

CD/PV.76
9 April 1980
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-SIXTH MEETING
held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 9 April 1980, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. L. Sola Vila

(Cuba)

GE.80-60969

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

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

Argentina: Mr. A. DUMONT

Australia: Mr. A. BEHM
Ms. H. WICKES

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

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

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. I. SOTIROV
Mr. P. POPTCHEV
Mr. K. PRAMOV

Burma: U NGWE WIN

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

China: Mr. LIANG Yu-Fan
Mr. YANG Hu-Shan
Mr. LUO Ren-Shi
Mr. LIANG De-Fen
Mr. PAN Zhen-Qiang
Mrs. GE Yu-Yun

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

Czechoslovakia: Mr. P. LUKES
Mr. V. ROHAL-ILKIV

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

Ethiopia: Mr. T. TERREFE
Mr. F. YOHANNES

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

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

Germany, Federal Republic of: Mr. N. KLINGER

Hungary: Mr. I. KOMIVES

India: Mr. S. SARAN

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

Iran: Mr. D. AMERI

Italy: Mr. V. CORDERO DI MONTIZEMOLO
Mr. F. DE LUCA

Japan: Mr. Y. OKAWA
Mr. R. ISHII

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

Mexico: Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES
Mr. M.A. CACERES

Mongolia:

Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
Mr. L. ERDENECHULUUN
Mr. L. BAYART

Morocco:

Mr. M. CHRAIBI

Netherlands:

Mr. R.H. FEIN
Mr. H. WAGENMAKERS

Nigeria:

Mr. O. ADENIJI
Mr. T.O. OLUMOKO

Pakistan:

Mr. M. AKRAM
Mr. S. BASHIR

Peru:

Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO

Poland:

Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. H. PAC
Mr. J. CIALOWICZ

Romania:

Mr. C. ENE
Mr. T. MELESCANU

Sri Lanka:

Mr. I.B. FONSEKA

Sweden:

Mr. L. NORBERG

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. V.L. 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.D. ZAITZEV
Mr. B.I. KORNEYENKO

United Kingdom:

Mr. N.H. MARSHALL
Mr. P.M.W. FRANCIS
Mrs. J. LINK

United States of America:

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

Venezuela:

Mrs. G. DA SILVA

Yugoslavia:

Mr. D. DJOKIC

Zaire:

Mr. KALONJI TSHIKALA KAKWAKA

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

Mr. R. JAIPAL

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): I wish to pay my compliments to you on the occasion of your assuming the Chair of this Committee. This is the first time that Cuba has the Chairmanship and we are sure that you will be successful. The Netherlands delegation will certainly co-operate in a constructive way.

According to our programme of work, the formal meeting of the Committee on Disarmament of last Thursday, 3 April 1980, was scheduled to deal with new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: radiological weapons. That meeting was postponed, and I therefore wish to make some substantive remarks on the subject of radiological weapons today.

My comments will indicate the basic Netherlands position on the agreed USSR-United States proposal on major elements of a treaty prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons (documents CD/31 and CD/32); my comments will also reflect the statements made by the Netherlands delegation in the informal CD meeting on 12 July 1979. Once we have embarked on the actual negotiating process in the Working Group, my delegation might wish to table some additional suggestions on certain parts of the draft text.

At the outset, I want to restate -- as we have said before -- that the Netherlands Government looks upon an RW convention as a useful, albeit modest, contribution to the disarmament process. While the military potential of radiological weapons would appear to be limited, as we stated as long ago as in 1970 (CCD/291), we are nevertheless quite aware of the possible dangers emanating from the very existence of radioactive substances. The awareness of these dangers constitutes the rationale of the detailed comments I shall now make on the various articles of the USSR-United States draft convention.

Articles I to III deal with the modalities of the prohibitions to be contained in the convention. It stands to reason that, in order to prevent any misunderstanding as regards the scope of the comprehensive prohibition stated in article I, the definition of radiological weapons should be clear and unambiguous. Granted, articles II and III do offer a good description of what is meant by the term "radiological weapon". Still, one might query whether the exceptions contained in articles II and III as regards radioactive material -- "other than that produced by a nuclear explosive device" and "not produced by a nuclear explosive device" -- do not contain a loophole.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

I refer to the potential use as radiological weapons of radioactive substances produced and induced by (underground) nuclear tests or even PNEs. We assume, of course, that such is not the intention of the two sponsors of the draft convention. We are sure that they too would prefer to eliminate any ambiguity that might be found in their draft. In this context I may recall the distinction between two different methods of radiological warfare discerned both in United Nations General Assembly resolution 2602 (XXIV) of 16 December 1969 and in the Netherlands working paper CCD/291 of 14 July 1970, namely, on the one hand the enhancing of the radiological fall-out of nuclear weapons to a maximum level and, on the other hand, the use of radioactive agents independently of nuclear explosions. It is quite right that the present draft convention is restricted to the second method of radiological warfare, while the prohibition of the first method should legitimately come up, as can be inferred from article II, subparagraph 1, in the framework of nuclear disarmament.

Assuming as we do that the loophole I pointed out in article II, subparagraph 2, and in article III is nothing more than a problem of definition, we would suggest remedying this imperfection by the following formulations:

(a) Article II, subparagraph 2, would read:

"Any radioactive material specifically designed for employment, by its dissemination independently of nuclear explosions, to cause destruction, damage or injury by means of the radiation produced by the decay of such material";

(b) Article III would read:

"Each State Party to the Treaty also undertakes not to employ deliberately, by its dissemination independently of nuclear explosions, any radioactive material not defined as a radiological weapon in paragraph II, subparagraph 2, to cause destruction, damage or injury by means of the radiation produced by the decay of such material".

Thus amended, the text of article II, subparagraph 2, and article III would be consistent with the text of article II, subparagraph 1, and there would be no room whatsoever for any misunderstanding of the particular method of radiological warfare which is to be completely prohibited under the present treaty.

Of course, we are aware that it is said that radioactive substances produced or induced by nuclear explosions are hardly serviceable as radiological weapons, because all means of dissemination are prohibited in any case. This line of reasoning, however, does not appear convincing, since it can hardly be proved that a particular means of dissemination has been specifically designed for radiological warfare. Furthermore, both co-sponsors thought it fit to include in their draft the prohibition of radioactive materials as such, besides that of the means of dissemination.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

We are of the opinion that the present draft convention would stand to win if it were established unequivocally that the use of radioactive barriers on one's own territory is also to be banned. True, such a ban can be inferred from the text of articles I to III since, contrary to the dispositions of the Environmental Modification Treaty, the "destruction, damage or injury" envisaged in articles I and II is not restricted "to any other State Party". This may be so, but there can be no question about the obvious desirability of a clear prohibition of the use of radioactive barriers, even on one's own territory, and this should be brought out in the text, or at least in the course of our negotiations.

In his intervention of 26 February 1980, the Swedish Ambassador raised the question whether particle-beam weapons should be included as prohibited radiological weapons in the context of the RW convention we are now discussing. The same point was made on 1 April 1980 by the Ambassador of Mexico. There are some reasons why we are inclined to feel that particle-beam weapons should be dealt with separately, in another context. In the first place, there is small doubt that a proposal to have particle-beam weapons included in the prohibitions of the present draft treaty would give rise to time-consuming differences of opinion in this Committee, to the detriment of our dealing with other, major, items on the CD's agenda. In the second place, we hold that a convention prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons should not be construed to be anything else or more than an implementation of the ban on the radioactive material weapons referred to in the definition of weapons of mass destruction, contained both in the resolution of the Commission for Conventional Armaments of 12 August 1948 and in United Nations General Assembly resolution 32/84 B of 12 December 1977.

I would also like to follow up another question raised by the Swedish delegation, concerning the identical statements of the Soviet and United States delegates that:

"no obligations undertaken by States in the projected treaty will be interpreted as covering the use of radioactive materials or any sources of radiation for the purpose of any activity except such activities as the parties to the treaty have undertaken not to engage in pursuant to the provisions of the treaty".

The Netherlands delegation would be grateful to have some clarification of this Soviet-United States statement. Do the co-sponsors have any particular activity in mind?

I now come to article VI which deals with the physical protection of radioactive materials. Within the IAEA, an expert group has in the past made recommendations on the physical protection of fissionable materials (IAEA document INFCIRC 225/Rev.1).

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

These recommendations are implemented by many countries. Moreover, a Convention was recently concluded in Vienna on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Materials, particularly during transport. Both these recommendations and the Convention cover fissionable materials, whether irradiated or not, but do not cover radioactive materials in which no fissionable material is present. If we accept the idea, as reflected in article VI of the RW draft, that this category of materials must also be protected, parties must try to achieve common standards with respect to the level of protection. This could be done by amending the said Convention; but this does seem to be a somewhat cumbersome approach. Although my delegation certainly would not like to exclude the possibility of amending the Convention in the future, the most practical approach seems to be to ask IAEA to reconvene the expert group with a view to expanding the already existing recommendations so as to cover radioactive materials as well. Consequently, I propose to invite the Director-General of IAEA to present his views on this matter as soon as possible.

As far as article VIII is concerned, we think, upon reflection, that the envisaged complaints procedure -- which, by the way, is completely identical to that of the ENMOD Convention -- is sufficient in the context of the limited military significance of radiological weapons. This does not mean that, in our view, the present complaints procedure should necessarily be regarded as a model for any other future arms control and disarmament convention. In our opinion, verification and complaints procedures should be geared to the scope of a specific treaty, to the military relevance of prohibited activities and/or weapons, as well as to the proportions and distribution of possible stockpiles of the weapons under consideration. On the other hand it is correct, in our opinion, that article X provides for an unlimited duration. We fail to see, however, why subparagraph 2 of article X contains a right to withdraw from the treaty. The ENMOD Convention does not provide for a right to withdraw.

As for review of the operation of the treaty, referred to in article XI of the present draft convention, we feel that the first review conference should take place not later than five years after the entry into force of the treaty. Further review conferences could be held at longer intervals, depending on the need felt and expressed by a majority of States or a number of States not constituting a majority, as may be agreed upon.

As I said earlier in my statement, these are some basic reflections of the Netherlands on the joint Soviet-United States draft, and we may wish to comment in more detail later on in the Working Group.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I thank Ambassador Fein for his statement and for the words he has addressed to the Chair. We are sure we can count on the co-operation of his country in our arduous task.

Mr. ENE (Romania) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, my delegation's statement today is concerned with the two items which are at present at the centre of our discussions -- first, the question of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons and, secondly, the item on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. In this way the Romanian delegation would like to contribute to a greater concentration of our discussions, so that the dialogue in the Committee can lead to joint conclusions on the state of our negotiations and on further steps to be taken.

Romania views the prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction from two angles -- on the one hand, as action to limit the effects of scientific research for military purposes as a spur to the acceleration of the arms race and, on the other hand, as a practical measure designed to prevent the arms race from moving into new and ever more terrifying fields.

On the basis of this fundamental approach, my delegation has agreed from the outset that the question of new types of weapons of mass destruction should be considered by the Committee on Disarmament and should -- like every improvement in weapons, particularly nuclear weapons -- become a concrete subject for negotiation.

The Romanian delegation would like, on this occasion also, to reaffirm its positive attitude to the conclusion of a global instrument prohibiting the use of certain scientific and technological discoveries for the manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction.

At the same time, we have been aware of the concerns of the various delegations regarding the priorities that the Committee should observe and its duty to attempt first to solve the problems caused by the vast quantities of weapons already accumulated in military arsenals, above all in nuclear arsenals.

We also agree with the views expressed concerning the need to ensure that disarmament measures do not in any way affect the development of scientific and technical research for the benefit of mankind and society as a whole.

The considerations I have just expressed will also serve as guidelines for the Romanian delegation's participation in the negotiations to be conducted during this session on the conclusion of an international convention on the prohibition of radiological weapons.

At the present stage of the study of the problem of new types of weapons of mass destruction, the immediate question for the Committee is to decide how our work is to be continued.

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

In our opinion our present task is to find the most appropriate means for continuing the process of harmonizing views so that concrete negotiations can begin. The Committee must certainly remain alert to the possible dangers of the use of scientific and technical discoveries for producing new means of mass destruction -- ever more sophisticated and more deadly. In view of the specific technical nature of this question, we share the view that a more detailed examination of the subject can best be undertaken in a specialist body. It seems to us, therefore, that the Soviet delegation's proposal for the creation of a group of scientific experts to pursue the study of the problems raised by new types of weapons, and the conclusion of one or more international conventions with a view to closing a new potential channel for the arms race, would place our activities in this matter on a constructive and promising course. The Romanian delegation wishes to express its agreement with the establishment of such a group.

Our attitude is also based on the fact that this proposal is in keeping with the concrete character which we must impart to the work of the Committee on Disarmament. The positive experience gained by the Working Group on Seismic Events, which has become a valuable subsidiary organ able to provide the Committee with concrete ideas for a more active phase of our work -- which, we hope, is very near -- is clear evidence of the desirability and effectiveness of a working group of this kind.

In our opinion, the scientific experts in question should draw up their programme of work in the light of their own conclusions and of the urgency of the problems to be explored.

I would like now to speak on the other agenda item entitled "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament."

The Romanian delegation shares the opinion that this year the Committee on Disarmament is in an even better position to address itself to this matter with all the seriousness and the special importance it deserves. The participation of all the nuclear Powers in our Committee's work has created better conditions for negotiations on nuclear matters.

The urgency of such negotiations was demonstrated at the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The Final Document adopted by consensus states that "nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization ...", and that "in the task of achieving the goals of nuclear disarmament, all the nuclear-weapon States, in particular those among them which possess the most important nuclear arsenals, bear a special responsibility".

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

Paragraph 50 of the Final Document states that the achievement of nuclear disarmament will require urgent negotiation of agreements on the cessation of the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear-weapon systems, of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, and of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes, and also on the establishment of a comprehensive, phased programme for progressive and balanced reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, leading to their complete elimination. The urgency of such negotiations was confirmed in resolution 34/83 J, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 11 December 1979.

The need for speedy action in this direction is emphasized today, more than ever, by the mounting international tension and the danger of a military confrontation.

Today, the problem of the cessation of the nuclear arms race and of nuclear disarmament is not a theoretical question but a question that is vital for all States since, in the event of conflict, nuclear weapons will strike at everyone without discrimination. It is more than ever vital to halt the dangerous race in which military escalation and political tension go hand in hand.

Accordingly, the Romanian delegation considers that the inclusion of this problem in our agenda is a sure indication of the Committee's special responsibility for mobilizing the efforts of all States members to give effect to the commitments they have undertaken by adopting the Final Document of the special session.

Expressing the position of the Romanian Government, my delegation stressed in its first statement on 7 February that it attached "importance, as a matter of principle, to the organization this year, in the Committee, of effective consultations calculated to lead to the start of structured, stage-by-stage negotiations on particular topics with a view to the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and their gradual reduction. By such action the Committee itself would for the first time be taking the initiative of opening up a new chapter of its activities in a field, moreover, of paramount importance for international peace and security."

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

Certainly, we do not ignore or in any way simplify the difficulty of realizing this objective since it must be recognized that, while we have hitherto discussed certain aspects of the nuclear armaments race, questions concerning the very existence of nuclear weapons have never before been the subject of negotiations.

At the same time, the Romanian delegation is fully aware of the direct link between the nuclear field and other fields, such as the conventional weapons field, in the context of world equilibrium. As we see it, in the debate on nuclear disarmament it will be necessary to consider a whole group of components, as part of a determined effort to eliminate force and the threat of force from relations between States, and to advance from an armaments policy to a genuine disarmament policy which will ensure a proper balance by the progressive reduction of armaments, and primarily nuclear armaments.

But we think that the complexity of the problem should not be used as grounds for questioning the very idea of negotiating. On the contrary, it is yet another reason for mobilizing our efforts to identify the most realistic and responsible approaches. The Committee on Disarmament must become a genuine crucible for producing the ideas, the solutions and finally the nuclear disarmament agreements that were recognized as necessary and urgent in the consensus in the Final Document. It must not wait for them to come from outside.

The Romanian delegation considers that in the present international political situation, the Committee on Disarmament not only offers the most appropriate framework for such action. It is in fact the only body which can tackle the task; and we feel, consequently, that the Committee must take concrete action at this session.

For this purpose, it already has a good point of departure.

First of all, there are the proposals submitted last year by the Soviet delegation in document CD/4, with which my delegation is also associated; then there is document CD/36, submitted by the countries of the Group of 21, which Romania has also endorsed; and lastly, there are the many ideas, suggestions and concerns expressed by the various delegations at formal and informal meetings of the Committee on this question last year.

On this basis, and on the basis of other ideas which will be advanced this year, we must continue the dialogue, but in a more structured manner so as to make the best use of the work already done.

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

With this end in view, the Committee might consider holding a series of informal meetings for discussing in detail the practical problems involved in the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, in order to discover where the problems lie and to try to outline methods of tackling them. An exchange of views of this kind might be simplified if it were conducted on the basis of an indicative list of questions which have already been raised in the past, to which others could be added during the present debate.

Among the questions on which the Romanian delegation would like more clarification, I would mention, for example, the relationship between the three components of nuclear disarmament mentioned in paragraph 50 of the Final Document; the relationship between the different aspects and stages of nuclear disarmament and the existence of other military offensive means, particularly in the conventional field; nuclear disarmament and the non-use of force; the procedures for applying in practice the principle agreed upon at the special session, to the effect that nuclear disarmament should start with the States which have the largest nuclear arsenals; and so forth.

We are convinced that the identification of basic problems which every nuclear disarmament measure will raise for different States in the light of their specific positions and interests, could greatly facilitate progress in our work. An undertaking of this kind should be carried out in an open and constructive spirit of exploration.

Once the problems have been identified, the Committee can then go on to consider methods of solving them and the machinery necessary for this purpose, taking into account the legitimate concerns expressed by different States. The Committee will then be able to incorporate its conclusions in a comprehensive, phased programme for nuclear disarmament as called for in paragraph 50 of the Final Document.

Action of this kind will also simplify the Committee's efforts to elaborate the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

In conclusion, I would like to add that my delegation believes that every discussion in our plenary meetings on the various agenda items is a step in the direction of concrete action. Our debates on the two items in question should therefore also lead us to positive action on the practical level.

To this end the Romanian delegation is ready to make every contribution it can.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I thank Ambassador Ene of Romania for his statement and for the kind words he has addressed to the Chair and to my country.

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): Before I turn to the main theme of my brief statement today -- the question of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: radiological weapons -- I should like first of all to take this opportunity to associate my delegation with the congratulations and good wishes which previous speakers have expressed to you on your assumption of the important and demanding post of our Chairman for the month. We are pleased to see the representative of fraternal Cuba preside over our deliberations in April, at a crucial and difficult period of our work. We are confident, Comrade Chairman, that given your diplomatic skill and the dedication of your country to the cause of disarmament, you will be able to discharge your tasks successfully. In this respect you can rely on the Polish delegation for its full co-operation.

I should like to begin by placing on record the full support of the Polish delegation for the proposal made at our previous meeting by the distinguished representative of the USSR, Ambassador Victor L. Issraelyan, concerning the establishment, under the auspices of the Committee, of a group of experts with terms of reference providing for sustained efforts to elaborate an agreement on a comprehensive ban on the development and production of new systems of weapons of mass destruction while, at the same time, seeking to identify and ban specific types of such weapons.

In the view of my delegation, this imaginative and constructive approach of the Soviet Union to the question under consideration fully corresponds to the request contained in General Assembly resolution 34/79. It also goes a long way to meet the recommendation contained in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. As will be recalled, that document stated inter alia, and I quote:

"In order to help prevent a qualitative arms race and so that scientific and technological achievements may ultimately be used solely for peaceful purposes, effective measures should be taken to avoid the danger and prevent the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction based on new scientific principles and achievements. Efforts should be appropriately pursued aiming at the prohibition of such new types and new systems of weapons of mass destruction. Specific agreements could be concluded on particular types of new weapons of mass destruction which may be identified. This question should be kept under continuing review."

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

As my delegation interprets the proposal for the setting up of an expert group, its task would be precisely geared to keep the question of new types of weapons of mass destruction under continued review.

A positive action of the Committee on Disarmament on the Soviet proposal would enlarge in an important way on its recent decision to establish an Ad Hoc Working Group on Radiological Weapons, one of the specific types of weapons of mass destruction which have been identified through joint efforts pursued in the Committee and on a bilateral basis.

The Polish delegation has always argued that it is indispensable, indeed imperative, for the scope of disarmament efforts pursued by the international community, more particularly by this disarmament negotiating body, to be broad and far-sighted enough to develop effective checks on the technological arms race, especially in areas where new weapons of mass annihilation may be at stake. My delegation is not alone in holding this view.

As a matter of fact, the Committee on Disarmament is quite familiar with the importance of the issues involved in the technological arms race and the efforts to control it. Over the years, due to extensive consideration, often with the benefit of expert advice, the members of this body have developed an informed opinion on the subject. It is probably accurate to say that the perception of dangers involved in new technological breakthroughs in the area of weapons of mass destruction, whether potential or perceived, is now coupled with a better understanding and appreciation of what, how and when should be done in order to cope with the possible threats in a more effective way.

It can be reasonably claimed that there is an ever growing body of opinion which understands the importance of early action, which in effect favours prevention over cure. Such an approach to the problem of the technological arms race is not only practicable but certainly less expensive in terms of human and material resources.

I am sure that no one will deny that the technological arms race, the ominous trend which threatens unpredictable developments in weapons technology, must be effectively checked at an early date. Apart from outlawing specific developments in that area, the best approach is a comprehensive agreement imposing effective restrictions upon problem-oriented applied research. An agreement in that area

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

may not easily lend itself to verification and control but, nevertheless, it would be in an educated self-interest of mankind.

It is our firm view that the Committee on Disarmament cannot afford to be idle or indifferent in the face of the potential assault on the threshold of the technological arms race, in the face of the real possibility that the technology of war again escapes from man's control. Should this come to pass, its adverse effects would inevitably deal a heavy blow to our efforts in all other areas of arms limitation and disarmament. For these reasons, the initiative of the Soviet Union for a resolute and imaginative approach to dealing with the prohibition of new types and new systems of weapons of mass destruction within the context of a group of competent experts deserves unanimous support.

In the light of these considerations I cannot but express great satisfaction at the Committee's decision to deal, within an ad hoc working group, with the question of radiological weapons.

The increasing development of nuclear energy has rendered highly radioactive material easily accessible to many countries, even those who under the Non-Proliferation Treaty have formally forsworn nuclear weapons. Effective and conclusive action, within the group, on the joint Soviet-United States proposal on "major elements" of an agreement prohibiting radiological weapons would close all avenues, however remote and theoretical, to the potential military applications of radioactive material produced in nuclear reactors. As an immediate benefit, it would stop or prevent undertaking specific research which might seek to turn long-lived radioactive material into short-lived and hence more dangerous and more militarily attractive material.

A positive action in this area, reflected in the elaboration of an agreed text of a draft international agreement on the prohibition of RW, would be an important signal that the international community has firmly made the first step to prevent military technology from overtaking the rate of progress in the negotiations concerned with arms limitation and disarmament.

I need not add, of course, that the Polish delegation will not spare its efforts to contribute to that objective.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I thank the Ambassador of Poland for his statement and for the kind words he has addressed to our delegation and our country.

Mr. ONKELINX (Belgium) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, as my other colleagues have done, I would like first of all to express my best wishes for your Chairmanship and to assure you of our full co-operation during your period of office.

The few comments I have to make now -- and I must apologize to you and to our Committee for not keeping to the general programme of work which you have proposed -- my comments now will relate to radiological weapons.

The support which the Belgian authorities are prepared to give to the negotiation effort undertaken with a view to prohibiting radiological weapons is based on a series of considerations which have already been explained to the Committee and which can be summarized as follows:

As long ago as 1948 radiological weapons were already included in the definition of weapons of mass destruction by a United Nations Commission. And whereas at that time there was some doubt as to the possibility of using them in combat, the technical progress achieved since then leads one to believe that the vectors of radioactive products are today more developed and more effective. Furthermore, with the multiplication of nuclear power stations throughout the world, the amount of radioactive waste, which would be the raw material required for the manufacture of such weapons, is increasing daily.

The joint proposal submitted to our Committee by the United States and the USSR is in line with our approach to the subject of new weapons of mass destruction. Belgium has always felt that case-by-case consideration was required in this field, and that negotiations should be undertaken whenever it seemed possible that a ban could be achieved for a specific and clearly identified type of weapon.

The third consideration is that the conclusion of a Treaty banning radiological weapons would be the first concrete achievement by our Committee with its present composition. In the tense international situation of today, whose difficulties make themselves felt even within our Committee, we should be particularly mindful of the symbolical value of the conclusion of such a Treaty.

(Mr. Onkelinx, Belgium)

Such a result, at the end of the current session, would constitute a significant contribution by our Committee particularly since, for the first time in the nuclear field, the international community could then expect to see a treaty acceded to by all the nuclear Powers.

It is therefore important that the Working Group which we have decided to set up should consider the various proposals before it as soon as possible.

In order not to waste time and to make a start on the discussion which should lead to the elaboration of a treaty, the Belgian authorities feel that it would be preferable to present to the Committee forthwith the few comments they have to make on the joint United States-Soviet proposal submitted to the Committee on 9 July last.

In article I of the proposal, Belgium suggests adding the words "never, under any circumstances,". The sentence would thus read: "Each State party to the Treaty undertakes never, under any circumstances, to develop, produce, stockpile, otherwise acquire or possess, or use radiological weapons".

The merits of this amendment would be two-fold, as follows:

It would prevent anyone from invoking the doctrine of the lapsing of disarmament treaties in situations of armed conflict and would therefore eliminate any doubt about the application of the Treaty in time of war.

This formula was applied for the first time in the Treaty on Bacteriological Weapons and again in the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Environmental Modification Techniques;

The second advantage would be to extend the field of application of the convention, unequivocally, to cover actions taken for purely defensive purposes. This might perhaps meet the legitimate concerns on this point expressed by Ambassador Lidgard, the representative of Sweden, in his statement on 26 February.

Article II of the joint United States-USSR proposal excludes "nuclear explosive devices", as well as any radioactive matter they produce, from the field of application of the convention.

In order not to give the impression that the convention might in some way "legitimize" recourse to a nuclear explosive device, it would undoubtedly be advisable to state in precise terms, in the preamble to the convention, the basic objective of nuclear disarmament. This would also be in keeping with one of the comments made by Ambassador Lidgard on 26 February. And I would like to mention that

(Mr. Onkelinx, Belgium)

the draft preamble submitted to the Committee on 23 July last (document CD/40) by the representative of Hungary does not, in its present form, contain any specific reference to the objectives of nuclear disarmament.

The wording of article III of the joint proposal leads us to ask its co-sponsors a question for the purpose of clarification. The radioactive material referred to here is material not specifically designed for use "by dissemination". Does this mean any radioactive material present in any nuclear power station? And if this is the case, does the prohibition apply only to acts of active use of such material by dissemination? Or are deliberate attacks against storage depots or nuclear power stations, with the risk of dissemination they involve, to be included in the prohibition as well?

In article VIII, paragraph 2, the procedure for convening the Consultative Committee of Experts seems particularly slow. The procedure envisaged could be improved by drafting the beginning of the paragraph as follows: "For the purposes set forth in Subparagraph 1 of this Paragraph, the Depositary shall, if possible immediately and in any case within one month of the receipt of a request ...".

The wording of this article VIII, paragraph 2, gives the impression that the Consultative Committee is convened automatically once the depositary receives a request. Would the depositary under the terms of this article, have no powers of consultation or rapid investigation before convening the Committee?

Our last comment relates to article 1 of the annex to the treaty, concerning the Consultative Committee of Experts. The Belgian delegation wonders whether the words "by the State party requesting the convening of the Committee" are essential, and whether they do not in fact excessively restrict the Consultative Committee's powers of deliberation by specifying that the Committee may express its views only on problems raised by the State requesting the convening of the Committee.

These comments could have been made to the Working Group it has been decided to set up. But we felt that in order to save time it was preferable to present them forthwith to the Committee, and particularly to the delegations which have sponsored the joint proposal and the draft preamble. These delegations can now consider our comments before the Working Group meets. This procedure should, we believe, increase the chances of success in concluding the convention during the current session.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I thank the Ambassador of Belgium for his statement and for the kind words he has addressed to the Chair. We are sure that we will be able to count on his co-operation in our work.

There are no other speakers on today's list and the Chairman would like to make a statement.

On two occasions, on 17 and 18 March, the Committee has considered in detail the action to be taken on the six requests for participation by non-member States. In my opinion, there is no need to pursue the discussion of this matter because the outcome would be the same. If we look at rule 34 of the rules of procedure, we see that the matter was considered during the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The first sentence of that rule embodies an agreed principle with regard to States not members of the Committee which apply to take part in the Committee's discussions. The second sentence of rule 34 provides that the Committee shall consider such requests before the Chairman transmits invitations to the non-member States concerned. What is meant by considering the requests of non-member States? The answer to this question depends on the different views expressed by members of the Committee in examining the requests. It may be assumed that the elements to be taken into account include the relevance of the requests, the specific interests of the non-member States, the question whether the requests do really come from non-member States and other factors which the members may deem to be relevant to the case. As members will note, some of the requests submitted are requests to participate under rule 33 and others are requests to participate under rule 34. In my opinion, the six requests should be considered one by one in the order in which they were received. I say this because we have no other solution. We have already considered at length the advantages and disadvantages of studying them together and some members have objected, but, in fact, no one has objected to the idea that we should consider the requests one by one. I would also like to recall that, on 27 March, members of two groups stated that they were prepared to take part in the consideration of the requests one by one in plenary meetings. I therefore suggest that we should deal with the requests one by one in the order in which they were received.

If I hear no objection ...

The delegation of Pakistan has the floor.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): Mr. Chairman, at the meeting to which you just referred, my delegation had suggested, in response to a statement made in the Committee, that the Committee, could, if it wished, take up the six requests from non-member States in the order in which they had been submitted. Therefore, my delegation would have no difficulty with your proposal to take up the six requests that are before the Committee.

I have, however, asked for the floor to refer to a related matter and a question which not only causes some difficulties for my delegation but also I am sure, has implications of a wider character for this Committee. I refer to a document which my delegation has received this afternoon. This is a document which is numbered CD/87 and is dated 8 April. It is entitled "Telegram dated 8 April 1980 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea addressed to the Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament".

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you, Sir, and all the members of the Committee are aware of the questions which the circulation of this document in the Committee gives rise to. The document purports to be issued by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the "so-called" People's Republic of Kampuchea, and this statement is something on which each of our delegations has a specific position. I could take the time of the Committee to express the point of view of my Government on the credentials and antecedents of the "so-called" People's Republic of Kampuchea. I shall not do so. However, what is, I think, relevant for this Committee is to take into account the fact that this "so-called" People's Republic of Kampuchea is not recognized as such as a State, as a legitimate Government, by the General Assembly of the United Nations; and therefore this gives rise to certain questions about the legality and the propriety of circulating a document from a régime which is not recognized as being the legal régime of the country in question within this Committee. I will not go into the question of the relationship of this Committee and the United Nations General Assembly, although I am prepared to do so at a later stage; but I would like to point out that the secretariat of this Committee, and especially the Secretary of this Committee, is a representative of the Secretary-General and appointed by him. The secretariat of this Committee is financed by the United Nations budget and therefore, Sir, whether we like it or not there is an integral relationship between this Committee and the United Nations.

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

It is the expectation of my delegation at least that the secretariat of this Committee would not act contrary to the decisions and recommendations adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on any question and especially on the question of the representation of States Members of the United Nations. I say this, Mr. Chairman, with all my respect and affection for the Secretary of the Committee and for the members of the secretariat.

We have two questions that I would like to pose to you, Sir, and I would like to say, before I do pose these two questions to you, that we do understand your difficulties as well, and the complexities of the questions with which you were confronted. I would like to ask, firstly, at whose behest and by whose decision has the present document, received from a régime which is not recognized as the legitimate representative of Kampuchea by the United Nations -- by whose decision has this document been circulated as an official document of the Committee? My second question, Sir, which is related to the first, is what are the criteria that are followed by the secretariat of the Committee or by its Chairman in determining which communications should or should not be circulated as official documents of this Committee. Is it possible for any group of people, describing itself as a government of any country, to seek distribution of its views in this Committee? Is it possible to give the same facilities, for any instance, to the government of the "so-called" Transkei in southern Africa -- a régime which has been installed by Pretoria? Is it possible to give the same facility to the régime installed, similarly, in Namibia? Does the rule cover the request from a liberation organization or front? In short, Sir, what are the criteria that are followed in the circulation of documents which are supposed to be from States?

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): The Chair will now reply to the questions raised by the representative of Pakistan concerning the reasons which led us to request the secretariat to publish the document.

In our rules of procedure, from rule 1 right down to the end of the rules, we did not find any reference to "State Member of the United Nations" which would have caused us to think of any other alternative. As I understand the situation, I have a duty to inform the Committee of everything which relates to its work; and I decided to inform it of the content of document CD/87. In reply to the second question by the representative of Pakistan, I should make it clear that, when I

(The Chairman)

authorized the circulation of document CD/87, I was following the practice established by my predecessor -- a practice which was not questioned by any member of this Committee when document CD/76 was circulated -- and I understood that it was generally accepted that documents should be circulated. Now, if the representative of Pakistan wishes to express the view which he has already stated, he is of course fully entitled to do so; but we believe that we could now embark on the consideration of the requests one by one in the order in which they were submitted. If this method were adopted, there would be no objection to his making his statement at the appropriate moment.

With regard to the recognition or non-recognition of particular States, we were guided by the same reasoning since not all members of the Committee recognize the same authority as the legitimate representative of a State. The purpose of the document was essentially informative. If the representative of Pakistan had let us finish our statement, he would have realized that the purpose of the document, as of all communications which have been circulated from States not members of the Committee on Disarmament, was to inform members of the Committee of the wishes of States to participate in the work of the Committee.

If there is no objection from the representative of Pakistan, we might now begin to consider the request from Finland.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you for the statement you have just made in explanation of the circulation of CD/87. May I say, Sir, that with all due respect, I cannot agree with the explanation that has been offered. You have said that you followed the precedent set by your predecessor in circulating document CD/87. However, that document was submitted by a State Member of the United Nations, and it therefore posed no problem since that Government is represented in the United Nations; it is represented in these halls and therefore I do not think that the two cases can be compared in any sense.

In the present case, the Government concerned is not recognized by the United Nations, and I do not need to quote to you the resolution of the United Nations which has rejected the credentials of the "so-called" People's Republic of Kampuchea. Therefore, there is no comparison between the two requests or the two documents before us.

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

Secondly, as far as the question of recognition or non-recognition is concerned, here again I have posed a real problem that the Committee will encounter in the future, depending on how it acts on the present document. If it is the wish of the Committee that anybody representing -- or purporting to represent -- a country can circulate documents to this Committee without let or hindrance, we may be flooded with requests from liberation fronts in Afghanistan or other parts of the world, and what would then be the criterion to be followed by the Chairman of the Committee and the secretariat in such instances? I think these matters have grave political implications. In certain previous instances there were some doubts as to the circulation of documents. I refer specifically to a document circulated last year, which was received from the Chairman of the Special Committee on Apartheid. In that instance, the Chairman brought the matter to the Committee itself in informal meetings and, once a consensus had been reached to circulate the document in the Committee, it was circulated thereafter. In this instance, that procedure has not been followed. The circulation of this document does not compromise the position of either my delegation or my Government; but the matter is important for the future work of this Committee, if, in the future we would have to take a decision regarding requests received from Governments, régimes, and liberation fronts in accordance with what is decided here today. That is the question I have posed, Sir, and I am afraid that we have not as yet received a satisfactory answer.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): It is not the intention of the Chair, before giving the floor to Sri Lanka and the People's Republic of China, which have asked for it, to enter into a dialogue. As the members of the Committee will remember, the 40 members who are here now are the same 40 who were here last year; and in 1979 every request submitted by any State, whether or not its status was in question, was circulated as a working paper by the Chair. In 1980, this precedent was changed and all documents containing requests for participation have been circulated as official documents without previously being circulated as working papers. This is the precedent which the Chair followed in circulating this document. If document CD/76 had been distributed as a working paper, many countries represented here might have questioned the need for its distribution. The intention of the Chair was to circulate an information paper to all members of this Committee, so that they would be aware of a particular request.

Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka): Mr. Chairman, as it is the first occasion that my delegation is speaking under your Chairmanship, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, to wish you well in your term of office, and to express the sentiments -- which I believe and am confident will be shared -- that you will discharge the responsibilities as Chairman of this Committee in the high traditions maintained by your very illustrious predecessors. I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that you will yourself follow these very good traditions.

Mr. Chairman, as you yourself said, it is not your wish to entertain a dialogue or a debate on this question and I certainly will follow that guidance from you. I do not think that this Committee needs to enter into a controversial dialogue on this question.

The delegate of Pakistan explained the position of his delegation at length and I, for my own part, do not wish to go into even greater details, as it sometimes does not contribute to the solution of questions. You were kind enough, Mr. Chairman, to offer an explanation of the reasoning for the action that had been taken. I do not doubt your instructions, as you are the Chairman of our Committee and the power in deciding on the procedures of this Committee is vested in you. The Secretariat cannot act except on your express instructions. Mr. Chairman, the point I wish to make is this, and it concerns the document which has been issued under the symbol CD/87.

First, Mr. Chairman, my connexions with this Committee are relatively brief. I only came last year when it became the Committee on Disarmament. I am therefore in the comfortable position that both my and your own connexions with the Committee are of about the same duration, as we were both privileged to join the Committee at approximately the same time. My understanding is that there is a certain meaning attached to the issuance of a document with a CD symbol, because it is done in order to give that document a certain validity, a certain stature and a degree of recognition by all members of this Committee. My delegation believes that one should not use the documentation procedures of this Committee lightly. The distinguished delegate of Pakistan elaborated on the situations with which we might be faced if we were to issue any communications received as documents of this Committee with a CD number.

Mr. Chairman, you were kind enough to offer us an explanation for the distribution of this document. As I understood you, this reason was that there is nothing in the rules of procedure which specifies the conditions under which a

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

document received in the Committee can be issued. That is my understanding. You are empowered to issue as a document of the Committee this document, which you received as Chairman of the Committee. However, Mr. Chairman, I am just wondering whether one should set about it as simply as that. The delegate of Pakistan made a reference to the possibility of a liberation front sending a letter or a telegram to be issued as a document of the Committee, something to which the Governments of many of the countries assembled in this Committee would not react kindly. This could place us in a rather awkward situation, since many of the States represented here do have factions or groups claiming to have formed an alternative Government and they might send you a communication. If we were to follow up such a request by issuing it as a document of the Committee, we might be faced with embarrassing situations.

As you may know, Mr. Chairman, in the past we had a comparable situation, for which the Chairman chose to hold an informal meeting of the Committee to enquire from members what they felt about this document. He had the opportunity to hear the views of members concerning the distribution of the document and then a decision was taken. I find that this document, CD/87 bears the date 8 April 1980; but I do not see when this communication was received in the Secretariat. Perhaps the Secretariat would be able to enlighten us by using its systems of registration, as to the date when the document reached the Secretariat. It is possible that it was lying in the Secretariat, and you had an opportunity to see it and hold some consultations with members of the Committee. These are just possibilities. I am wondering whether, instead of taking a decision in this manner, it might be advisable for the Committee to adopt a procedure whereby there would be some consultations before a document was given the status of an official document of this Committee.

Mr. LIANG YU-FAN (China) (translated from Chinese): Mr. Chairman, originally I had no intention of asking for the floor at the present stage of the meeting. However, in the statement you have just made, you said that the Chinese delegation distributed document CD/76 during its term of office as the Chairman of the Committee in the month of March; and I am therefore compelled to make a brief statement.

The document distributed by the Chairman on 17 March was a request to participate in the work of the Committee, received from a Member State of the United Nations which has been generally recognized by the international community. It is just like

(Mr. LIANG Yu-Fan, China)

the other five requests. In the discussions that followed, we have all referred to the six requests from non-member States. In the entire process, not one member of the Committee has raised any objections. As for document CD/87, the party which has submitted this document cannot be placed on the same footing as Democratic Kampuchea at all. Therefore, I cannot agree with your argument that the distribution of this document by you is of the same nature as the distribution by the Chinese delegation of document CD/76.

As for document CD/87 which contains vicious attacks on the Chinese Government, I do not intend for the moment to say anything on this point. The Chinese delegation, however, reserves its right to comment further on that document.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): If there is no objection, I suggest that, as we had intended, we should begin the discussion of the request by Finland and, when we come to the situation just referred to, we can revert to it.

Is there any objection to starting the discussion of the matter for which the meeting was called?

I would like to remind the Committee that the requests by the non-member States are contained in the following documents: CD/75 and 81, Finland; CD/66, Socialist Republic of Viet Nam; CD/69, Denmark; CD/70, Spain; CD/74, Austria; and CD/76, Democratic Kampuchea. In this connexion, I also received a request from the People's Republic of Kampuchea and asked the Secretariat to circulate it as document CD/87. I would like to point out that the only purpose of these documents, as has been indicated on other occasions in this Committee, is to provide information that may be useful to the Committee in its consideration of these and other matters on which it must take decisions. I think I should make this point quite clear since I would not like there to be any confusion about it. Accordingly, we shall take the decisions in chronological order.

It will be recalled that the secretariat distributed draft replies to the States which applied to take part in the Committee's work at the informal meeting held on last 17 March. I now suggest that the Committee should consider the draft decision which relates to the request by Finland and reads as follows:

"In reply to the request by Finland (CD/75) the Committee decides to invite the representative of Finland to participate, in accordance with rules 33 to 35 of the rules of procedure, in the formal and informal meetings on chemical weapons to be held by the Committee during its 1980 session."

(The Chairman)

There is also a request by Finland concerning the Committee's subsidiary bodies. The Chair considers that we should not at this time deal with the question of the subsidiary bodies since they have not yet been established. The draft reply would include a paragraph identical to the one suggested in other cases and reading as follows:

"Participation in the meetings of the Committee's subsidiary bodies will be decided upon at a later date when these bodies have been established."

Is there any objection to the request by Finland?

The request by Finland is approved. I would ask the Secretariat to transmit the Committee's invitation to the Finnish authorities.

I suggest that we should go on to the draft decision on the request received from the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam which reads as follows:

"In reply to the request by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam (CD/66), the Committee decides to invite the representative of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam to take part, in accordance with rule 34 of the rules of procedure, in the formal meetings on chemical weapons to be held by the Committee during its 1980 session."

Mr. NORBERG (Sweden): Mr. Chairman, I have asked for the floor in order to make a short remark with respect to the decision that we have taken regarding the request from Finland.

Mr. Chairman, since this is the first time the Swedish delegation takes the floor during the month of April, I wish to associate my delegation with those who have congratulated you on your assumption of the Chairmanship of the Committee on Disarmament. The Swedish delegation was pleased to participate in the consensus decision to invite the representative of Finland to take part in the formal and informal meetings of this Committee dealing with chemical weapons.

In this regard, Finland has, in a letter dated 18 March 1980, stated that its request for participation is to be understood as applying also to the ad hoc working group of the Committee on Disarmament. In view of the very valuable work carried out by Finland in the field of chemical weapons, in particular regarding verification, the Swedish delegation strongly supports Finland's request to participate in the working group on chemical weapons and we hope that the Committee will take a decision to that effect at a later date.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): Mr. Chairman, my delegation is happy that the Committee has approved the request for participation from Finland. The Pakistan delegation is, in principle, in favour of the Committee approving all the six requests from non-member States to participate in the work of this Committee.

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

However, Sir, in the case which is presently under consideration, that of Viet Nam, there are certain considerations which need to be taken into account. The Committee has received a request for participation from another State in the same region to express itself on the same subject. I refer to the request from Democratic Kampuchea. These two requests should be treated equally, without discrimination against either of the two regional parties. Therefore, the Pakistan delegation will reserve its position on the request for participation from Viet Nam until the Committee has considered the request from Democratic Kampuchea. I would like to clarify that, if there is a consensus to approve the latter request, we would join in approving the request from Viet Nam for participation.

For the moment, therefore, we would propose that a decision on the Vietnamese request should be deferred.

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic): May I first express my delegation's satisfaction with the Committee's favourable response to the request of Finland to participate in the work of the Committee on Disarmament on chemical weapons during the 1980 session. We consider this decision very useful and creative and in full accordance with the rules of procedure of the Committee.

The socialist countries have, from the very beginning, supported a case-by-case consideration of the requests made by non-member States. We agreed, before beginning this discussion, to take them up one by one. My delegation is now surprised to hear the proposal that, in view of certain reservations -- inconceivable for us -- the Committee should put aside, for further consideration, the request made by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, and turn to the consideration of other requests. It is even more surprising for us, since the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam was invited last year to participate in the work of the Committee and constructively contributed to our work. Therefore, it would be an obvious discrimination against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam to put aside its request and to go on with the consideration of further requests.

I would like to state very firmly that my delegation is not inclined to go along with such a solution, and insists that the request of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam be considered further and responded to favourably. My delegation is ready to wait until all delegations are in a position to do so. Also, my delegation would be in favour of proceeding without delay. I am sure that this position is shared by a great number of delegations represented in the Committee.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (translated from Russian): The Mongolian delegation fully supports the views just expressed by the distinguished Ambassador of the German Democratic Republic. The representative of Pakistan, speaking after the adoption of the decision on the request of Finland, has just said that his delegation would prefer to consider the request of Viet Nam in conjunction with the request contained in document CD/76; and, in the course of his statement he used the term "the so-called People's Republic of Kampuchea". I should like to receive from the representative of Pakistan a clear and precise answer to the question whether, when he used the term "People's Republic of Kampuchea", he had in mind the country which is situated in south-east Asia, with Phnom Penh as its capital. The second question I should like to ask the distinguished representative of Pakistan is as follows: what did he have in mind when he spoke of the request contained in document CD/76? Where is this State situated, in which region of the world, and what is its capital?

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): Mr. Chairman, I must confess that my delegation is not used to being interrogated in this Committee but, due to my deep respect for the distinguished Ambassador of Mongolia, I will seek to answer his questions.

Mr. Chairman, the country I have in mind is Democratic Kampuchea. That is a country whose geography we are very familiar with. Its capital is Phnom Penh; that capital is occupied by foreign troops. The party we wish to hear from Kampuchea is the party which the United Nations General Assembly recognizes as the legitimate Government of Kampuchea.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (translated from Russian): I apologize for taking the floor a second time. The Mongolian People's Republic has friendly relations with the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic): Mr. Chairman, when our Committee started its work, almost all delegations expressed their interest in doing fruitful and effective work. In the course of this part of our annual session, certain delegations repeatedly expressed their concern about attempts by certain delegations to divert the attention of our Committee from its substantive work and involve it in a number of questions which are not relevant to the mandate of our

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

Committee. Certainly, this afternoon, I had to overcome feelings of resistance to this when witnessing again such attempts to divert the attention of the Committee from the concrete tasks we are facing. We could certainly put forward even more arguments, perhaps more convincing arguments, than have been put forward by certain representatives. We could even put facts before this Committee, not very pleasant facts, about the "so-called" régime certain representatives are defending here, but we are interested in constructive work. That is why I appeal to you to use your authority as Chairman, and I also appeal to all delegates to stop diverting the Committee and imposing the discussion of problems which are not within the competence of our body and which should not be discussed here. Let us hold such philosophical discussions -- on legitimate régimes or on the legitimate existence of States -- elsewhere; and let us not involve the Committee in this debate. I ask you not to follow this line and to continue more substantive work.

Mr. LIANG Yu-Fan (China) (translated from Chinese): Mr. Chairman, I very much agree with the view expressed just now by the Ambassador from the German Democratic Republic. In our Committee, we should do useful work and not create obstacles on questions which are unrelated to the work of the Committee. We should have been discussing the requests from the six non-members to participate in the work of the Committee; and these six requests have been under discussion since March. Now it has become clearer why decisions on these six requests were not reached at an earlier date. I do not intend to dwell on this matter again. However, there is today an additional request before all the members. I really do not know how to describe this request. Should it be considered as the seventh request or what? I think we can stop playing hide-and-seek now, because we all know what is the question that we have to discuss. If we are to discuss the question of the representation of Democratic Kampuchea, this question has already been discussed and settled at the last session of the United Nations General Assembly. If anyone wishes to raise the question of the so-called People's Republic of Kampuchea now, is this not a desire or a request to repeat in the Committee on Disarmament the discussion of a question which has already been discussed at the United Nations General Assembly? In my previous statement, I have already said that, although the telegram from the so-called Minister for Foreign Affairs of the

(Mr. Liang Yu-Fan, China)

People's Republic of Kampuchea contained in document CD/87 contains vicious attacks on China, I do not know what connexion it has with the question of disarmament or what benefits it can bring to the work of the Committee on Disarmament; but still I do not wish to make any comment on this question. Should comments be made, there would be plenty. So, I wish to return to the question of the six requests from non-member States raised just now by the Chairman.

First, I would like to express our satisfaction that Finland is allowed to participate in the relevant meetings of the Committee. According to the Final Document of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and the spirit of the relevant provisions of the rules of procedure of the Committee, the Chinese delegation takes the view that the six requests from non-member States which were made since last month should all be accepted without discrimination. The Chinese delegation is prepared to agree to the request from Viet Nam on condition that the four subsequent requests -- I repeat, the four requests which were made since March -- do not meet with any obstacles. This position of the Chinese delegation is precisely for the purpose of preventing any kind of discrimination because, from the proceedings of our meeting, the Chinese delegation cannot but worry that someone might apply differential treatments to these six requests. Therefore, with regard to the request from Viet Nam, the Chinese delegation reserves its right to speak after the other four requests have all been discussed. At present, it cannot be considered that any kind of consensus has been reached on the request from Viet Nam. This position of the Chinese delegation is precisely for the purpose of avoiding any discrimination. I repeat, if there should be no discrimination of any sort, the Chinese delegation would be prepared to agree to the request from Viet Nam.

Mr. KCMIVES (Hungary): I will be very brief. I had many occasions to express the position of my delegation concerning the application of non-member States for participation in the work of the Committee. This position is unchanged; requests should be considered one by one and in the order of their submission. The question which is now before us concerns the request of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam.

I would like to state also that the Hungarian delegation fully adheres to the statement made by the representative of the German Democratic Republic and fully supports it.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I would remind the distinguished representatives that we are considering the second request. The view of the Chair, and I may be wrong, is that the Committee decided a few minutes ago to examine the

(The Chairman)

requests one by one and in the chronological order in which they had been submitted, and not to examine the two cases which have been mentioned, because another case might arise and any of the other four might be made conditional upon a fifth or a third case. We consider that, if delegations object to a request at any time, their objections must be stated. There there is no consensus and we go on to the next point. Now our rules of procedure do not provide for reservations. They do establish the principle of consensus, and this is what we have always followed; in other words, we do not make, say, an article 19 conditional upon the adoption of proposal No. 31. I think this a decision that must be taken now. If there is no consensus, the Chairman must state that there is no consensus, and accordingly I state that, to my great regret, there is no consensus. I believe that we have to adopt a definite approach because, if we make some requests conditional upon others, the same thing can happen with any other requests that are submitted.

I request the Committee to decide. Is there any objection to inviting Viet Nam?

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): Mr. Chairman, I made a statement earlier explaining the position of my delegation and I believe that there is no consensus, at the moment, on the request of Viet Nam.

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): We have just received two lessons, one concerning geography and a second concerning discrimination. As a conclusion to these two lessons, and while there is no consensus in the Committee responding positively to the request of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, my delegation is prepared to wait for the moment when such a consensus appears and until that moment, my delegation is not prepared to consider any other items.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): According to my interpretation, the statement by the representative of Poland means that, for the time being, consideration of the requests made has come to a standstill. Is this interpretation correct?

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): Mr. Chairman, the Committee took a decision to consider all cases one by one and my delegation fully agreed to this approach. My delegation is not prepared to place any precondition on the application of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam because we see no reason for such preconditions. My delegation is hoping that the delegations which are not presently prepared to give their consent to the request of Viet Nam will change their minds and we will wait for that moment.

Mr. VOUTOV (Bulgaria): I might, maybe by accident, be one of the founders of the Committee on Disarmament, from the very beginning when it was composed of ten members, then 18, 25, 31 and 40. I have not always been here but, with some interruptions, I have participated in it. When asking myself what is my love in my diplomatic work, the Committee on Disarmament is my answer because this Committee is unique. It was set up by the United Nations by consensus and after long consideration by countries which felt that we had to do everything possible to go along the road of disarmament. The Committee passed the most unfortunate period of the world after the Second World War, during the Cold War. I was happy when I came here at the last stage of the Committee, when it was transformed from CCD to CD. In all this history, I do not remember such comity for the constructive work of the Committee than this year. Perhaps these are very strong words, but it is in my heart. We were, as already mentioned, witnesses in recent weeks of blaming each other from time to time, spreading rumours in the Committee for the purpose of protecting the instigators and, in fact, putting a spoke in the wheel of the Committee. I am speaking so emotionally because my world in the international diplomatic world is that of the Committee on Disarmament and because the question of disarmament is the most important, and will decide whether humanity is to go along the road of progress or along the road of destruction. My delegation was happy when the working groups were set up. It seemed that we were, finally, putting the work of the Committee on the track of negotiation -- but immediately, those who are in fact against this new trend are inventing something new. And now we see that these people, these delegations are blocking the Committee's decision on an important question -- that of the invitation to States not members of the Committee to participate in its work. I would therefore like to say that my delegation is unhappy with this situation. Personally, I would say that it does not matter if these States are Members of the United Nations or not, as last year we invited Switzerland, which is not a member of the United Nations, and were happy to welcome its participation in our work on disarmament. I think that the responsibility of those who are blocking the invitation of non-member States of the Committee should be their own.

Mr. AKRAH (Pakistan): Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of our work this afternoon, you stated that the Committee had decided to take up the requests of non-member States one by one, that is, on a case by case basis. That was the proposal made in this Committee for several weeks by certain members. We are now somewhat surprised to hear proposals that would depart from the procedure advocated by those delegations themselves. I also think Sir, that as far as emotion and attachment to the goals of disarmament are concerned, we must all consider that each one of us is equally attached to the goals of disarmament. However, I think it would be well to recall a particular quotation which says that "we are not the physicians, but we may be the disease".

Mr. LIANG Yu-Fan (China) (translated from Chinese): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The time is already late and I did not intend to take the floor again because, once I take the floor, it seems like giving a lesson -- because the Chinese delegation does not often take the floor. But I have just heard the statement of the Ambassador from Bulgaria, Ambassador Voutov; and according to the argument of certain delegates, we are once again having a lesson on history. Of course, I do not wish to refer to this question since this would take us too far. Ambassador Voutov did not even wish to name names of those who have spoken in the Committee. I think perhaps he was a little excited. I think we should have the minimum of courtesy here, but I do not wish to continue on this question.

I only wish to say that, with regard to the procedure proposed by the Chairman for a case-to-case discussion of the six requests from non-members, the first request has already been discussed; and on the second request, some delegations have expressed certain views. That is quite normal. It does not mean that all six requests should be agreed to right away. Originally we proposed that all six requests could be settled at the same time. At that time, there was disagreement in the Committee, so I feel that, since there are different views with regard to the second request and no consensus has merged for the time being, then why cannot we proceed with the third and the fourth requests? I think this is not in any way contrary to the principle of case-to-case discussion. If any question cannot be settled for the time being, that does not mean that we cannot proceed with the other questions. If such were the case, then once we were bogged down on one question the whole work of the Committee would be bogged down. So, I suggest that, perhaps, the Chairman could open our discussion with regard to the third request.

Mr. TERREFFE (Ethiopia): Mr. Chairman, when you first suggested the procedure of dealing with this question, case by case, I was really very sincerely hoping that we would proceed faster than we have been doing. I thought that the decision that we have adopted was the correct one and that the chronological order of these requests should be our guiding principle; and it is with this in mind that the approval of the first request, that of Finland, was accepted without any difficulty. As far as my delegation is concerned, there is no reason why we should stop at the second request, that of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, especially, as that particular country has a lot to offer on the topics that we shall discuss.

(Mr. Terrefe, Ethiopia)

The objections that are brought by some members are qualified; I do not think that they insist that Viet Nam should not be given the chance to speak or to participate. My own feeling is that we should allow Viet Nam to participate as it did last year. To introduce this problem of the representation of Kampuchea is out of order. It does not belong to the item which we are discussing. I therefore appeal to those members of the Committee who insist on a package deal to consider the point that we are discussing, which is the participation of Viet Nam, and I suggest that we delay the problem of Kampuchea's representation until later. I think we should cross that bridge when we come to it. We have not yet reached that point and may not be able to deal with it today. Therefore, the position of my delegation is to strongly support the participation of Viet Nam without qualification.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I should like to express the views of the Soviet delegation on this question, and I am doing so for the first time, although we attach great importance to the question of participation in the Committee's work by States which are not members of the Committee. We do not of course regard this a key question, and we state once again that the Committee often wastes its time criminally on various secondary issues. If all the delegations which have taken the floor before me were to address themselves to questions of substance as often as they have spoken today, if, say, they were to express their views on the question of the prohibition of new types and new systems of weapons of mass destruction -- the question which is on the programme for the Committee's work today -- how much weightier their contribution would be. But we do not hear them. In the discussions on questions of substance, they usually remain silent. They remain silent, or they are not in the room at all. Nevertheless, the Soviet delegation would like to know their views on these questions, and we would like to conduct negotiations with them, but not about the credentials of this or that Government or about particular criminals who have fled from a country. In our Committee we should be negotiating on questions of disarmament; but persistent and stubborn attempts are being made to sidetrack us. I agree with my Chinese colleague when he said that attacks on China had nothing to do with disarmament. In this connexion I would remind distinguished delegates that the Soviet delegation took the floor on a point of order when on 5 February one delegation made crude attacks on the Soviet Union. What has this got to do with disarmament?

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

We must conduct negotiations on disarmament, and all delegations represented in this Committee should understand this. They should not waste time to no purpose or take the floor ten times on questions which are not so substantive.

The Committee has established working groups -- and that is good. But let us not exaggerate the importance of this fact. Let me remind you how many commissions, sub-commissions, committees, sub-committees, working groups and sub-groups on disarmament have been set up in the history of mankind. And with what result? More than \$400 billion a year are being spent on the armaments race.

No, let us not exaggerate the significance of the modest successes achieved by the Committee in its work, and particularly not of the establishment of working groups. We cannot even agree on the chairmen of these groups. On this question everyone tries to take the most rigid position as possible. Is this really what we are called upon to do? Must we really concern ourselves with such matters? No: the Soviet delegation did not come to Geneva for procedural debates, and we shall in future speak very rarely and very briefly in debates of this kind.

This does not mean that we do not have a position on the matter under discussion. I am prepared to explain it briefly. It is reflected in document CD/83, the statement by a group of Socialist States. We have always been ready to consider without delay a request by any State that is not a member of the Committee, whether it is a Member of the United Nations or not. We were ready today also to consider positively the existing requests that have been made and to take decisions on them, on the six requests. And here also there is a surprising coincidence of views between us and the Chinese delegation. We are also prepared to take six positive decisions, and in order to avoid any ambiguity I shall name the countries on which we are prepared to take positive decisions today, immediately. On one of them -- Finland -- we have already taken a decision. Next come the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, Denmark, Spain, Austria and the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

Many of you may say: "But how can that be? There is the General Assembly, and it has adopted a resolution recognizing the authority of the 'Democratic Republic of Kampuchea'". In this connexion, Comrade Chairman, now that everybody here is giving lessons, let me recall a certain historical fact. Probably, some people would like to forget it, but it exists and there is no getting away from it.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

In the autumn of 1949, the People's revolution in China was victorious. The Soviet Union welcomed the victory of that revolution and the proclamation of the People's Republic of China. The Soviet Union and a small number of other States immediately recognized and established diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China, breaking off all relations with Chiang Kai-shek's supporters. And what did the United Nations, that temple of justice, do? It did not recognize the credentials of the representatives of the People's Republic of China. Year in and year out, the USSR and other socialist countries objected to the recognition of the credentials of representatives of Chiang Kai-shek. We were a small group of countries, and we were in the minority. The majority of countries, including the majority of those represented here -- I have a list of them but I am not going to read it out -- were against recognizing the credentials of the representatives of the People's Republic of China and were in favour of approving the credentials of the Chiang Kai-shek supporters who represented nobody. How many years passed? -- one year? two years? Gentlemen, let us remember. It was twenty-two years! It was only in October 1971 that the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China were restored, and the credentials of its delegation recognized. Until then the United Nations went on adopting resolutions recognizing the Chiang Kai-shek supporters and repudiating the People's Republic of China. And who were the losers in this? The losers were those who ignored the real facts.

Yes, gentlemen, today, the People's Republic of Kampuchea is still not recognized by the majority of States Members of the United Nations, but what in fact follows from this, if we remember the historical fact which I have mentioned?

As you know, my country is not a small one, but for seven years it was not recognized by any of the capitalist countries; they recognized Admiral Kolchak, Baron Wrangel and Kerensky. In the United States, for example, for about ten years there was a mission representing the provisional government of Kerensky. And what, may one ask, followed from that? Did the Soviet Union dissolve and disappear? And what followed from the fact that for twenty and more years the General Assembly did not recognize the People's Republic of China? Did the People's Republic of China disappear? No. And what follows from the fact that the majority in the General Assembly of the United Nations still does not recognize the People's Republic of Kampuchea? What indeed? The time will come -- it will come -- when many, if not all, of those sitting at this table will vote for recognition of the credentials of the People's Republic of Kampuchea as a Member of the United Nations. This will happen, inevitably.

Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka): Mr. Chairman, the hour is late. May I, on behalf of my delegation, say that we entirely welcome and are happy that this Committee has agreed on the participation of Finland. We were considering the second application, which is from the People's Republic of Viet Nam and I would like to state that my delegation welcomes the participation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam unconditionally.

Mr. Chairman, having said that, may I try to assist you, although I may be anticipating you. My delegation is prepared to welcome the participation of Denmark, Spain, Austria, Democratic Kampuchea and according to the preceding views expressed by members in this Committee, Mr. Chairman, I did not hear any member object to your proceeding to the next application, that of Denmark.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.