

FINAL RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-THIRD MEETING
held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 27 March 1980, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

·Mr. YU Pei-Wen

(China)·

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. A. SALAH-BEY
Mr. A. BENYAMINA

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

Australia: Mr. A. BEHM

Belgium: Mr. J-M. NOIRFALISSE
Mr. P. BERG

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

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. P. POPTCHEV

Burma: U. SAW HLAING
U. NGWE WIN

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

China: Mr. YU Pei-Wen
Mr. LIANG Yu-Fan
Mr. YANG Hu-Shan
Mr. YANG Ming-Liang
Mr. PAN Zhen-Qiang

Cuba: Mr. L. SOLA VILA
Mr. F. ORTIZ
Mrs. V. BOROWDOSKY JACKIEWICH

Czechoslovakia: Mr. P. LUKEŠ
Mr. E. ZÁPOTOCKÝ
Mr. V. ROHAL-ILKIV

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

Ethiopia: Mr. F. YOHANNES

France: Mr. F. DE LA GORCE
Mr. J. DE BEAUSSE
Mr. M. COUTHURES

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

Germany, Federal Republic of: Mr. N. KLINGER
Mr. H. MÜLLER

Hungary: Mr. I. KÓMIVES
Mr. C. GYÖRFFY

India: Mr. C.R. GHAREKHAN
Mr. S. SARAN

Indonesia: Mr. D.B. SULEMAN
Mr. H.M.U. SILABAN

Iran: Mr. D. AMERI

Italy: Mr. M. MORENO
Mr. C. FRATESCHI
Mr. F. DE LUCA

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

Kenya: Mr. S. SHITEMI

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

Mongolia: Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
Mr. L. ERDENECHULUUN

Morocco: Mr. A. SKALLI
Mr. M. CHRAIBI

Netherlands: Mr. R.H. FEIN
Mr. H. WAGENMAKERS
Mr. F.J.A. TERWISSCHA VAN SCHELTINGA
Mr. P.J.M. VERBEEK

Nigeria: Mr. O. ADENIJI
Mr. T.O. OLUMOKO

Pakistan: Mr. J.K.A. MARKER
Mr. M. AKRAM

Peru: Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO

Poland: Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. H. PAĆ

Romania: Mr. C. ENE
Mr. T. MELESCANU

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

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

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. V. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. B.P. PROKOFIEV
Mr. M.P. SHELEPIN
Mr. V.M. GANJA
Mr. V.I. USTINOV
Mr. A.I. TIOURENKOV
Mr. Y.P. KLIUKIN
Mr. E.K. POTYARKIN

United Kingdom:

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

United States of America:

Mr. C. FLOWERREE
Mr. A. AKALOVSKY
Mr. M. DALEY
Mr. C. TAYLOR
Mr. J. MACDONALD
Mr. H. WILSON

Venezuela:

Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT
Mr. H. ARTEAGA

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. VRHUNEC
Mr. D. DJOKIĆ
Mr. M. MIKHAILOVIĆ

Zaire:

Mr. KALONJI TSHIKALA KAKWAKA

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

Mr. R. JAIPAL

Assistant Secretary-General:

Mr. J. MARTENSON

Mr. EL-SHAFEI (Egypt) (translated from Arabic): It gives me a great pleasure today to extend to you, before I begin my statement on the item of the Committee's agenda relating to the comprehensive programme of disarmament, my sincere congratulations and those of my delegation on your assumption of the chairmanship of the Committee for the month of March this year. The reason for my gratification is twofold: it is explained firstly by the well-developed and strong relations that exist between our two countries, and secondly by my conviction in your personal efficiency and ability to conduct the work of the Committee successfully, which you have clearly demonstrated in directing the work of the Committee so far.

I would also like to extend my thanks to Mr. McPhail, the Ambassador of Canada, for the constructive efforts which he made as Chairman of the Committee for February, and which led to agreement on the Committee's agenda for the first part of the session and paved the way for the agreement on the establishment of working groups.

The Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly states that the final objective of the efforts of all States should continue to be general and complete disarmament under effective international control, and that for disarmament to become a reality it is essential to agree on a series of specific disarmament measures, selected by common accord, as those on which there is a consensus to the effect that their subsequent realization in the short term appears to be feasible. The Document further states that there is also a need to prepare, through agreed procedures, a comprehensive disarmament programme which, passing through all the necessary stages, should lead to general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

Paragraph 45 of the Final Document states that priorities in disarmament should be: nuclear weapons; other weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons; conventional weapons; including any which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects; and reduction of armed forces. It was with this in view that the General Assembly entrusted the Disarmament Commission with the task of formulating the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament as recommendations to be submitted to the Committee on Disarmament through the General Assembly. This task was performed by the Disarmament Commission in the form of a report submitted to the General Assembly, which is at present before our Committee. Under the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session,

(Mr. El-Shafei, Egypt)

the Committee on Disarmament is called upon to elaborate the elements of this comprehensive programme so as to include all other measures that could lead to the achievement of a general and complete disarmament under effective international control in a world in which peace and security prevail and the new international economic order is strengthened. The comprehensive programme should also include suitable measures ensuring that the General Assembly is constantly kept informed of the progress achieved in those negotiations, so as to enable it to assess, if and when necessary, the situation, and especially constantly to review the implementation of the programme.

On this occasion, I would like to express my country's satisfaction at the initiation of negotiations on ways of achieving general and complete disarmament after two decades during which efforts have been restricted to the adoption of partial and incomplete measures.

Needless to say, my country attaches the utmost importance to the results achieved by the tenth special session of the General Assembly, and to maintaining the momentum generated by this session by formulating the comprehensive programme at the earliest possible time and before the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In this connexion, the existence of a political will, the creation of an international climate characterized by balanced responsibilities and duties to be assumed by nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States, the attempt to solve political problems by peaceful means, and the promotion of measures for building international confidence are prerequisites which should run parallel to general and complete disarmament.

In the view of my country, the programme should consist of a series of concrete and detailed steps or measures carried out under effective international control on the basis of the principles set forth in paragraphs 25 and 42 of the Final Document, and it should be implemented according to a specific timetable and by stages, taking into account the disarmament priorities to which I have referred above; it is, of course, understood that the United Nations would continue to play the leading role in the examination, adoption and implementation of the comprehensive programme.

Here I would like to touch briefly on the essential elements which, in the opinion of my country, a comprehensive programme should comprise.

First of all, nuclear disarmament, to which my country and the international community attach paramount importance and priority. In this context, there is an urgent need to halt the nuclear arms race, to eliminate the threat of a nuclear war,

(Mr. El-Shafei, Egypt)

to halt the production and development of nuclear weapons and delivery systems, to do away with stockpiles of nuclear weapons, to end the production of thermal substances for military purposes, to prohibit the use of or the threat to use nuclear weapons, and to provide non-nuclear-weapon States with effective international security safeguards against the use of or the threat to use nuclear weapons. In this context, the conclusion of a test ban treaty is an urgent priority. There can be no doubt that the achievement of positive results in the trilateral negotiations between the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom will help the Committee on Disarmament to assume responsibility for the conclusion of that treaty.

My delegation would also like to point out the importance of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the need for the countries of the world to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, as an essential condition for the achievement of peace and security throughout the world, particularly in sensitive areas.

In this context, we hope that the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons will achieve results that will ensure universal accession to it. On this occasion, and in view of the serious and disturbing news recently circulated to the effect that Israel and South Africa have carried out nuclear explosions, I feel compelled to repeat the appeal made by my country in particular to all the countries in the area to join the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to agree to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle East and Africa.

In keeping with our support for the establishment of demilitarized zones, we would like to emphasize the particular responsibility of the nuclear-weapon States for those areas and the need to respect their status as nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Lastly, I would like to state, in the context of nuclear disarmament, that my country supports the establishment of zones of peace and steps aimed at the reduction of military potential in various sensitive regions of the world.

Parallel with nuclear disarmament measures, the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction is also a priority issue. In particular, my country is deeply anxious to see the conclusion of a treaty on the complete prohibition of the development, production, and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction. It is equally important that all countries should accede to a treaty banning the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological and toxic weapons and their destruction.

(Mr. El-Shafei, Egypt)

As regards conventional weapons and the reduction of armed forces, my country considers it important in the context of a general and complete disarmament, that countries with huge military arsenals should halt their arms race in conventional weapons and complete the elaboration of a treaty on the prohibition and destruction of all such weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects. Levels for the gradual reduction of conventional weapons should be agreed upon, taking into account the need of each individual country to ensure its security and at the same time strengthening the collective security provided for by the Charter of the United Nations.

As for the reduction of armed forces, my delegation considers that this should be done within the framework of achieving general and complete disarmament and through measures for building international confidence. Such a reduction, my delegation maintains, requires in particular a solution of pressing political problems by peaceful means, an end to occupation, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, respect for their sovereignty and independence, the removal of foreign military bases and an end to foreign military presence.

Disarmament measures which are closely connected with and which directly affect the national security of countries clearly necessitate the elaboration of effective control and verification measures. Accordingly, we consider it important that national verification measures should be accompanied by international control and verification measures to increase international confidence, and that the United Nations should establish the machinery and bodies necessary to verify disarmament measures and monitor their implementation.

Lastly, my delegation considers that, in all measures and arrangements aimed at achieving general and complete disarmament, due regard should be paid to the close relationship that exists between those measures and arrangements -- and in particular the interrelationship between nuclear disarmament and conventional disarmament and between international and regional disarmament measures -- and those for building and strengthening confidence.

My delegation would like to express the hope that the Working Group will be able to start negotiations on the elements of the comprehensive programme at the earliest possible time and succeed in elaborating it so that it can be approved by our Committee before the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament takes place in 1982.

(Mr. El-Shafei, Egypt)

All the objectives and principles agreed upon in the Final Document of the special session, the priorities defined therein, the working papers and proposals previously submitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, and any other proposals submitted by the Working Group can constitute a good basis for the progress and conclusion of the negotiations. In this regard, we would like to endorse the proposal submitted by the representative of Pakistan that the Secretariat should make a compilation of all the papers and proposals submitted over the past two decades which are related to the question of general and complete disarmament.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): In my statement today I shall deal, very briefly, with two questions that have been before this Committee, both in formal and informal meetings, for the last several weeks.

In the first place I wish to place on record the grave concern of my delegation with the manner in which this Committee has dealt with applications from non-members to participate in our work, strictly in conformity with the Final Document and our own rules of procedure. I therefore wish to leave no room for any misunderstanding in this matter as far as the attitude of the Netherlands is concerned: the Netherlands is willing to partake in a consensus agreement, today, at this very meeting, to the effect that all six applicants should be invited to take part in our work in accordance with the wishes expressed by them. We are willing to take that decision on the basis of dealing with the requests one by one, in the order in which they were received -- or in any other order that the Committee in its wisdom may wish to follow, or even all together -- as long as the decision to invite them is taken now without any further delay. I must add, that for reasons which I need not explain, we are not looking forward to the contributions of all six with equal anticipation.

The second part of my statement concerns chemical weapons. You will recall that, in my statement of 17 March 1980, I made a suggestion to the members of the CD concerning the manner in which the Ad Hoc Working Group on chemical weapons might proceed with its task. I also gave you the reasoning behind our proposal. My delegation has taken a somewhat passive attitude since making that proposal, in order to receive comments from those delegations which felt inclined to give us their views. We have received such comments and suggestions from many sides. It is on this basis that we have now decided to submit to the Committee a working paper, CD/84.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

In the light of my intervention of 17 March -- the text of which is known to you all -- this working paper does not need a lengthy introduction. Suffice it to say that the purpose of the Netherlands delegation in submitting this working paper is to make a procedural contribution to a logical and successful take-off of the Working Group on chemical weapons.

The first step -- as fate will have it in many fields of human endeavour -- being a major one, it might be useful if I clarify our intentions as regards the drawing up -- as step number one -- of an official CD questionnaire on chemical weapons. For reasons explained to you before, we think the availability of such a questionnaire might be helpful for the CW Working Group. At the same time, I hasten to add that we do not think that such a CD questionnaire is indispensable. In case it should prove too difficult or time-consuming to draw up a CD questionnaire, the Working Group might have to drop this idea and, instead, invite delegations which hitherto have not answered the old questionnaire of last year, to do so, at least if they wish to. There is, of course, no obligation whatever for anyone to answer any questionnaire if they do not wish to do so. Delegations could also be asked to submit commentaries on the papers submitted last year by the delegations of the United States and the USSR. Once these views have been collected, the Working Group could proceed, in conformity with step 4 of our proposal, to the examination of the answers received.

Though second best, we think that the procedure which I have just indicated is also a viable one. On the other hand, we maintain that from the point of view of orderly procedure and efficiency for that matter, it would be preferable if the Working Group should prove capable of drawing up an official CD questionnaire on chemical weapons. That is why, today, we table our proposal as working document CD/84.

Mr. MORENO (Italy) (translated from French): On behalf of the Italian delegation I should like today to present to the Committee some considerations and observations regarding item 6 of our programme of work, on the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

As you know, my Government has always attached the greatest importance to this endeavour, while not underestimating its magnitude and difficulty.

As long ago as in 1969 and 1970, the Italian delegation put before the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament concrete proposals -- I should like to mention in particular working papers ENDC/245, ENDC/263 and CCD/309 -- dealing both with the general approach to be adopted and with specific elements which should be included in a coherent and balanced programme.

(Mr. Ibreno, Italy)

Our ideas were subsequently further developed and elaborated in a document entitled "Working paper on the question of the drafting of a comprehensive programme of disarmament", which was drafted as part of the preparatory work for the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and submitted to the General Assembly in 1978 in document CCD/548. The general lines and basic elements of this document are still fully valid today.

My Government has always considered that it is essential to view every effort in the sphere of disarmament against a broad general background, for otherwise there would be little chance of attaining the ultimate objective, namely, general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

This in no way implies underestimating the role of partial and limited measures for the regulation, reduction or prohibition of specific weapons, which are often the only measures possible in an international situation still overshadowed by threatening clouds. Moreover, the real value of these measures can be assessed only in terms of the contribution they can make to a gradual and balanced process leading towards the ever-widening goals of disarmament. It is therefore important not to lose sight of the final objective, and to establish an organic framework and guiding principles which can both stimulate and direct our activities.

In view of the foregoing, my delegation welcomed the recommendations made by the General Assembly at its tenth special session devoted to disarmament, endorsing this general approach and entrusting the Committee on Disarmament with the task of elaborating a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

To help us in our task, we have at our disposal a voluminous amount of documentation, including:

The recommendations made in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly;

The elements transmitted to us by the United Nations Disarmament Commission;

The proposals and working papers submitted to the Committee on Disarmament and the multilateral disarmament negotiating bodies which preceded it.

My delegation is gratified by the establishment of an ad hoc Working Group in which effective negotiations may be started on the general concept and various constituent elements of the programme. Italy suggested the creation of such a group

(Mr. Moreno, Italy)

at the opening **meeting** of this session, in Ambassador Montezemolo's statement of 5 February. It is our hope that the Group will be able to start work as soon as possible and in a constructive manner. The task devolving upon the Committee is a considerable one, and we should endeavour to complete it before the next special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, scheduled for 1982.

I do not at this stage wish to go into detail about the various measures which my delegation believes should be included in a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

Most of these measures are described in our working paper CCD/548, which is divided into three main sections: 1. Nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction; 2. Conventional weapons; and 3. Other measures.

Our views on the substance of these various categories of measures, and in particular measures of high priority such as the complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests and the prohibition of chemical weapons, are well known and need no repetition at the present time.

On one particular aspect, namely, the control of international arms transfers, we recently submitted a working paper in document CD/56, which we hope may be examined at an appropriate stage during this session. We shall, however, revert to the subject of these specific measures as a whole in the discussions of the Working Group, to which we intend to make a constructive contribution.

I should like, on this occasion, rather to dwell a moment on the general principles by which the Committee ought, in our view, to be guided in carrying out its task.

It is, I think, generally agreed that general and complete disarmament under effective international control is the final goal to be attained only as the result of a long process based on certain priorities and proceeding by stages.

It is therefore essential for a detailed disarmament programme to satisfy certain conditions, which I should like to summarize as follows:

1. The maintenance of a balance between the measures taken in various spheres -- the sphere of nuclear disarmament, that of conventional disarmament, etc. -- and at various levels -- world, regional and bilateral. This balance is in fact an essential aspect of security, which must not at any stage be jeopardized through the acquisition of unilateral advantages or positions of privilege.

(Mr. Moreno, Italy)

2. The need to maintain a certain flexibility in the linking of individual sequences so as to avoid any risk of destabilizing consequences and to ensure that, at each stage, the conditions of security and confidence necessary to permit passing on to the next stage are really satisfied.

3. The requirement of adequate measures of verification based on a combination of effective national and international methods and techniques likely to ensure the full implementation of the obligations undertaken.

4. Respect for the right of all States to unrestricted access to the peaceful uses of new scientific and technological discoveries in spheres in which it would be difficult to draw a clear distinction between civilian and military uses.

5. The parallel adoption of the measures necessary to create a climate of confidence, to strengthen collective security and to ensure the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

We are convinced that if we start from these essential principles, which are reflected in the recommendations of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, it should not be difficult for us to elaborate a programme which has a realistic general outline and achieves a balance between its component elements.

Mr. SKALLI (Morocco) (translated from French): I should first of all like to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on your assumption of the chairmanship of our Committee. It gives me pleasure to say that you are discharging your responsibilities in a praiseworthy manner.

Our congratulations also go to your predecessor, Ambassador McPhail, who guided the Committee's work competently and efficiently, and accomplished a great deal of work in the course of last month.

I should like to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to express our satisfaction at the presence of your country at this negotiating table. I hope you will believe that we deeply appreciate your Government's decision to take its place in our Committee and to shoulder therein the responsibilities incumbent upon it as a nuclear-weapon Power.

We may reasonably hope that the role which China is in a position to play will make an appreciable contribution to the effectiveness of our work, since the participation of all the nuclear-weapon Powers is an additional asset and offers a better guarantee of success, in view of the particular responsibilities borne by those Powers in the field of disarmament.

(Mr. Skalli, Morocco)

Needless to say, the Committee on Disarmament began the work of its second session in an atmosphere marked by a serious deterioration of the international situation. It is easy to understand our profound concern at the appearance of new centres of tension -- in addition to those already in existence -- which could have very serious consequences for world peace unless eliminated rapidly.

Without wishing to appear unduly pessimistic, we must admit that the deterioration of the international situation is hardly a cause for rejoicing. Never have international peace and security seemed to us so seriously threatened. Never perhaps has the danger of confrontation seemed so real and so clear.

This demonstrates, if need be, how fragile and precarious are the bases on which international relations rest, and how relative and uncertain is the peace in which we live and which we seek to preserve.

We cannot deny that, despite the sustained efforts of the international community to establish relations of a new type between States and peoples, based on trust, co-operation and solidarity, the world continues to live in an armed peace based on mistrust and terror.

This alarming situation is aggravated by the continued unbridled arms race in pursuit of more and more sophisticated and more and more destructive weapons. The uneasiness we feel today is compounded by the feeling of frustration arising from the lack of convincing results in the field of disarmament. There can be no doubt that the lack of substantial progress in this area represents a serious threat to world security.

After long years of marking time in negotiations on effective disarmament measures, the tenth special session of the General Assembly was held at just the right time to lay down new bases on which to begin a process of real disarmament and set forth the measures likely to achieve that end. In so doing, it aroused enormous hope and encouraged the belief that the disarmament problem would be tackled in a better light and under more favourable auspices.

(Mr. Skalli, Morocco)

The Final Document adopted at that special session is rightly considered as being very far-reaching. The consensus reached with regard to it foreshadowed the coming of a new era in disarmament and the assertion of a common will to achieve tangible progress towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

The Final Document stressed the urgent need to promote real disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, and reflected the international community's interest in and desire for an easing of international tension and a strengthening of peace and security in the world.

Specifically, this took the form of the adoption of a comprehensive Programme of Action and the establishment of international negotiating machinery specially designed to deal effectively with the disarmament problem.

To our great satisfaction, this international machinery began its work last year.

There can be no doubt that, as a result of its enlarged membership -- and therefore its greater representativeness -- and of the democratization of its procedures and the authority thus conferred upon it, the Committee on Disarmament led us to hope that it would make an auspicious beginning and be capable of tackling successfully the arduous and complex task entrusted to it.

Unfortunately, however, we must admit that the Committee has so far been unable to make noticeable progress towards the objectives of disarmament.

We have to acknowledge that, at its last session, the Committee on Disarmament did not really begin substantive negotiations on the priority topics entrusted to it. However, that was not for lack of trying; for it is only fair to say that the Committee accomplished a great deal of work, and sustained efforts were made by all its members.

The reasons for this lack of concrete results should therefore be sought in the obvious absence of political will, without which nothing can be done and for which the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament quite rightly made an appeal in its Final Document.

It cannot be repeated too often that, without decisive political will and greater determination on our part, it would be unrealistic to believe that we could achieve the objectives set for us.

(Mr. Skalli, Morocco)

The first part of this 1980 session began nearly two months ago. I must say that the present state of our work leaves us somewhat bewildered. For it is heartbreaking to observe that, at the beginning of each session, the Committee seems doomed to devote the majority of its time to questions of procedure and organization of work -- work which is never embarked upon at a satisfactory pace, and whose end is never in sight, even in the long term.

In this connexion, the Moroccan delegation regrets that our Committee has not yet been able to begin concrete negotiations on the substantive items on its agenda.

At this session, the Committee has admittedly taken an important decision with regard to the setting up of four Working Groups. We believe that these Groups are a wholly suitable form of machinery for negotiating concrete disarmament measures. The Moroccan delegation considers that they must be able to begin their work without delay and discharge the responsibilities entrusted to them.

In this connexion, I should like to recall the declaration of the Group of 21 of 27 February on the ultimate objective of these Working Groups:

"The ultimate objective and basic mandate of all the working groups should be to undertake concrete negotiations for the implementation of agreed measures called for in the Final Document of the First Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to Disarmament".

We earnestly hope that the results of the work of the Groups recently set up will be such as to satisfy our expectations, especially since they will be dealing with the comprehensive programme of disarmament, chemical weapons, negative security guarantees and radiological weapons, all of which are, in our opinion, matters of the utmost importance.

Of the five Working Groups whose establishment we requested, the only one which has not yet been set up is the working group on a nuclear test ban. And yet we are all aware of the importance of this matter and of the urgent need to conclude a treaty banning nuclear tests. Need we recall that, despite the appeals of the United Nations General Assembly and its many resolutions requesting that the highest priority should be accorded to this question, the Committee on Disarmament has regrettably been unable to commence negotiations on this subject.

(Mr. Skalli, Morocco)

At its latest session, the General Assembly adopted a resolution emphasizing that all nuclear-weapon Powers should cease from testing nuclear weapons. In this resolution the General Assembly, expressing its grave concern at the fact that nuclear arms tests had continued unabated, requested our Committee to initiate negotiations with a view to the conclusion of a nuclear test ban treaty, as a matter of the highest priority.

We should therefore like to express the hope that the Committee will be able to set up a working group as quickly as possible on this important matter, all the more so since we are in possession of the documents necessary for initiating negotiations on this subject without delay.

My delegation would like to set forth its views on the participation of non-member States in the work of the Committee. There can be no doubt that disarmament concerns not merely the members of our Committee but, quite rightly, the international community as a whole. We therefore believe that rule 34 of our rules of procedure should be interpreted in a flexible manner, and that a favourable response should be given to requests from States which are not members of the Committee whenever they express the wish to take part in our work.

It is unfortunate that the Committee has not yet been able to take a decision on the participation of the non-member States which have so requested.

We should concert our efforts to ensure that the Committee does not become bogged down in considerations of a procedural nature and devote the greater part of our time to the consideration of the substantive questions entrusted to us by the General Assembly. We must not lose sight of the fact that the meagre results achieved so far are by no means in keeping with the hopes and momentum generated by the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

However, although these results are indeed scanty, we should by no means give way to discouragement or resignation. We should more than ever co-operate and display solidarity, goodwill and simple determination to carry out our task successfully, in the interest of peace and of all peoples of the world.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Morocco and for his kind words addressed to my country and myself.

Mr. McPHAIL (Canada): I would just like, as several preceding speakers have done this morning, to touch on a few points today. I want to talk about the comprehensive programme of disarmament, but I also feel compelled at this point in time to make some comments on the state of play of the Committee's work as it approaches the conclusion of its second month of this session.

I would like to state briefly the views of my delegation on the question on our agenda this week, namely, the comprehensive programme of disarmament. Pursuant to the Final Document of the special session devoted to disarmament, the Disarmament Commission adopted in June 1979, by consensus, the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. As agreed, these elements were submitted to the General Assembly at its last session and sent to us for negotiation. Resolution 34/83B requests ~~this~~ Committee to initiate negotiations on the comprehensive programme with a view to completing its elaboration before the second special session devoted to disarmament. To discharge this responsibility, the Committee has agreed to set up an Ad Hoc Working Group which, we hope, will be in a position to start its work in a not too distant future.

We have welcomed the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, as elaborated by the Disarmament Commission. Some previous speakers have dealt extensively with the "historical" development of this question which, as it has been noted, is linked with the goal of general and complete disarmament. I would like to address some aspects which are of particular interest to my Government.

Prime Minister Trudeau, at the special session devoted to Disarmament, said "there can be no first and second priorities as between nuclear and the whole series of conventional arms races". This view was based on the actual use of weapons since 1945 and on the respective proportions of resources being spent on various systems of weapons. No one doubts that the threat of a nuclear war is an extremely serious threat, taking into account the consequences that such a war would have. But this should not lead us to ignore the facts that millions of people have been victims of conventional weapons since 1945 and that any measures which would lead to some conventional disarmament would constitute an important step towards the goal of disarmament. Conventional weapons and armed forces appear, of course, in the elements relating to the comprehensive programme. However, we would like to see Governments more conscious of the necessity of negotiating on such measures in the

(Mr. McPhail, Canada)

present situation. My Government's view is that not enough emphasis has been put on this aspect of the arms race. In relation with this issue, we would like to welcome the Italian working paper CD/56 submitted on 5 February 1980 on the control and limitation of international arms transfers. We hope and expect that due attention will be given to that paper by the Working Group when dealing with conventional weapons.

We also consider important the reference to United Nations peacekeeping operations. We have already stated in the Disarmament Commission that this activity in the field of maintaining international peace and security is not as such envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations, so it might have been a bit more appropriate to mention that these operations were under the auspices of the United Nations rather than in conformity with the Charter. However, this is a point of detail. We must give proper consideration to alternative arrangements for international security in a disarmed or disarming world. These aspects have been somehow neglected in our consideration of the disarmament process. We believe, therefore, that the Ad Hoc Working Group should give them the attention they deserve.

Finally, I would like to express our views on the question of a "calendar" for the disarmament measures included in a comprehensive programme. We are skeptical about deadlines being inscribed in this programme. Of course, we are anxious to see the various measures negotiated and adopted as soon as feasible, but setting deadlines would not necessarily facilitate the reaching of agreement. These issues are complex, and we might simply introduce a supplementary complication if we were to insist upon a time-bound programme. As we stated at the last session of the Disarmament Commission, "Rather we would hope that a comprehensive programme of disarmament will act as a spur to negotiations and as a measuring rod against which the United Nations can review progress at regular intervals".

I would now like to take a few moments to talk about the present state of the Committee's work, as my Government and my delegation see it. A group of socialist countries recently offered to the Committee their views in document CD/83. I can say that there is much in that document with which I would agree -- and a great deal, of course, with which I would not. In particular, I am not prepared to engage in an exercise in blame-setting with respect to procedural slow-downs in the Committee. I do not believe that is the mandate that my Government gave me when sending me here to participate in our work. Suffice it to say that I would perhaps interpret the

(Mr. McPhail, Canada)

situation differently, but that is not to say that my conclusions would be vastly different from those contained in that document. Nor from the concerns which have been expressed to us here this morning by, for example, my colleague from Morocco and others. We believe that the working groups which are being established should be organized and begin their work quickly.

There is also the procedural matter concerning invitations to non-member countries to come before this Committee and express their views. For the record, let me say that, like the representative of the Netherlands, we are ready to proceed at once to resolve this issue and we could do so in the way that he has suggested today. However, if others are not ready, then let us find a solution to this difficulty and find it quickly. Surely it is not beyond our powers of imagination to decide upon one of a number of possible solutions fairly quickly. For example, if this is a procedural problem, then it is something which has longer-term implications and therefore, we should perhaps consider again a question which I believe was discussed when this Committee was set up. That is, the possibility of establishing a Bureau or Committee of wise men who could try, by gathering together eminent representatives, to come to a conclusion on the future handling of such procedural matters. Alternatively, we could set up an Ad Hoc Working Group, as our rules of procedure permit, to discuss the necessity of interpreting the existing rules.

I repeat, if there is a procedural problem -- let it be treated in the way which the rules of procedure provide for. Such a subgroup could report back by the end of the session, but for the moment and without prejudice to any possible future recommendation or interpretation, let us proceed at once in an informal meeting to hear from those non-member States which have asked to participate in the meetings of the Committee. This would be without prejudice, of course, to whatever eventual further interpretation of the rules might be agreed upon. It would not necessarily set a precedent for the future, if we decided that it should not be.

I shall sum up the position of my Government by saying that we believe it is right to decide now to hear those non-members who want to speak while their views are relevant to the matters under discussion. Secondly, we would like to proceed now in order not to delay the Committee's work by this procedural problem. Surely it is the responsibility of us all not to refuse the consideration of possible solutions, and we should be working harder to find one.

Mr. FLOWERREE (United States of America): I wish to make clear the position of the United States on the requests by various non-member countries for participation in the proceedings of this Committee.

The requests before us differ as regards the rules of procedure under which they have been made. The United States delegation agrees with the Chairman that it would be wise to defer action on requests for participation in subsidiary bodies. In our view, such requests raise a question about the role of non-member States in activities where language is being formulated on which decisions may have to be taken. We will state our views on this matter in greater detail at an appropriate time. In any event, we believe that absence of a decision on this issue should in no way delay the beginning of the Working Group's activities.

The United States delegation thus welcomes the Chairman's suggestion that requests of non-member States for participation in plenary or informal meetings of the Committee should be acted upon in advance of, and without prejudice to, an eventual decision concerning participation in subsidiary bodies.

The United States fully supports the requests of Finland, Denmark and Spain to be invited to present their views on the subject of the prohibition of chemical weapons. It also fully supports a similar request by Austria with respect to the question of negative security assurances. We believe the Committee will benefit from the contributions of these countries.

As to the other two requests before the Committee, we note that the respective countries have already circulated in writing some views on the subject they are concerned with, either here in the Committee or in the United Nations in New York. Nevertheless, the United States delegation would not stand in the way of a consensus approving those two requests.

I would also like to refer briefly to the Soviet statement made at our last plenary concerning the reported use of chemical weapons in certain parts of the world. Given the nature of my statement of 18 March, the United States delegation found it interesting that the Soviet representative felt compelled to respond. Although my Government strongly rejects some of the assertions made by the Soviet representative, I will limit myself to stating that the United States stands by the statement I delivered on 18 March. As to the facts, let the future be the judge.

Mr. DE SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): Mr. Chairman, I should like to welcome your delegation on joining the Committee on Disarmament and congratulate you on presiding over our deliberations during the current month of March.

My delegation would like to address itself today to item 6 of our agenda, namely, the comprehensive programme of disarmament. As we all know, this item has been included in the agenda of the CD for 1980 as a result of the decision contained in General Assembly resolution 34/83 H. In order to comply with the specific mandate of the General Assembly, this Committee must examine and negotiate the "Elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament" with a view to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In the already long history of the efforts made by the international community to arrive at a specific framework of negotiations on disarmament issues, several attempts of this kind have been made within as well as outside the United Nations. The current effort aims at defining, not later than the second special session in 1982, generally-agreed guidelines which would encompass objectives and principles, together with the establishment of appropriate procedures for the implementation and review of the programme. The consensus document adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session, on the recommendation of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, contains a text which has been suggested as a possible basis for the work entrusted to the CD. Other proposals and suggestions will also be examined by this Committee.

The Brazilian delegation is looking forward to the substantive debate that will take place in the Working Group established by the CD to negotiate the elements of a comprehensive programme. We consider such an approach as a positive step not only as regards the comprehensive programme but on other items of our agenda as well. We also believe that the allocation of some meetings of the CD for general statements on the comprehensive programme is well-advised, and we are glad to take advantage of this opportunity to state some general views on this item of our agenda.

Brazil participated actively in the work of UNDC last spring, when the report of that Commission was adopted for submission to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. We should note here that the adoption by consensus, by UNDC, of the "Elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament" reflected the

(Mr. De Souza E Silva, Brazil)

difficulty of arriving at anything but the most general mention of some of the points contemplated in that document. Although not introducing a formal reservation to the text finally adopted by UNDC, the Brazilian delegation placed on record its dissatisfaction with some of the formulations included in it.

One of the basic shortcomings of the document is, in our view, the fact that it seems to be very timid when dealing with measures of disarmament in the proper sense of the term, giving the impression that it is directed, instead, at measures of non-armament, that is, measures that envisage arms control as a goal in itself. We would have liked UNDC to have produced a document in which an adequate balance of responsibilities for measures of disarmament formed the basis for the obligations emanating therefrom. Brazil has consistently maintained that the most urgent task in the field of disarmament is nuclear disarmament, the responsibility for which rests primarily upon the nuclear-weapon Powers, but the concern for which pertains to all mankind. Accordingly, we believe that the comprehensive programme of disarmament should spell out in clearer terms such responsibilities and give adequate expression to such concerns. The inability of UNDC to reach a clear formulation on questions like the prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons or the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime shows once again the striking differences of approach that prevail in the negotiations on a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

Lately, increasing attention has been directed, for instance, to the questions related to measures for the prevention of the further spread of nuclear weapons. In a few months the States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons will hold in Geneva the Second Review Conference to examine the operation of that international instrument. As is well known, Brazil, together with some 50 other States, has not acceded to the NPT. At the time of the negotiations that led to the conclusion of that agreement as it now stands, Brazil made abundantly clear its position regarding the question of the renunciation of nuclear weapons and of the responsibilities that such renunciation entails for nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States alike.

We now watch with interest as the parties to the NPT prepare to appraise the efforts made to check the further spread of nuclear weapons. It appears that some countries, especially those which already possess such weapons, are concerned only

(Mr. De Souza E Silva, Brazil)

with the so-called "horizontal" aspect of nuclear proliferation. We believe that steps are urgently needed, as they were already at the time of those negotiations, to curb the tremendous upsurge in the nuclear arms race. Twelve years after the accession to the NPT by three of the five nuclear-weapon Powers and by several other States, the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons seems to have gained a new momentum; increasingly larger budgetary allocations are made for the continuous perfecting of existing weapons systems, and the bilateral arms control agreements arrived at by the Super Powers seem to have had the effect of spurring on the search for even more sophisticated types of weapons. The cessation, let alone the reversal, of the armaments race in the nuclear field appears to be as distant now as it was in 1968, at the time of the conclusion of the NPT. We believe, therefore, that any comprehensive programme of disarmament should include specific and concrete measures in the field of nuclear disarmament; it should also take into account the "vertical" aspect of nuclear proliferation in dealing with arms control measures.

We have often heard the argument that the complexity of disarmament negotiations suggests, as the most practical course, the adoption of whatever collateral measures are deemed possible in the circumstances prevailing in the international context. That argument, of course, stems from the same distorted assumption responsible for the adoption of agreements of a discriminatory character. This assumption is that the issues of disarmament are important only to the militarily significant Powers, and that such Powers are the ones entitled to determine priorities. Brazil believes, on the contrary, that disarmament is a task of paramount importance for the whole of mankind, and that the negotiation of those issues concerns every nation, large or small, without any discrimination whatsoever. In other words, to paraphrase a famous statesman, disarmament is too important to be left to the discretion of the armed Powers alone.

For these reasons, Brazil supports the adoption of a programme of disarmament that would spell out clearly the responsibilities for concrete progress in the field of disarmament. In our opinion, the negotiation of the comprehensive programme of disarmament should be guided by the following basic principles:

(a) Recognition of the primary responsibility and special role of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament;

(Mr. De Souza E Silva, Brazil)

- (b) Recognition of the urgency and priority of nuclear disarmament;
- (c) Recognition of the fundamental and legitimate concern of the international community for disarmament issues, together with the attribution of special responsibilities to the nuclear-weapon Powers for nuclear disarmament;
- (d) The need for adequate verification of disarmament measures by means of control systems acceptable to all parties;
- (e) Channelling of resources freed by disarmament measures towards the promotion of social and economic development, particularly in the developing countries;
- (f) The need for ensuring that measures of disarmament do not hamper, in any form whatsoever, the absorption and development of peaceful technology in all fields of application of science;
- (g) The need for an adequate balance between commitments entered into in the sphere of disarmament on the part of nuclear-weapon Powers and non-nuclear-weapon nations, so as to prevent the adoption of measures of a discriminatory nature or of measures that result in the perpetuation of existing imbalances;
- (h) The need to ensure that measures of disarmament do not enhance the security of some States to the detriment of others;
- (i) Observance of the main priorities established by the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament questions; and, finally,
- (j) Adequate use of the existing multilateral machinery for negotiation.

The Brazilian delegation hopes that the working groups established by this Committee for the duration of its 1980 session can start their work without further delay. It is obvious that disarmament questions, and negotiations relating to them, do not exist in a vacuum, and this Committee cannot perform its work adequately if it insulates itself from the political realities of our time. We would much prefer, however, that the actual negotiations by the subsidiary bodies could commence without the unnecessary complications generated by the raising of other issues, totally unrelated to the substance of the task entrusted to each working group. Let us hope that present differences are immediately resolved in a constructive spirit, so that progress on the definition of the "Elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament" can be effectively achieved at this session of the Committee on Disarmament; for its part, the Brazilian delegation stands ready to contribute to the successful outcome of the negotiations in the Working Group.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Brazil for his statement and for his kind words addressed to the Chinese delegation and myself.

Mr. VOUTOV (Bulgaria): The question of the comprehensive programme of disarmament takes a prominent place in the process of halting the arms race and achieving disarmament. My country, which provides the vice-chairman of the Disarmament Commission, whose specific task was the elaboration of the elements of such a programme, took an active part in the discussions which showed the complex nature of the comprehensive programme of disarmament. In the opinion of my delegation, the elements of a CPD which were approved by consensus last June, constitute good groundwork. A number of the provisions in document A/CN.10/7/Rev.1, sponsored by Bulgaria and other socialist countries, were found to be an appropriate basis in the formulation of the recommendations of the Commission.

On the other hand, many important disarmament issues are either missing or are represented inadequately in the texts adopted by the Commission.

My delegation will express its opinion on specific issues when we enter into concrete negotiations. Today I would like to offer certain considerations of a more general character.

One of the conclusions of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, was that the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament is an important element in an international disarmament strategy. The Bulgarian delegation firmly believes that this strategy can be pursued only in an atmosphere of détente. It is generally accepted that, in the process of détente, a whole system of treaties and agreements restricting the arms race were concluded: the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, the Treaty on the Prohibition of Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof, the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction, etc., etc. The relationship between détente and disarmament should be highlighted and promoted further if we are to take seriously the elaboration of international disarmament programmes and strategies.

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

In this connexion I would like to quote part of a speech delivered recently by the President of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Mr. Todor Zhivkov:

"The people and Government of Bulgaria believe in the future of détente. We believe that the wisdom of statesmen and the enduring interests and mutual advantage of all countries, States and peoples will eventually prevail. Clear-headedness, responsibility and common sense are necessary. Peace can and must be preserved, and détente can and must be protected and promoted. The People's Republic of Bulgaria believes in this goal and will work and fight to attain it". (CD/63, p. 3)

Some delegations speaking on the comprehensive programme of disarmament have already underlined the necessity of envisaging in it not only global but also regional disarmament measures. The policy of the socialist countries towards the global and over-all problems of disarmament is well known; its principles and main objectives were embodied above all in the Moscow Declaration of November 1978, signed by the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty. My delegation wishes on the other hand to underline the timely and in-depth proposal of the socialist countries concerning disarmament and confidence-building measures in Europe. No other region in the world has a greater concentration of arms and military personnel than Europe. Therefore the issue of military détente and disarmament in Europe has to be considered with high priority. This task can be solved not by building up armed forces and armaments and by introducing new types of nuclear missiles, but rather by adopting measures aimed at diminishing the armed forces and armaments in the continent. The early convening of a conference to consider the matters of military détente and disarmament in the European continent will be a major step on the road to strengthening peace and security in the Old Continent.

A very important question in the context of the comprehensive programme of disarmament is the one concerning a world disarmament conference. Resolution 34/81 notes with satisfaction the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference in which it is stated that:

"... the General Assembly may wish to decide that, after its second special session devoted to disarmament, a world disarmament conference could take place as soon as the necessary consensus on its convening has been reached ...".

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

The process of elaborating a comprehensive programme of disarmament, in the opinion of my delegation, can also be conducive to the efforts to reach "the necessary consensus", since there is a certain degree of interrelation between these two issues. A world disarmament conference has its natural place among the central topics in a comprehensive programme of disarmament, so that a decision on the conference will contribute to the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

The ultimate goal of such a programme is to contribute to a process of genuine disarmament, in strict observance of the principles contained in the Final Document of the tenth special session devoted to disarmament. On the basis of these principles the various disarmament measures envisaged in the comprehensive programme of disarmament can be accorded respective priority and be linked to certain stages.

The Bulgarian delegation takes this opportunity to stress the importance of the political will of States as the main and indispensable element in any disarmament negotiations, whether multilateral, bilateral or trilateral. A comprehensive programme of disarmament should be so devised that no State, particularly any nuclear-weapon State, is left out of the process of achieving a halt in the arms race and effective disarmament.

The working out of a comprehensive programme of disarmament is a task to be accomplished by several international forums dealing with disarmament, but it is the Committee on Disarmament which has a special responsibility for its elaboration. Paragraph 6 of part IV, entitled "Recommendations", of the report of the Disarmament Commission (A/34/42) states that:

"... all efforts should be exerted so as to submit it for consideration and adoption not later than the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament scheduled to be held in 1982".

Two years time is not that long a period when such a major issue is to be considered. The comprehensive and strategic character of such a programme demands that continuous and persistent work should be carried out without delay by the members of this Committee with a view to completing the elaboration of a comprehensive disarmament programme in due time.

My delegation welcomes the establishment of an Ad Hoc Working Group on the comprehensive programme of disarmament, and is prepared to participate in its work in a constructive spirit, giving consideration to the views other delegations may wish to express.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Today the delegation of the USSR would like to present its views on the question of the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament which is to take place in the Ad hoc Working Group.

We consider that the elaboration of such a programme should be based on the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, since it reflects all the main proposals and ideas put forward by many countries of the world on the questions of the limitation of the armaments race and disarmament. As you know, during the 1979 session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the "Elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament" was prepared on the basis of that document. In our view, in future work on a comprehensive programme of disarmament States also should adhere strictly to the decisions underlying the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, and should not attempt to change the balance of the compromise formulations which were reached on a whole series of questions and included in that Document.

Since we are required to elaborate a disarmament programme which, as emphasized in paragraph 109 of the Final Document, should encompass measures likely to ensure that the goal of general and complete disarmament becomes a reality, then the formulation of those measures should also be based on purposes and principles likely to ensure the attainment of general and complete disarmament.

We believe, in the first place, that the elaboration of disarmament measures should be based on the principle of not prejudicing the security of any of the parties. This means the renunciation of attempts to secure unilateral advantages, which is the most important condition for the effectiveness of negotiations and the viability of the agreements drawn up.

In order to create favourable conditions for curbing the arms race and ridding mankind of the threat of war, the universal affirmation and development of the principle of the non-use of force in international relations is of exceptional importance. The renunciation of the use of force or of the threat to use force should become a law of international life.

Further, the most important condition for the effectiveness of steps in the sphere of disarmament is the participation in the negotiations and in the agreements elaborated of the largest possible number of States, and particularly the nuclear-weapon Powers and States possessing the most powerful armed forces.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Their participation in efforts to curb the nuclear arms race and to reduce and eliminate all armaments is essential to the attainment of complete success in this direction.

The agreements worked out in the sphere of disarmament should provide for effective control, the scope and nature of which should be determined by the extent, nature and details of the specific measures which may be laid down in these agreements.

As regards concrete measures for the limitation of the arms race and disarmament, they should, in our view, include the following:

The cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament;

The prevention of the danger of a nuclear war;

The conclusion of an international convention on guarantees of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States;

The non-deployment of nuclear weapons on the territory of States where there are none at the present time;

The complete and universal prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests;

The strengthening by every means possible of the régime of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons;

The creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace;

The prohibition of chemical weapons;

The prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction;

The limitation and reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons;

The reduction of military budgets;

The complete demilitarization of the beds of the seas and oceans;

Regional measures for military détente and disarmament.

Naturally, in the implementation of these or other measures constituting a comprehensive programme of disarmament no rigid time-frames can be laid down for the conclusion of the relevant international agreements.

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): In my intervention today I should like to address the question of the comprehensive programme of disarmament. In our view, the elaboration of such a programme should not pose major difficulties, since we have sufficient elements in hand which should guide us in our endeavour. First of all, we have to follow the guidelines adopted at the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

A comprehensive programme of disarmament, in order to be realistic and capable of stimulating the work of this Committee must, of course, take full account of the existing political interrelationships and both positive and negative trends and

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

tendencies which mark the political climate in the world. At the same time, we must be fully aware that the successful drafting of such a programme is predicated on the universal acceptance and endorsement of the principles which, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and other well known international documents should govern international relations.

It is our firm view that a comprehensive programme of disarmament embracing --- as it should --- all aspects of global and regional disarmament, worked out either bilaterally or in the context of multilateral endeavours, should identify and determine the principal directions of the main negotiating effort in the Committee on Disarmament and in other disarmament negotiating forums. Our specific and detailed views in this respect were formulated in the reply of the Polish Government which, at the request of the Secretary-General, was submitted to the Disarmament Commission last year. These views have also been incorporated in the joint proposal concerning the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament which the socialist countries circulated last May as an official document of the Disarmament Commission.

It is unquestionable that the peaceful co-existence of States with different political and social systems is the principal factor which determines present-day international relations. Strict respect of this fundamental principle is a sine qua non of the success of any disarmament negotiations.

While recognizing the primary and primordial nature of the problems which for years have been a prominent feature of United Nations resolutions and which relate to the overriding question of eliminating the threat of war, and curbing and reducing the most lethal means of warfare, we cannot fail to address those issues which, even though less radical and ambitious can, nevertheless, bring us closer to our ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament. Poland believes that it is indispensable --- indeed, imperative --- to initiate efforts on a broad, even universal scale, in which all States would be brought together to co-operate with a view to the elimination of sources of tension and conflict, which --- as we know --- is the precondition for meaningful progress in disarmament negotiations.

The proposals formulated by the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, to mention, for instance, the Moscow Declaration of 1978 or the well-known documents resulting from the meetings of the Foreign Ministers of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty of last year, comprise a broad programme fully corresponding to the requirements and expectations of the international community. I need not emphasize that these initiatives go a long way towards meeting the postulates of both western and non-aligned and neutral countries of Europe and of the world at large.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

In the considered view of the Polish delegation, a realistic and practicable programme of disarmament and, in fact, any disarmament proposals, must take due account of the principles of the sovereign equality of States, the balance of rights and obligations and -- last but not least -- the undiminished security of all parties. Strict adherence to these principles implies, of course, that States must refrain from seeking to gain unilateral military advantages.

A comprehensive programme of disarmament must focus on the attainment of basic tenets. In our view, the central place among such tenets must be reserved for efforts to check and eliminate the threat of nuclear war. This objective can be achieved through the effective limitation and gradual reduction of stockpiles of all kinds of nuclear weapons. As will be recalled, there is an appropriate proposal in this regard on our negotiating table. The major issue is to muster sufficient will to proceed to matter-of-fact negotiations in this respect. Tangible and crucial progress in this particular area would be facilitated by early action to freeze the rampant arms race, especially in the realms of weapons of mass destruction, which at this time pose the greatest threat. Such a freeze would, indeed, represent a solid and lasting foundation for negotiations in that specific area, as well as in any other kind of negotiations.

One must constantly bear in mind that a disarmament programme, however comprehensive, should never be considered in a vacuum, divorced from the realities of the present-day world. It is, therefore, necessary to seek its early materialization through the concerted efforts and decisions of Governments, parliaments and civic organizations in order to consolidate the conviction that, in the nuclear era, there is simply no rational alternative to peaceful coexistence, in effect -- to disarmament.

Expediency and immediate objectives cannot be allowed to overshadow the long-range view of matters pertaining to peace and international security. It is necessary to seek such a programme of disarmament which will be totally capable of creating conditions for the peaceful life and work of future generations. In order to develop such a programme, we must neither ignore nor dismiss endeavours to provide for the political and psychological infrastructure of peace. The United Nations Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, which Poland initiated in 1978, was geared to serve precisely that objective. The main issue is to construct a lasting foundation for the peaceful co-existence of States by providing for binding juridical and political guarantees of equal security for all

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

States, through the universalization of the principle of non-use of force or the threat of force, through the further normalization of mutual relations between States, through the expansion of mutual confidence between States by steadily and gradually de-emphasizing the military factor in the policy of States, through the elimination of all manner of obstacles stemming from the division into opposing politico-military groupings, through the elimination of all manner of prejudice and intolerance and so on, and so forth.

Complete and faithful implementation of the Declaration which the United Nations General Assembly adopted at its thirty-third session without a single dissenting vote, dissemination of information about the increasing and accelerating arms race and the consequent waste of material, intellectual and spiritual resources, which so adversely affects the possibilities of the socio-economic development of States, should be among the major factors favouring and facilitating decision-making with respect to the limitation and reduction of the military potential of States. The education of younger generations in the spirit of peace and the need to foster friendly relations among all nations and peoples should be raised to the level of a universally-binding norm of international relations. This would be the most telling reaffirmation of the inalienable right of individuals to live and work in peace.

When initiating the draft declaration, we were guided by the suggestion that "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defence of peace must be constructed". It therefore appears desirable for States to promote a broader knowledge of the real factors which determine man's peaceful life. To this end, the Polish delegation feels that action should be taken to encourage closer co-operation and exchanges between peace research institutions, as well as between governmental and non-governmental organizations which follow with keen interest and sincere dedication the developments pertaining to peace and disarmament matters. This concerted effort should seek, first of all, to get societies to know and understand better the facts and mechanics of the arms race and of the efforts to curb that race. Peoples and societies would, in effect, come to realize their direct link with the strategy and long-term goals of the socio-economic development of States everywhere.

It is the view of my delegation that one way of helping to shape an environment conducive to the implementation of a realistic and practicable programme of disarmament would be for the United Nations to provide specific machinery designed to solicit and encourage the co-operation of the creative professions, namely, writers, artists and motion picture producers, in disarmament. Their works of art would play an important role in fostering in the minds of audiences everywhere the ideals of peaceful life, of disarmament, and of friendly co-operation between nations.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

As originator of the United Nations Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, Poland has put into effect a broad-ranging programme of measures designed to translate its recommendations into practical action. Mass media, artists and school curricula have been assigned a carefully-planned role to play in that regard. It is expected that, as a result, the common feeling of man's helplessness in the face of events seemingly beyond his control will be replaced by a firm conviction that, indeed, individuals are capable of controlling their future, and their peaceful work, provided they fully understand what is at stake.

In seeking to elaborate a comprehensive programme of disarmament, we must therefore think about helping to create conditions, and above all political conditions, which would be most conducive to the implementation of such a programme. In this regard, my delegation feels strongly that, given the balance of power obtaining now in the world, key significance must be attached to the nature of mutual relations between those major Powers which evidently shoulder the greatest responsibility for international security and world peace. In our view, this statement has been fully borne out by the positive international developments of the past decade. If we now permit these positive achievements to be eroded it can be justifiably held that no meaningful progress will be possible in halting the arms race or in the field of tangible disarmament. The prospects of promoting political détente as a universal and irreversible process depend largely on whether it can be in fact reinforced with commensurate détente in the military sphere. This explains, to a large extent, why the Polish Government attaches paramount importance to the SALT negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America and why we urge early action to ratify the SALT II agreement. For one thing, this agreement — if put into effect soon — would open up the way for further SALT talks, thus holding out the best guarantee of a reduced threat of nuclear conflict and fostering the most desirable external conditions in which to pursue disarmament efforts in other forums, including the Committee on Disarmament.

The indivisibility of peace and disarmament and the self-evident interdependence of all disarmament efforts, irrespective of the forums in which they are pursued, make it imperative for us gathered in this disarmament negotiating organ to take full advantage of all available possibilities of elaborating specific agreements in the field of arms limitation and disarmament.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

It is indeed regrettable that, having such a suitable mechanism as the Committee on Disarmament, we should prove hesitant to put its possibilities to the earliest and most effective use. In effect, we appear to tolerate a situation in which the Committee has been rendered incapable of launching matter-of-fact and constructive negotiations, especially in those areas which we all agree are ripe for solution.

My delegation finds it especially deplorable that the Committee's rules of procedure have not been strictly followed in the interest of the early solution of outstanding organizational matters. As a result, much useful time has been lost to the detriment of the expeditious and successful accomplishment of our substantive tasks.

In concluding my statement, I should like to refer to the suggestions made at earlier meetings, as well as today, by the distinguished representatives of the Netherlands and Canada, Ambassadors Fein and McPhail. My delegation is fully prepared to go along with their suggestions and to consider one by one all the requests of non-members to participate in our work. We expect that, as a result, the Committee will adopt, in each case, an appropriate decision corresponding to the rules of procedure of our Committee and to the nature of the respective request.

Mr. DE LA GORCE (France) (translated from French): I will say only a few words with reference to the points which we have heard raised today by certain delegations, and which reflect a fairly justifiable disappointment with the results of our work, particularly in view of the deadlock, which we greatly regret, on the problem of the participation of non-member States. The French delegation, which shares these concerns, has already -- at our meeting on 18 March -- expressed its views about the impasse in which the Committee now finds itself.

The French delegation has had no share in causing or prolonging this situation, and does not intend to take a stand concerning the dispute that has brought it about. We deeply regret the delay in providing the answers that the Committee should give to the requests before it, and we wish to state, for the Committee's records, that we hope these requests will be considered without further delay. We are ready, for our part, to agree to them.

Mr. MORENO (Italy): Mr. Chairman, I apologise to you for taking the floor for the second time in our meeting. I should like, however, to join previous speakers in putting on the record the views of my delegation concerning the participation of States not members of the Committee in the consideration of issues of particular concern to them. I would like to say that the Italian delegation cannot subscribe to the interpretation of the situation in the Committee given in document CD/83, submitted by a group of socialist States and circulated today. Italy has already taken the stand that the Committee should not discourage the participation in formal and informal meetings, in the circumstances clearly outlined in our rules of procedure, of States in a position to make an effective and genuine contribution to the progress of our work.

We have again received a number of requests which, examined on their own merit, deserve, in our view, a positive response. Among such requests, we note the application of some Western countries which, by their experience, expertise and positive contributions in the past, appear particularly qualified to participate in the work of the Committee on chemical weapons.

We therefore do not see any reason to postpone inviting countries having applied before, and we are totally prepared to accept the draft decisions submitted by you. As to the procedure to follow, we have no particular advice to offer. We are confident in your wisdom, Mr. Chairman, and in the wisdom of Ambassador Jaipal, who is always of great assistance to the Committee on delicate issues. What we expect is a correct and fair application of the rules of procedure.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other delegation wishes to take the floor, I intend to make a statement.

Fellow delegates, since this is the last occasion on which I am presiding over a plenary meeting of the Committee, I should like to take this opportunity, as Chairman, to make an assessment of our work during the month of March. When this month began, we had not reached a consensus on the question of establishing ad hoc working groups under four items, namely, (i) security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States, (ii) a comprehensive programme of disarmament, (iii) a chemical weapons ban, and (iv) a convention prohibiting radiological weapons.

However, during the first half of the month the Committee was able to decide to set up these four Working Groups and at the same time it approved the mandates for those Groups. This achievement has been hailed by several members as an

(The Chairman)

important landmark in our work. It now remains for the Committee to reach agreement on four chairmen for the four groups. In my opinion, this is not a difficult task. My contacts with various delegations reveal that, with goodwill and mutual accommodation between interested parties, and bearing in mind the fact that chairmanships are for this year and that it is possible for aspiring countries to fill the chair next year or even thereafter, since some negotiations will take a few years, it should be possible to resolve this particular problem quite soon.

I need not remind members of the Committee that our decision to establish four Working groups is now a matter of public knowledge; and the international community therefore expects us to nominate the four chairmen soon and begin the process of negotiations before the end of our current session. Failure to do so will attract adverse comment from several quarters, including the Disarmament Commission, which will meet in New York in May this year. Efforts were made by me as well as other members to secure agreement on four chairmen, but unfortunately not everyone was quite ready to participate in the process of consensus-making.

Another unresolved question is the participation of non-member States in our discussions. Our rules of procedure provide for this, and they also define precisely the extent and manner of participation of non-member States. As of now, there are before us six requests from six non-member States. Our inability so far to take decisions on this question has provoked criticism from some members who seem to feel that certain members are to be blamed for it. I feel obliged to clarify briefly the facts concerning our consideration of this question.

According to our records, my predecessor, Ambassador McPhail of Canada, received the first request from Finland dated 21 February on the following day, 22 February, which was a Friday. The Secretariat received it on Monday, 25 February, and issued it as an official document on 27 February. The second request for participation, dated 25 February, was received from Viet Nam on the same day and was issued as an official document, also on 27 February.

The Chairman first announced the arrival of these two requests at an informal meeting on 27 February and took them up for discussion on 28 February, when he proposed two draft formulations agreeing to the two requests. The discussions that followed were inconclusive because opinion was divided on the extent of participation of non-members in subsidiary bodies. This clouded the issue somewhat, and since subsidiary bodies had not then been set up, the matter was postponed to a later meeting.

(The Chairman)

At our first plenary meeting on 4 March, I noted as the first order of business that, as agreed upon by the Committee on 29 February, the week 3 to 7 March would be devoted, in addition to two substantive items on the agenda, to questions relating to the establishment of ad hoc working groups and the programme of work. Working paper No. 6 on a draft programme of work was submitted by the Chairman at an informal meeting on 7 March, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the rules of procedure. As proposed by the Chairman at our plenary meeting on 6 March, the Committee also considered at that informal meeting on 7 March the question of requests for participation in our discussions from non-members. By then, two more requests from Denmark and Spain had been received. The Chairman suggested that, for the time being, discussion of the question of participation in subsidiary bodies might be deferred, and that the Committee should approve the requests from four non-member States, namely, Denmark and Finland under rules 33 and 35, and Spain and Viet Nam under rules 34 and 35. Draft decisions were proposed by the Chairman. This was the second opportunity for the Committee to approve the requests, the first having been on 28 February. However, the proposed draft decisions were not entirely acceptable to all members and the Chairman therefore offered to redraft the formulations. Moreover, certain doubts had been raised by some members about the degree of permissible participation of non-member States in working groups, and this needed to be clarified.

For the third time, on 12 March, the Committee met in an informal meeting to resume consideration of this question. One more request had come in by then from Austria, and the Chairman proposed five draft decisions agreeing to the five requests. In regard to the doubts expressed by some members, the Chairman clarified that participation of non-member States in subsidiary bodies could not be to a larger or greater extent than that permitted by the rules of procedure in plenary meetings of the Committee. The draft decisions proposed by the Chairman were then subjected to attempts to standardize the replies and the Chairman agreed to submit revised formulations.

Once again the Committee met for the fourth time on Monday, 17 March, when the Chairman referred to a sixth request dated Thursday, 13 March from Democratic Kampuchea which had been received. The Chairman placed before the Committee six draft decisions, standardized as far as possible, and sought the Committee's advice as to the manner in which they should be dealt with, whether one by one or all together. The ensuing discussion which continued the following day, 18 March, was inconclusive, and it has remained so until today.

(The Chairman)

There is apparently a basic difference of opinion on this question. Some members regard it a matter of principle that non-member States are entitled to take part in our discussions, in accordance with the rules of procedure, having regard to the fact that our work is of general interest and concern to all States. They feel, therefore, that requests received from non-member States should be approved by the Committee as a matter of course and without discrimination. In other words, according to them, if any request were to be rejected for any reason, its rejection may have general repercussions.

On the contrary, other members evidently feel equally strongly that each request for participation from non-member States should be considered on its specific merits in conformity with the rules of procedure, and that it is improper to subject the acceptability of most requests to the non-acceptability of some. They are opposed to what they regard as "package deals" in the matter of considering requests for participation from non-members.

These are the two fundamental differences in approach to this question, and it would be a mistake to refer to them as having been artificially created. Efforts were made by me and other members to consult with each other on this matter, but there has been so far no indication of a consensus. I hope this issue can be resolved in a manner that is in keeping with the spirit and letter of the agreement embodied in paragraph 120 (h) of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament. I have tried to set out the facts of the consideration of this question by our Committee. These facts speak for themselves. We should now concentrate on positive approaches in the direction of reaching consensus.

Lastly, may I add that, apart from the two unresolved questions I have mentioned, the Committee has some achievements to its credit during this month. It adopted its programme of work, set up four Working Groups and started considering two important substantive items. We have already had some discussions on the question of a comprehensive nuclear test ban and we expect to revert to it next month when we receive the Secretary-General's report. We are now near the end of our debate on a comprehensive programme of disarmament. These matters are on the credit side of our work during March. I feel sure that we will achieve even more during next month.

In conclusion, I would like to place on record my deep appreciation of the co-operation, assistance and advice extended to me by all our colleagues. I believe that the achievements of the Committee during the month of March are the result of common efforts by all members to overcome their differences. I am very grateful

(The Chairman)

to all members for the understanding they have shown to me. I also wish to express my gratitude to the representative of the Secretary-General, Secretary of the Committee, Ambassador Jaipal for the assistance and advice he has given to the Chairman. I should also extend thanks to the Secretary's staff, including the translators and interpreters. In the work for this month they have helped us in a great deal of work.

I feel that all questions before the Committee can be resolved if there is mutual toleration of different positions and a common commitment to a constructive and positive approach to consensus. I wish my successor all the best in the performance of his duties. I am sure that he will receive from all of us the support that the Chairman of the Committee needs.

Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka): My delegation seems to have a habit of taking the floor a little after one, but I thought that despite the time and today being the last of our plenary meetings for March it could be useful and desirable that I say something on the state of things.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened very carefully to the statement you have made and what you described as an appraisal or an assessment of the work that has been done in the Committee in the month of March. My delegation also followed very carefully the factual record in the statement which you have just made on the question of the participation of non-members in the work of the Committee. My delegation welcomes your remarks and your appraisal of the work and what was, I believe, a factual statement on the question of participation of non-members.

My delegation also believes that what you have said today in your capacity as Chairman of this Committee, a capacity, an office, which is a continuing office, represents the thinking of the entirety of its members. My delegation has previously had occasion to say that the Chairman of our Committee cannot achieve more or advance more, or faster than its members will allow. From time to time, and again today, we have heard it said or sometimes discounted that the primary role of this Committee is negotiation. True as that may be, my delegation was consoled and reassured by certain remarks made by the distinguished representative of Mexico, not in the Committee but on a social occasion. The distinguished delegate of Mexico spoke of the consensus reached, to which you also referred just a while ago: the consensus that was reached on the establishment of four Working Groups. The distinguished delegate of Mexico referred to it as a historic event, and when it

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

comes from him -- an Ambassador who has had a long association with the work of this Committee and its predecessors -- I think it really means something, and that it is a valuable appraisal of the work we have been able to do during the course of this month.

Mr. Chairman, today is the last plenary which is being held under your chairmanship. You assumed this office a month after you took your seat in the Committee. It was not an easy responsibility and it was not an easy month. Nevertheless, I believe that I echo a wider sentiment in saying that you have guided our deliberations with caution, with understanding and wisdom in the best traditions already set by our other colleagues who preceded you. On behalf of my delegation, may I thank you and wish you a well-deserved weekend.

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

Mr. EL-SHAFEI (Egypt) (translated from Arabic): My delegation has listened with great interest to your appraisal of the work of our Committee during the last two months. I would like to state that it is a welcome initiative that the Chairman of our Committee was in a position to assess the Committee's work during his chairmanship.

The responsibility of the Chairman of any committee is great and important because of the position he holds, and therefore his assessment is especially reflective of the issues involved.

Over the long years during which I was able to follow closely the work of this Committee and of the one which preceded it, among the difficult tasks -- if not the most difficult -- was to agree among ourselves upon a common evaluation of our work. I will not mention any example of the difficulties we faced in the past in attempting this task, as a result of which we were occasionally obliged to abandon such an exercise. I therefore believe that any attempt on the part of a delegation or a group of delegations to make an appraisal of our work must be done with great care and caution. We must try to avoid, in so doing, accusing whomever it may be or casting any blame for our inability to achieve the results we desired.

In the course of the last two months during which your predecessor, the distinguished representative of Canada and you yourself presided over our deliberations, and without trying to make any appraisal whatever, I would like to say that the unanimous agreement reached on the establishment of four Working Groups

(Mr. El-Shafei, Egypt)

for the purpose of negotiation or definition of the elements of negotiation on the priority questions of our agenda was not only an important achievement, but also an important success attributable to our Committee, and to you yourself first of all.

Indeed, there were difficulties which had blocked agreement on other questions, but my delegation wishes to reiterate its thanks to you in bringing to our attention the various facts involved.

I wish to conclude by saying that my delegation hopes that such difficulties will not continue to persist.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Egypt for his very friendly words addressed to me.

If no other delegation wishes to take the floor, I would like to announce that the next plenary meeting of the Committee will be held on Tuesday, 1 April, at 10.30 a.m. On that occasion the Committee will start consideration of item 5 on its agenda entitled "New weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: radiological weapons".

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.