we could advance to the next step of convening an international conference to consider effective implementation of that Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. We even reached the stage of the General Assembly inviting the great Powers and major maritime users to serve on an expanded Ad Hoc Committee to prepare for a conference on the Indian Ocean.

Cardinal or very important for that conference was the resumption of the talks between the United States and the Soviet Union, regarding their military presence in the Indian Ocean, because it was important that both these parties should refrain from acting in a manner prejudicial to the implementation of the Declaration. But what is happening today? We hear reports of new bases - one might even say the reoccupation of old bases. We read of new arms supplies, new defence arrangements. This gives us less ground for optimism as far as a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean is concerned.

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

I shall conclude this part of my comments by saying that given the necessary understanding between the two Superpowers, matters can improve. It is really up to them to improve or to restore the climate of confidence. It is up to them to resume a dialogue. A cardinal rule of this Committee, of the Committee on Disarmament, is consensus. If the two Superpowers have no consensus on matters affecting each other outside the Committee on Disarmament, it is too much to expect that we will have consensus within this Committee. Yet it is not all that depressing. In spite of several members having spoken of a reversal of détente, I do not feel that pessimistic. Détente may have been slowed, it may have been interrupted, but it will resume because there is no alternative to détente. One very clear sign of it, that there is this dialogue between the two Superpowers, is the statement made by the distinguished delegate of the United States when he spoke in this Committee on the 7th, that the ratification of SALT II has only been deferred. I don't believe that any member of this Committee will for a moment think that a treaty concluded after such protracted negotiations and after such enormous effort will be summarily jettisoned.

The distinguished delegate of the United States seemed confident that SALT II is not in jeopardy. He went on to say that pending entry into force of the Treaty and assuming a parallel Soviet attitude, the United States will do all it can to preserve the SALT process. So détente has been slowed, but it will resume.

Let me now come to the agenda, which is occupying the attention of our Committee. I had thought that the agenda this year would be a relatively simple matter, and I believe I was not alone in my thoughts. Many members of the Committee in our informal discussions gave us reason to believe that we would get over this procedural stage. Your absence, Mr. Chairman, from the earlier stage of our meeting reassures me that you are making every effort to let us have this agenda, and that, hopefully, with certain introductory remarks which would be in the nature of an understanding among the members. Coming to the agenda, the first item is the Nuclear Test Ban. Many delegations who have spoken have welcomed the resumption of the tripartite talks and expressed the hope that this Committee would be given a fuller statement of progress between the parties. Several delegations have referred to the vital interrelationship between a Comprehensive Test Ban, the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, and of course, SALT II.

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

If you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, I would like to recall for members the statements made in the Committee by the representatives to these Tripartite Talks.

On 31 July last year, the distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of the tripartite negotiating parties stated:

"Though there is agreement on the main elements of verification, negotiations are still proceeding on the detailed arrangements. As members of the Committee on Disarmament know, verification is a complex subject involving many technical issues that require time to negotiate."

Then this year at the commencement of our session we had the statement of the distinguished delegate of the Soviet Union on 5 February. He said:

"A contribution towards solving this important problem is also being made by the Committee on Disarmament and its Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events."

On 7 February, the distinguished delegate of the United States told us:

"We expect that these talks will proceed in a business-like ... manner as our negotiators continue to tackle the difficult technical and political problems associated with verification of a comprehensive test ban."

There is a purpose in my refreshing our memory and our more recent recollections by quoting the spokesmen of the tripartite negotiations. As I see it, the emphasis is on verification, and that seems to be the major problem. Like other members of this Committee, my delegation is in no position to say more because we have not been the recipients of any more information than representatives of the tripartite negotiators are prepared to give us. This is all we have.

But on the subject of the Test Ban, my task has been made somewhat easier by the comments made just this week on 12 February, by the distinguished delegate of Sweden. I do not think that it could have been done any more eloquently. The distinguished delegate of Sweden gave us some statistics just as she did last year, during our last session, which leads my delegation to believe that the problem of verification is not as serious as one is led to believe. I do not wish to repeat those statistics, but what is relevant is that we already do have means of verification. As to their accuracy, if that has not been confirmed, it has not been refuted. We also have, as you know, the Seismic Expert Group whose work started last year and their mandate has been renewed again. The different

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

tripartite negotiators have all expressed their appreciation of the Group's work. If the problem of verification was a major issue, my delegation is inclined to think that it can no longer be regarded as a major issue.

I would make one other comment. We have had the views of the delegation of China when the distinguished leader of their delegation spoke to this Committee on the first day of our meetings. That statement gave the views of China on this question of the test ban. However, my delegation would like to believe that China-- a nuclear Power-- who has refrained from testing last year, will make a major contribution to the advance of the cause of the nuclear test ban.

May I conclude by saying that my delegation supports the proposal that has been made by several delegations before us, that the stage has now been reached when a working group can be established, and I can only express the hope that the tripartite negotiators will contribute to the consensus necessary for this important stage.

The other item on our agenda on which I would like to comment is effective international arrangements for non-nuclear-weapon States, also known as negative guarantees. Several delegations, I believe, referring to this subject, have expressed their satisfaction with the work done by the Ad Hoc Working Group last year under the chairmanship of the distinguished delegate of Egypt. The Ad Hoc Working Group was formed because the five unilateral formulas which were before the Committee were not considered adequate guarantees. My delegation is pleased that there does already seem to be a consensus in this Committee that the working group should continue its work. May I add that primary responsibility for providing acceptable guarantees or arrangements rests with the nuclear Powers.

Many delegations have already expressed their views on chemical weapons. The necessary material for our Committee to deal with it was presented to us at the end of the last session, and as delegations have pointed out, this came after the time allocated for the discussion of this subject in the Committee. Certain delegations have expressed different views as to the next procedural step. We have varied from proposals from a "consultative committee" to a working group. My delegation, which makes no claim to be among the best informed on the subject of chemical weapons, is inclined to support the view that material available to the Committee is sufficient to move to the stage of the working group.

(Mr. Fonseka, Sr Lanka)

I do recognize that a treaty itself, a treaty on chemical weapons, would seem to be some time away from us. But if we are to heed the repeated resolutions of the General Assembly, and a very significant body of opinion within this Committee, I think it is time for us to take that procedural step of forming a Working Group. In this connexion, I would like to say that my delegation has seen the proposal presented by Australia last week with a working paper on it, proposing informal meetings with experts on chemical weapons. We find it an interesting proposal and would support it in principle, provided the arrangements made can be brought within the time that is available to us, and may I add that it should not in any way inhibit or impede the proposal for the establishment of a working group.

The other item on the agenda on which many comments have been made is the subject of new types of weapons and weapon systems and radiological weapons. The Committee has before it a draft of a treaty drawn up before we closed our sessions last year, by the United States and the Soviet Union. One must, I believe, conclude from that that radiological weapons is one subject on which negotiations are possible, or, to use the phrase, that it is a matter which is ripe for negotiations. We are told that we should take the procedural step of establishing a working group. During informal consultations which have taken place in the Committee, one of the arguments advanced was that the draft treaty on radiological weapons was "a deal" and that this argument by itself is one that the Committee should take cognizance of.

The word "deal" is one of the good English four-letter words. I can only hope that this argument of a deal will be available to a larger body of members on other matters and other items on our agenda which they consider as deserving of the procedural step of a working group. I believe that a working group is an important stage in the procedures, and if it is to be made available for certain items of the agenda, it should not be denied to other items on the argument that matters are not ripe for negotiation.

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

I have not commented at any length on the subject of cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament because my delegation sees quite a connexion between that and the nuclear test ban. Here again, I would like to quote from a rather interesting remark made by the distinguished delegate of the Soviet Union when he spoke just the other day. Commenting on the nuclear test ban the distinguished delegate of the Soviet Union told us:

"The Soviet Union is of the opinion that the speedy completion of work on the treaty and its entry into force would contribute to stopping the arms race and creating conditions for the transition to nuclear disarmament."

That is a view with which my delegation can wholly agree. The cessation of the nuclear arms race would be greatly helped and be greatly hastened if we could bring about a treaty or advance a little more on the subject of the nuclear test ban. May I say, while on the subject of radiological weapons, that it does seem a little incongruous to my delegation that we are giving greater emphasis and priority to weapons which might be described as futuristic weapons without dealing with something that is already before us. I mean, the nuclear test ban. That is rather more urgent as far as my delegation is concerned.

I come now to the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament on which, as far as one can see, there appears to be a great measure of consensus. For one thing, the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament is the one new item which we have been able to introduce into our agenda. As far as I can follow, many delegations have already indicated that they would support the idea of a working group. My delegation will support the proposal, and may I say that the subject of a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, I understand, had been before the CCD, the predecessor of this Committee, for several years, and not very much happened on it. Those members of this Committee and the General Assembly, of course, who supported the proposal for the revival of the Disarmament Commission, do have some cause for satisfaction. I believe it is the

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

Disarmament Commission which last year, drew up the elements of a comprehensive programme. It is that that has given an impetus to this item and has enabled or encouraged this Committee to put it on its agenda. I do hope that a Working Group will be set up and that the Committee on Disarmament will have a document which we can place before the second special session on disarmament that is to take place in 1982.

Before concluding, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I do not wish in any way to inhibit or to make difficult the consultations which you, as Chairman, are undertaking in order to bring to us soon as an agreed agenda. We could then move on to the next procedural stage of the work programme. I trust that in preparing or placing before us this draft agenda you would have no difficulty in including among the subjects for consideration by the Committee the proposals and suggestions appearing in paragraph 125 of the Final Document of the tenth special session, on disarmament.

May I conclude by referring to the greater attention that this Committee appears to have received in the last few days from the media. I noticed in one newspaper at least two references to this Committee, one on the opening day of course and again on our proceedings last Tuesday. The description they gave us on the first day (our opening day) was rather interesting. I did not know whether it was a compliment or if it was patronizing. They referred to this Committee, the proceedings of the Committee, being interrupted and its "club-like" atmosphere being affected. I do not know how the media got that impression. I am quite sure that members of the Committee are all friends. We have differences, but I would hardly consider ourselves, in carrying out our duties here, a club. We are representatives of States. We have views to express, and perhaps there are times when some of us do not quite conform to the old club rules, but I can assure you that we are all serious. My delegation is in earnest about making the work of this Committee a success.

Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, I should first like to say how pleased my delegation is to see you presiding over the work of the Committee for the month of February. During the past working week, you have demonstrated your outstanding diplomatic qualities by the tact, wisdom and skill you displayed in conducting the proceedings. An additional reason for my delegation's satisfaction stems from the knowledge that the Chairman of the Committee is a good friend of Venezuela and knows the country well, since you served for a time as the Canadian Ambassador in Caracas.

I should also like to associate my delegation with the words of welcome which have been addressed to the new representatives of member States who have joined the Committee at this session and with whom we hope to co-operate closely.

It is inevitable that I should begin this statement by reaffirming my country's support for the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I wish to express that support in particularly strong and emphatic terms, and to make it clear that it applies equally to all the sections that make up the Final Document -- the Introduction, the Declaration, the Programme of Action and the guidelines relating to machinery -- as my country regards this document as an indivisible whole.

In the first section of the Final Document, that is, in the Introduction, we, the member States of the United Nations, have made the following pronouncement in very solemn terms (I am reading from paragraph 3):

"The dynamic development of détente, encompassing all spheres of international relations in all regions of the world, with the participation of all countries, would create conditions conducive to the efforts of States to end the arms race ...".

The same paragraph then states:

"Progress on détente and progress on disarmament mutually complement and strengthen each other".

Further on, in the section containing the Declaration, the Final Document proclaims, also in solemn terms, that: (I am now quoting paragraph 25 and part of paragraph 26):

"Negotiations and measures in the field of disarmament shall be guided by the fundamental principles set forth below.

"All States Members of the United Nations ... stress the special importance of refraining from the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of any State ...".

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

Paragraph 34, which is also part of the section of the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly containing the Declaration, states word for word:

"Disarmament, relaxation of international tension, respect for the right to self-determination and national independence, the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the strengthening of international peace and security are directly related to each other. Progress in any of these spheres has a beneficial effect on all of them; in turn, failure in one sphere has negative effects on others".

These passages, which I have taken the liberty of quoting from the Final Document, assume special significance at the present time, as the Committee on Disarmament embarks on its work at this second session in an atmosphere of acute international tension stemming from the grave events that have occurred in Afghanistan. In Afghanistan, there has been a serious infringement of the right to self-determination, and the independence and sovereignty of a country have been violated. Considerable harm has been done to international security and the peace-strengthening process has been prejudiced. Because of this, the leaders of some of the more militarily powerful countries have referred publicly to the danger of a world conflict and have announced the intention of strengthening military forces by building up their panoply of war and increasing their defence budgets. This all suggests that the Second Disarmament Decade, proclaimed barely a few weeks ago by the General Assembly, is turning out to be more like the decade of the recrudescence of the arms build-up. We are faced with a severe setback in the promotion of détente which inevitably has an adverse effect on efforts to curb the arms race and, consequently, on the work of this Committee.

Within this sombre setting, against which the work of the Committee on Disarmament at this second session is unfolding, it is nonetheless comforting to note some encouraging signs which give cause for a certain feeling of optimism and for predicting that some positive result may be expected from our work this year.

The first of these encouraging indications is the fact that the member countries of the Committee which have taken part in this debate have been virtually unanimous in stressing that the state of tension prevailing throughout the world is in itself a challenge for the Committee on Disarmament and highlights the obligation incumbent on each one of the countries of which it is composed to

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

make even more determined efforts to mitigate the adverse effects which the present international crisis is having on the inescapable responsibility that has been vested in us to seek effective disarmament measures.

Another positive sign is the fact that, despite difficulties on the international scene, the States participating in smaller forums where various disarmament questions are negotiated have agreed to resume their contacts, thus giving clear proof of their desire to pursue their efforts to narrow the differences which separate their respective positions and which have so far prevented final agreement being reached within the context of those negotiations. I am referring specifically to the information we received to the effect that the negotiations between the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union on the comprehensive nuclear test ban, as well as the bilateral negotiations on chemical weapons between the Soviet Union and the United States, have been resumed.

A further element which, beyond a shadow of a doubt, is helping to set our work this year on a positive course is the presence among us of the representatives of the People's Republic of China. Now that China has joined in the work of the Committee, the participation of the nuclear-weapon States is complete and it should be easier to make progress in the field of nuclear disarmament for which these countries, as stated in the Final Document, "have the primary responsibility". My delegation wishes to place on record, in a very specific way, the satisfaction it feels at the inclusion of the People's Republic of China in the work of the Committee.

So far as my delegation is concerned, Mr. Chairman, I would affirm our readiness to collaborate with the Bureau and with all the other delegations with a view to helping, by our efforts, to ensure that the work of this session leads to more tangible and more positive results than those obtained last year.

In my delegation's view, there are certain indispensable conditions that must be fulfilled, since they are decisive if the Committee is to achieve tangible results in its work.

The first condition concerns the recognition and practical realization of the Committee's role as a negotiating body, as provided for in the Final Document, reaffirmed in the rules of procedure and confirmed in the relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session and, more specifically, in resolution 34/33B. The Committee must maintain its role as a negotiating body, and it is therefore necessary to ensure that it is not sidetracked into debates and discussions of a theoretical and academic nature

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

on the items on its agenda. It must examine those items from the negotiating standpoint and set about initiating substantive negotiations as soon as possible so that progress can be made in drawing up instruments which provide for specific disarmament measures.

The second condition is acceptance of the participation of the Committee, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, in all stages of the negotiations on items included in its agenda. The negotiations which are being held outside the Committee in smaller groupings (bilateral, trilateral or whatever their composition) must not prevent the Committee from expediting negotiations on the matters being discussed in these more limited forums. Participants in small negotiating groups must keep the Committee fully and constantly informed of the progress achieved. The Powers which, by reason of their military strength, have special responsibility for disarmament matters must have greater confidence in the work of the multilateral body and must not expect it to serve merely as a centre for recording agreements arrived at in the smaller groupings.

Another essential condition is that member States should accept the practice of setting up working groups to undertake substantive negotiations on any item as soon as it is felt that the matter is sufficiently ripe for consideration and the information and material necessary for determining whether it lends itself to a process of negotiation have been compiled.

The last and, without any doubt whatsoever, most important condition is the need for all member States of the Committee to give effect to the common political will which they have already reflected in the Final Document of the special session, and to make genuine efforts to ensure that the disarmament negotiations proceed without interruption and develop in accordance with the guidelines and goals laid down in the Programme of Action set forth in the Final Document.

These are some remarks of a general nature which my delegation felt it would be useful to make at this preliminary stage of our work, while reserving its more specific comments and observations for the time when we take up individual items of our agenda.

Before concluding my statement, I would like to make use of the fact that I still have the floor to take up a few more minutes of the Committee's time.

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

It has so far been the tradition in our Committee to welcome new representatives of the member States and to greet them when they join our work. I believe it would be appropriate to extend that tradition to the occasion of their departure. Consequently, and since this, I understand, is one of the last plenary meetings at which he will be with us, I would like to bid a cordial and affectionate farewell to a distinguished neighbour and eminent colleague, Ambassador Fisher. The fact that, thanks to the alphabet, I am his immediate neighbour, a privilege which I have had the pleasure of sharing with the representative of the United Kingdom, has enabled me to appreciate his intellectual and personal qualities at close quarters. We shall miss him in the Committee very much, but I am pleased to know that he is returning to his country to devote himself to his favourite work, as Professor in the Faculty of Law of the University of Georgetown, where for a long time he was Dean. I wish you much success in your academic work, Professor Fisher, and sincerely assure you, once again, of my friendship and admiration.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.