

CD/PV.107
17 February 1981
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 17 February 1981, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. F. de la Gorce (France)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. A. SALAH-BEY
Mr. M. MATI

Argentina: Mr. F. JIMENEZ DAVILA
Miss N. FREYRE PENABAD

Australia: Mr. R.A. WALKER
Mr. R. STEELE
Mr. T. FINDLAY

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

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

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. R. DEYANOV

Burma: U SAW HLAING
U THAN HTUN
U NGWE WIN

Canada: Mr. G. SKINNER
Mr. B. THACKER

China: Mr. YU Peiwen
Mr. YU Mengjia
Mrs. WANG Zhiyun
Mr. PAN Jusheng

Cuba: Mrs. V. BOROWDOSKY JACKIEWICH

Czechoslovakia: Mr. M. RUZEK
Mr. P. LUKES
Mr. A. CIMA
Mr. L. STAVINOHA

Egypt: Mr. E.S.A.R. EL REEDY
Mr. I.A. HASSAN
Mr. M.N. FAHMY
Miss W. BASSIM

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

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

German Democratic Republic: Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. H. THIELICKE
Mr. M. KAULFUSS
Mr. P. BÜNTIG

Germany, Federal Republic of: Mr. N. KLINGLER
Mr. H. MÜLLER
Mr. W. ROHR

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

India: Mr. A.P. VENKATESWARAN
Mr. S. SARAN

Indonesia: Mr. E. SOEPRAPTO
Mr. KARYONO
Mr. F. QASIM
Mr. HARYOMATARAM

Iran: Mr. D. AMERI

Italy: Mr. V. CORDERO DI MONTEZEMOLO
Mr. A. CIARRAPICO
Mr. B. CABRAS
Mr. E. DI GIOVANNI

Japan: Mr. Y. OKAWA
Mr. M. TAKAHASHI
Mr. R. ISHII
Mr. K. SHIMADA

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

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

Mongolia: Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
Mr. S.-O. BOLD

Morocco: Mr. M. CHRAIBI

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

Nigeria: Mr. O. ADENIJI
Mr. T. AGUIYI-IRONSI

Pakistan: Mr. M. AHMAD
Mr. T. ALTAF

Peru:

Poland: Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. J. CIALOWICZ
Mr. S. KONIK
Mr. T. STROJWAS

Romania: Mr. M. MALITA
Mr. T. MELESCANU

Sri Lanka: Mr. H.M.G.S. PALIHAKKARA

Sweden: Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. L. NORBERG
Mr. S. STROMBACK
Mr. J. LUNDIN

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. B.P. PROKOFIEV
Mr. V.A. SEMLONOV
Mr. L.A. NJUMOV
Mr. V.A. PERFILIEV
Mr. L.S. MOSHKOV
Mr. V.M. GANJA
Mr. V.V. LOSHCININE
Mr. A.G. DOULYAN
Mr. Y.V. KOSTENKO

United Kingdom:

Mr. D.M. SUMMERHAYES
Mr. N.H. MARSHALL
Mrs. J.I. LINK

United States of America:

Mr. C.C. FLOWERREE
Mr. L.R. FLEISCHER
Ms. K. CRITTENBERGER
Mr. J.A. MISKEL
Mr. H. WILSON
Mr. S. FITZGERALD

Venezuela:

Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT
Mr. O.A. AGUILAR
Miss G. DA SILVA

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. VRHUNEC
Mr. B. BRANKOVIC

Zaire:

Mr. N.D. BWANDA
Mr. O. GNOK

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

Mr. R. JAIPAL

Deputy Secretary of the
Committee:

Mr. V. BERASATEGUI

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I should like first of all to express our pleasure in welcoming among us Mr. Sytenko, Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs, who is visiting us today. I wish him an interesting stay in Geneva, and useful contacts with the members of the Committee on Disarmament.

I should now like, with your permission, to put before you for nomination as Chairmen of the ad hoc working groups we have already decided to set up, the following names:

For the Ad Hoc Working Group on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, Mr. Ciarrapico, Minister Plenipotentiary, of Italy;

For the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons, Ambassador Lidgard of Sweden;

For the Ad Hoc Working Group on Radiological Weapons, Ambassador Komives of Hungary;

For the Ad Hoc Working Group on a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, Ambassador García Robles of Mexico.

In the absence of observations I will take it that there is a consensus in the Committee on the nomination of these persons to the chairmanships of the working groups and would offer our colleagues the warm congratulations of the Committee and assure them of our full confidence and our best wishes for the complete success of the work they will be called upon to guide.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I would remind you that according to the programme of work set out in document CD/144, the Committee ought today to begin considering item 1 of its agenda, nuclear test ban. As you know, this programme is in no way binding and under our rules of procedure delegations are at all times free to refer to other items on the agenda.

Mr. PALIHAKKARA (Sri Lanka): Mr. Chairman, may I, at the outset, join the previous speakers in expressing the great pleasure of my delegation to see you in the Chair of our Committee. I am confident that your proven efficiency and skill will guide the work of the Committee in a most constructive manner, and I wish to pledge to you the fullest co-operation of my delegation.

May I also take this opportunity to express the appreciation of my delegation to your predecessor, Ambassador Terrefe of Ethiopia who very ably guided the work of the Committee during the last month of the 1980 session. My delegation also wishes to join the other delegations in welcoming the new heads of the delegations of Egypt, Pakistan, Romania and Zaire.

The 1981 session of the Committee on Disarmament which you declared open two weeks ago will be its last full session before the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament scheduled for 1982. As we enter the Second Disarmament Decade and the third year of the CD's endeavours in disarmament,

(Mr. Palihakkara, Sri Lanka)

negotiations, it is evident that the international community's anxiety over the danger of nuclear holocaust has not been dispelled to any considerable degree. On the contrary, we are witnessing continued developments in qualitative improvements to existing nuclear explosive devices and their delivery systems which, according to the "Comprehensive study on nuclear weapons" submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session already possess "an energy greater than that of all conventional explosives ever used since gunpowder was invented", not to speak of their fall-out effects, which will condemn the human race to gradual and painful disintegration. Pronouncements by nuclear Powers of their commitment to disarmament notwithstanding, these refinements of instruments of death and catastrophe and ever-spiralling expenditure of human and other resources on armaments, particularly nuclear armaments, have seriously eroded the credibility of these pronouncements. As the Secretary-General of the United Nations in his message to this Committee has stated, "the goal of disarmament remains as elusive as ever". We also hear of "concepts" which advocate the waging of "limited nuclear wars" that can be won. How such theories are conceivable is beyond imagination, for it has been proved beyond any doubt by Hiroshima, Nagasaki and subsequent test explosions that no barrier will stand in the way of nuclear blast and subsequent contamination. We are up against an absolute weapon, the unleashing of which, however limited that may appear to those who advocate it, will leave neither the victor nor the vanquished and therefore does not serve any realistic political or military purpose. The only purpose such a "feasible" nuclear war would serve could be a precipitation of a global nuclear conflagration with unprecedented destruction and misery for mankind. Nuclear deterrence and the further refining of it, which we see today, are said to be required for the national security of major nuclear Powers. This concept of security, which is claimed to assure the security of a country or a few countries by increasing the anxiety and insecurity of a vast majority of other nations, will not be justified or acceptable to the international community. The international community, in the words of the Final Document of the United Nations General Assembly's first special session devoted to disarmament, had already declared unanimously that "the increase in weapons, especially nuclear weapons, far from helping to strengthen international security, on the contrary weakens it. The vast stockpiles and tremendous build-up of arms and armed forces and the competition for qualitative refinement of weapons of all kinds, to which scientific resources and technological advances are diverted, pose incalculable threats to peace".

The United Nations General Assembly, at its thirty-fifth session recently concluded, adopted no less than 43 resolutions on matters relating to disarmament, of which, 17 resolutions call for specific action by the Committee on Disarmament. As the detailed analysis presented by the distinguished Ambassador of Mexico in his statement would indicate, these resolutions also set out priorities for the current session of the Committee in carrying out substantive negotiations in order to achieve progress towards solving the most pressing problem of mankind.

We are all aware of the set-backs suffered by détente and SALT II and we can only hope that many years of painstaking efforts will not be reversed. This situation will make the responsibility of our Committee, the only multilateral body engaged in disarmament negotiations, that much greater because there is no viable alternative to disarmament.

It is in this context that my delegation has been looking forward to tangible progress in substantive negotiations during the 1981 session of our Committee. While I do not wish to minimize the importance of the procedural and organizational tasks accomplished, it would be true to say that the last two years of the

(Mr. Palihakkara, Sri Lanka)

Committee's work have not presented the international community with a substantially significant achievement towards effective disarmament. In this connection, last year's session proved to be most educative. It proved the value of ad hoc working groups as the best available mechanisms for concrete negotiations within the framework of the Committee on Disarmament and that, given the necessary time, the working groups are capable of advancing substantive negotiations in an effective manner as was noticed towards the end of last year's session.

It is a matter for satisfaction that the Committee has already been able to take the decision, without much delay, that the four ad hoc working groups should resume work on the basis of their former mandates, a solution which became possible through your able guidance and the flexibility displayed by all delegations concerned in order to expedite substantive work. It is to be hoped that the same approach and spirit will prevail during the remaining part of our session, particularly with regard to the setting up of two new working groups, on two very important items on our agenda for the 1981 session, namely, a comprehensive test-ban treaty and the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. Last year, the Committee spent valuable time on lengthy procedural and other deliberations, time which the Committee can ill afford in view of the urgency and the nature of the task it is entrusted with. As the distinguished leader of the Swedish delegation mentioned in her statement, the time factor is not in our favour. This is not merely because the Committee has to make a report to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament in 1982 but purely because of the dire necessity and urgency of the task before it. The danger of continued and rapid developments in weapon technology, particularly nuclear weapon technology, outpacing the negotiation process and the influence of such developments on so-called defence policies are realities which should guide the Committee's work towards speedy and concrete progress in negotiations.

Moreover, the world military expenditure has now reached a staggering \$500 billion a year and present trends point towards further escalation of this expenditure. The more we delay in achieving tangible progress towards genuine disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, the more will be invested in destruction, thus siphoning away the vital resources needed elsewhere for economic development and the elimination of hunger and disease. As the distinguished leader of the Swedish delegation has pointed out, the doomsday clock has moved closer to zero hour, a movement which symbolizes the urgency with which this Committee, the single multilateral negotiation forum for disarmament, has to discharge its enormous responsibility.

As regards our agenda, the first item on it for the 1981 session is the nuclear test ban, a subject which has been under consideration in various forums for more than 25 years and on which the General Assembly has adopted more than 40 resolutions, reflecting the international community's impatience over the failure on the part of nuclear-weapon States to conclude a comprehensive test-ban treaty. This was in spite of the undertaking to seek the achievement of "the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time" given by three nuclear-weapon States in the partial test-ban Treaty, which was reiterated again in the non-proliferation Treaty of 1968. One need hardly stress the utmost importance of a comprehensive test-ban treaty towards preventing qualitative improvements in existing nuclear weapons and the development of new types of weapons as well as maintaining a viable non-proliferation régime. As regards the so-called inadequacy of existing verification measures relating to monitoring of test explosions, the international community will no longer believe that to be a major obstacle or an excuse for further delay in embarking on negotiations towards a CTBT. Suffice it to mention here that the General Assembly, at its thirty-fifth session, recalled in resolution 35/145 A, a

(Mr. Palihakkara, Sri Lanka)

resolution which was co-sponsored by Sri Lanka, "that all the technical and scientific aspects of the problem have been so fully explored that only a political decision is now necessary in order to achieve final agreement, that when the existing means of verification are taken into account, it is difficult to understand further delay in achieving agreement on an underground test ban and that the potential risks of continuing underground nuclear-weapon tests would far outweigh any possible risks from ending such tests". Resolution 35/145 B requests the Committee on Disarmament to take the necessary steps, including the establishment of a working group, to initiate substantive negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty as a matter of the highest priority, which the Group of 21 has been emphasizing time and again in this Committee. It is to be hoped that the nuclear-weapon States will contribute to the consensus necessary to establish an ad hoc working group on a CTBT, a contribution which will no doubt give some credibility to nuclear-weapon States' commitment to disarmament and also to the role of the Committee on Disarmament as the single multilateral body for disarmament negotiations.

The cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament is the other important item on our agenda on which action to initiate substantive negotiations is still pending. It is also an item to which the General Assembly, in its resolution 35/152 B, has attached high priority for negotiations upon the resumption of the CD's work in 1981. During the last session of the Committee, the Group of 21 submitted a proposal calling for the establishment of an ad hoc working group on this subject, the necessity of which was reiterated by the General Assembly in its resolution 35/152 C. It is the hope of my delegation that an ad hoc working group will now be established by this Committee, in order to "involve" itself in substantive negotiations on issues relating to the cessation of the arms race and nuclear disarmament.

My delegation does not intend to dwell at length on each agenda item at this stage. With regard to other items on our agenda, it is encouraging that within a relatively short time, the Committee was able to take the decision that the four ad hoc working groups on a comprehensive programme of disarmament, security assurances, chemical weapons and radiological weapons should resume their work. It is to be hoped that the degree of flexibility and desire for tangible progress expressed by many delegations during the last two weeks will prevail and contribute towards achieving further progress on the basis of a convergence of views and the constructive work accomplished in these areas last year.

Many delegations have made reference to the strained international relations which are apparent today and which, one might say, create circumstances hardly auspicious for disarmament negotiations. My delegation would only say that these, paradoxically, are the very circumstances which should provide the impetus to pursue more resolutely the negotiations in this Committee for the reason that we have no other choice. To quote those oft-quoted words of the United Nations General Assembly: "Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation". Given the necessary political will of all concerned, that of the nuclear-weapon Powers in particular, this Committee has the tools to accomplish its task.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I thank the distinguished representative of Sri Lanka for his statement and I should also like to thank him for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

Mr. EL REEDY (Egypt) (translated from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin my first statement in this Committee by expressing our high esteem for you personally. In addition to the respect in which we hold your distinguished country, France, my colleagues and I in the Egyptian delegation have observed your endeavours and have seen that you possess the best talents and capabilities needed to direct the work of this Committee successfully during its first and always difficult stage. I would also like to take this opportunity to express my delegation's gratitude to your predecessor, Ambassador Tadesse Terrefe, the representative of Ethiopia and previous Chairman of this Committee.

Please also allow me to express my gratitude to you and to my colleagues who welcomed me as my country's representative in this distinguished Committee. I assure you that my colleagues and I are looking forward to co-operating with you and will do our utmost to ensure the success of our work and the fulfilment of our task.

My delegation has listened to the important statements made in this Committee during the past two weeks, containing information and ideas which confirm only too clearly the seriousness of the present situation resulting from the alarming continuation of the arms race, particularly in the field of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, at a time when achievements in the field of disarmament or the cessation or control of the arms race are insignificant, not to say non-existent.

There is no need for me to add to what has already been said in this respect. Nor is there any need for me to re-emphasize Egypt's staunch and continuing role in the endeavours to put an end to the arms race in general and to the nuclear arms race in particular. Egypt's role has been well known from the very beginning, when this subject was first discussed in United Nations forums and at the numerous international conferences, beginning with the Bandung Conference of 1955 which gave rise to the Non-Aligned Movement whose twentieth anniversary we are currently celebrating, all of which played a pioneering role in this respect.

Several distinguished colleagues have already discussed the theories underlying the policies of the nuclear-weapon States in their constant attempts to win nuclear superiority, together with the dangerous implications of this race, which can never reach a reasonable conclusion and which is now threatening not only the parties participating therein but also every living being on this earth since the shadow of nuclear war is a terrifying spectre for everyone and the dangers of nuclear armament no longer recognize political or continental boundaries.

It might be appropriate to refer to the last meeting of the Pugwash Conference held at Breukelen in the Netherlands in August of last year. That Conference, which was attended by a select group of international scientists and thinkers, reached the following conclusions:

"1. It is a fallacy to believe that nuclear war can be limited in quantity or quality, or even that nuclear war can be won.

2. It is a fallacy to believe that, in nuclear war, Civil Defence can provide a chance of survival of the community.

(Mr. El Reedy, Egypt)

3. It is a fallacy to believe that a counterforce strategy can destroy the retaliatory capacity of the other side. (Even if it were to become technically feasible to destroy all fixed land-based missiles of the adversary, this would leave submarine and aircraft-carried weapons.)

4. It is a fallacy to claim that parity in nuclear weapons is necessary for effective deterrence."

On the other hand, if the funds and human and natural resources currently devoted to armament, with all its implications in the way of environmental imbalance, were utilized for purposes of socio-economic development, they could eliminate poverty and hunger throughout the world and ensure a better life for mankind at a time when we are facing difficulties and obstacles in the establishment of a new and equitable international economic order which would give the developing countries an opportunity to escape from the circle of poverty and backwardness. In this respect, we look forward to the study which is being prepared by the Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. We hope that that study will contain specific practical proposals for the re-channelling of resources from military to development purposes.

It has become clear that mankind is today facing a new and unprecedented phenomenon, namely, man's possession of the means of self-destruction. This phenomenon is the basic cause of the present international crisis which is not only manifested in the absence of security and stability and the deterioration of economic conditions, especially in the countries of the third world, but also involves the survival and continuance of the human race on earth.

Although, on a serious and important subject such as this, we do not wish to apportion blame hastily among any particular States, from an impartial standpoint the responsibility for putting an end to this trend lies primarily with those who possess, develop and produce nuclear arms and other weapons of mass destruction. Consequently, it is also their responsibility to lead the way by taking effective steps and measures to halt the frantic arms race and by taking real measures for disarmament.

Many of my colleagues here have already spoken of the relationship between the adoption of radical measures to save the world from the arms race and the prevailing international climate. Although it is, of course, impossible to differentiate between these two issues, we are among those who believe that the international situation should not be used as an excuse for failure to take decisive measures to halt the arms race or for the renunciation of agreements already concluded. However, we also believe in the importance of efforts to create an appropriate international climate through respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and for non-interference in their internal affairs. In this context, the military intervention in Afghanistan was, and still is, a negative factor in the shaping of the current international climate.

I have already referred to our fundamental positions regarding efforts for the achievement of disarmament and the need for the major Powers to curtail and put an end to the nuclear danger and to use the new energy for the greater good and

(Mr. El Reedy, Egypt)

happiness of mankind. In this connection, Egypt was among the first States to call for the conclusion of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Egypt played a basic role in the preparatory negotiations and subsequently signed the Treaty on the first day on which it was opened for signature, namely, 1 July 1968. Egypt continued its support for the non-proliferation system and participated in all the endeavours aimed at the establishment of an effective system of guarantees within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency, including the two review conferences held in 1975 and in the summer of last year.

Today I have pleasure in announcing that the Egyptian Government has requested the legislative institutions to approve ratification of the non-proliferation Treaty and this question is currently being studied by both the People's Assembly and the Advisory Council in Egypt. On this occasion, I would like to express my gratitude to Mrs. Inga Thorsson, the representative of Sweden, and to Ambassador Okawa, Ambassador of Japan, for their kind words welcoming the Egyptian measures in this respect.

In taking this step, the Egyptian Government hopes that it will be an incentive to the nuclear-weapon States to fulfil their pledges to halt the nuclear arms race, to achieve nuclear disarmament in accordance with the provisions of article VI of the Treaty and to put a final and total end to nuclear tests. The termination of such tests is not only an urgent requirement for mankind and the environment but would also constitute a fundamental step towards the curbing of the nuclear arms race.

Egypt is also paying special attention to the undertaking, under the terms of article IV of the Treaty, on the part of States Parties in a position to do so, to contribute to the further development of the applications of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, especially in the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States Party to the Treaty, with due consideration for the needs of the developing areas of the world.

We also see that Security Council resolution 255 is still, in effect, unable to provide a real guarantee of the non-use or threat of use of nuclear weapons by nuclear-weapon States against non-nuclear-weapon States. In this connection, I would like to take this opportunity to record our special interest in the Ad Hoc Working Group on Security Assurances which we hope will be able to conclude its work in an effective manner, which we believe will help to support the system of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and will constitute a major step towards the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and towards nuclear disarmament.

The implementation of these measures is in keeping with the basic principles formulated by the General Assembly for the conclusion of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and, in particular, the principle of a balance of responsibilities and duties between States possessing nuclear weapons and States which do not possess such weapons, and the principle that the Treaty should be a step towards the achievement of general and complete disarmament and, in particular, nuclear disarmament.

In view of the dangers posed by the nuclear arms race, and being convinced that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons will more effectively achieve its goals and objectives through the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world, we believe that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and in Africa is a matter of vital importance.

(Mr. El Reedy, Egypt)

It was to this end that our initiative was taken during the last session of the United Nations General Assembly through General Assembly resolution 35/147, adopted by consensus of the countries of the Middle East, as a first step towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, and which called upon those countries solemnly to declare their support for the achievement of this goal, to refrain, on a reciprocal basis, from producing, acquiring or possessing nuclear weapons or permitting them to be stationed on their territory and to place all their nuclear activities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. The resolution also called for those declarations to be deposited with the Security Council.

It is our belief that adherence to the non-proliferation Treaty by all countries of the region, their implementation of the General Assembly resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and support by the nuclear-weapon States for those steps would avert the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons in this important and sensitive part of the world, thereby helping to promote peace, security and prosperity for mankind as a whole.

This session is being held at a crossroads with regard to United Nations endeavours to achieve general and complete disarmament. It is taking place at the end of the first United Nations Disarmament Decade, which unfortunately has not produced tangible results, and also at the beginning of the Second Disarmament Decade. At the same time, as noted by several of my colleagues, it is the last plenary session of the Committee before the holding of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We therefore have a special responsibility to do our utmost to achieve definite and positive results during the current session.

In this regard, I am in agreement with those who believe that the Committee must set to work immediately, get to the core of the issues under consideration, resume its work from the point at which it was left last year and overcome any obstacles that may arise, including those relating to the review of the tasks of the working groups. At the same time, we believe that there is a need to establish two other working groups on the complete discontinuance of nuclear tests and the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, and that these two groups should be established as a matter of urgency in view of the fact that those two issues are among the extremely important issues to which the Committee must turn its attention and in which it must achieve real progress.

Since the Committee on Disarmament has an important function and a considerable responsibility with regard to the achievement of tangible progress in the field of nuclear disarmament, the prohibition of nuclear tests and the provision of effective guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States, we are also duty-bound to make a serious endeavour to conclude an agreement on the prohibition of the production, development and stockpiling of chemical weapons in view of the special priority which the international community has assigned to the prohibition of such weapons. In the framework of its preparations for the second special session of the General Assembly, the Committee must also formulate a comprehensive programme of disarmament which we hope will be of a practical and specific nature with regard to the timing of its implementation.

It is my belief that there is nothing more serious than the task assigned to us here by the international community. We must begin this session with hope and with the aim of achieving tangible results.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I thank the distinguished representative of Egypt for his statement and I should like to express to him my warm gratitude for his very friendly words about myself and also -- I was very touched by them -- about my country.

Mr. SALAH-BEY (Algeria) (translated from French): Allow me, on behalf of my delegation and of myself personally, to offer you my sincere congratulations on the occasion of your assumption of the chairmanship of the Committee for the month of February.

You represent a country with which Algeria maintains close and fruitful relations, both for historical reasons and as a neighbour.

The Chairman's personal role at the start of this Committee's work can be a highly influential one, when, as in your case, he enjoys wide diplomatic experience, constructive savoir-faire and also the confidence of his colleagues.

Allow me to suggest that your personal intervention was partly responsible for the positive start that has been made in our work.

I should also like to address my warm and friendly congratulations to Ambassador Tereffe, the representative of Ethiopia, who successfully completed the delicate task of presiding over the concluding stages of our work at the last session.

The Committee on Disarmament has some new members and it is my pleasant duty to welcome the Ambassadors of Egypt, Zaire, Pakistan and Romania.

It has become almost a tradition to describe and assess the international situation at the moment when the Committee on Disarmament resumes its work. To say that the state of international relations could be more satisfactory would be an understatement. Is the situation worse now or is it the same as at the beginning of 1980? We did not meet here to discuss this point, but it would be unrealistic to ignore the reality of the international relations against the background of which the discussions and efforts with a view to disarmament must necessarily take place.

Some use the aggravation of international tensions as an argument to justify enhanced efforts to secure qualitative improvements and quantitative increases in the means of mass destruction.

We cannot agree with such an approach, which would have an immediate paralysing effect on the entire international effort towards disarmament. It seems to us that it is precisely when things seem most difficult that our efforts to slow down and halt the arms race should be greatest.

In order to see how specious is the reasoning that seeks to justify an increase in efforts to arm by the aggravation of international tension, we have only to ask ourselves the following question: has there ever been a reduction in armaments when there was a relaxation of international tension? The answer to this question is unfortunately in the negative, for the countries or military alliances concerned are always preparing for the next period of tension with the presumed enemy. Thus the relationship between the international climate and the strengthening of capacities for mass destruction is a one-way relationship, and the realistic approach is not to wait for a hypothetical relaxation of international tensions but to get to work

(Mr. Salah-Bey, Algeria)

truly on what is primarily responsible for maintaining those tensions, namely, the more and more advanced research in the matter of weapons of mass destruction, their accelerated production, their incessant testing and their stockpiling-- all of which maintain the upward spiral which has been called the "balance of terror".

If we are all agreed in considering this situation truly "terrible", how can we fail to be outraged at the waste of the absolutely prodigious resources, financial, technical and intellectual, that are expended on perfecting this terror day by day, and on augmenting not only its dimensions but also its quality?

As for the question whether the terror is equal on both sides, perusal of the numerous studies devoted to this subject leaves us in doubt. The possibilities for appraisal appear extremely subjective, and when the human mind's capacity for evaluation and reasoning proves too weak or too slow to supply a reliable judgement, then the computer is used and this, as a number of recent incidents have shown, is subject to breakdowns and false alarms.

In the last analysis, the concept of balance or parity in the sphere of weapons of mass destruction seems to us illusory, inasmuch as the arms race feeds on its own absurd logic and is sustained by its own dynamics in the insane hope of reaching a level of absolute terror-- which can, of course, only be proven by testing in real-life conditions.

The idea entertained in certain quarters that a new nuclear war, whether limited or not, can be waged and won is not only extraordinarily dangerous because of the risks it imposes on mankind but also logically unacceptable because it is based on the assumption that the adversary's response will remain within rational limits. There is no need to be a great theoretician to foresee that, when that stage has been reached, the behaviour of the opposing camps will defy all the laws of rationality that we are today in a position to identify.

Furthermore, the hypothesis of a nuclear war, even if limited, is of concern not only to the countries directly involved but also to the countries and regions in the vicinity of the theatre of operations and even those more distant from it. It is doubtful whether the weapons of destruction in existence today will respect the frontiers which States have agreed on to mark the areas of their sovereignty.

And apart from the question of the responsibility of Governments, the peoples of the world, and especially those in the poorest regions, are entitled to demand the cessation of an arms race that is as absurd as it is costly, while a large part of humanity is still living in hunger and want.

These, in my delegation's view, are the most cogent arguments for our speeding up our work and seeking better means of making headway towards genuine disarmament.

Three or perhaps four sessions of the Committee on Disarmament separate us from the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Thus we have an opportunity to evaluate the progress made within our Committee as well as that which may be achieved by the 1982 deadline. Of course that date should not be regarded as completely ineluctable. But when it arrives, how will the States members of the Committee on Disarmament be able to reconcile themselves with the thought that their work has not led to any real progress towards effective disarmament measures?

(Mr. Salah-Bey, Algeria)

Responsibility for such a failure would be principally imputable to those of the States members of this Committee which, possessing nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction, had been unable to agree on ways and means of limiting the level of their destructive capabilities and perhaps reducing them until they had completely disappeared. Moral responsibility would also rest, however, although to a lesser extent, on all the non-aligned and neutral countries which had failed to find the means of persuasion, of pressure, even, sufficient to impose reasonable measures that would have led us towards effective disarmament.

The non-possession of nuclear weapons cannot be regarded as the ultimately convincing argument for giving up efforts aimed at their non-utilization, even experimentally.

My delegation therefore feels that the responsibility of each State member of the Committee on Disarmament is engaged in the efforts that must be made and the measures that must be taken if we are to achieve progress in the accomplishment of the task that has been entrusted to us.

The initiation of our work at this session has taken place in an atmosphere more promising than the one that prevailed at the opening of our first session for the year 1980. My delegation has had occasion to express its disappointment at the procedural wrangles which bedevilled many of the Committee's meetings. We were not convinced of the practical usefulness of such discussions then and we are no more convinced of it today. My delegation will therefore oppose any attempt to provoke in our Committee discussions unrelated to the central theme of our deliberations, disarmament.

Allow me now to turn to more specific issues. Without attaching disproportionate importance to the decision taken by the Committee last year to set up four working groups, it must be recognized that this measure has been of practical value. How, in fact, could the Committee have organized its work on specific issues otherwise than by confining within a negotiated and well-defined framework the approach to the subjects for negotiations which appear on its agenda? My delegation would have wished the working groups in question to resume their meetings without awaiting the outcome of new discussions on their terms of reference. We would still like to express the hope that the four working groups may resume their work immediately, while the Committee is discussing the possibility of new mandates for them.

At the last session the group known as the Group of 21 proposed that two working groups should be set up for the purpose of discussing, respectively, the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, and a nuclear test ban.

We feel that the over-all credibility of the Committee on Disarmament will remain in question until substantial progress has been achieved towards the establishment of working groups responsible for negotiating effective measures in those two fields.

Bearing in mind the guidance and priorities given to the Committee on Disarmament by the General Assembly, and bearing in mind also the need for an organization of our work which, because of its volume, must be spread over several sessions, we consider that the Committee should concentrate its efforts on a small number of questions on which we can reasonably hope to make significant progress. It seems to us that only by achieving a measurable advance in certain areas of disarmament shall we be able

(Mr. Salah-Bey, Algeria)

to communicate an atmosphere of serious negotiations to other areas where the very idea of negotiations appears impossible today. In other words, we must create the conditions conducive to the establishment of a trend in the opposite direction from the present frantic race towards the illusory goal of superiority based on terror.

The progress made towards a convention on chemical weapons means that we are already in a position to identify points of convergence and areas where divergencies still exist. The generally positive spirit in which the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons conducted its work at the last session augurs well for a favourable conclusion at what we hope will be the earliest possible date.

The priority accorded by the General Assembly to the preparation and conclusion of a treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear tests seems to us entirely correct. Only the political will of the States concerned by such a measure to commit themselves to a constructive line of action can really prove their readiness to negotiate genuine measures of disarmament. The persistence of the present situation, in which nuclear tests continue not only to threaten the future of mankind through their unpredictable consequences but also to increase the existing potentials for destruction, can only put off further and further the day when reason may finally prevail over the will to dominate.

The trilateral negotiations which are taking place outside the Committee on Disarmament and about which the Committee was kept informed last year do not seem to have made appreciable progress. My delegation wishes to express the two-fold hope that the discussions will yield more promising results than they have done up to now, and that the Committee on Disarmament will, at the very least, be kept informed of the progress of these negotiations.

Failing progress as regards the cessation of nuclear tests and the nuclear arms race, the non-nuclear-weapon States must be given effective assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. At the Committee's first session we said that the assurances in question could not be accompanied by restrictions. We continue to uphold the view that the assurances must be given without conditions or restrictions, particularly to non-nuclear-weapon States which pursue a line of foreign policy independent of the alliances organized around the principal nuclear-weapon powers. As a member of the non-aligned movement, Algeria attaches special importance to the conclusion of effective arrangements that would really prevent the nuclear-weapon States from carrying their military superiority into the political field.

The possibility of progress in the negotiations on the elaboration of a treaty on chemical weapons, developments in the positions of the States concerned with regard to the cessation of nuclear tests, and the defining of assurances acceptable to non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or the threat of use of such weapons in respect of them -- these, in my delegation's view, are the points on which genuine negotiations on the cessation of the race to develop nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction and on general and complete disarmament could be based.

My delegation will adopt a flexible attitude, however, as regards the precise order of the various stages of the negotiations which should take place within the Committee on Disarmament, provided there is evidence of a genuine desire to seek to resolve the vast and innumerable difficulties that lie before us rather than a continuing preference for sterile debates and empty oratory.

(Mr. Salah-Bey, Algeria)

At this stage in my statement I feel that it might be useful to emphasize once again the particular importance which my delegation attaches to the preservation of the fundamental character of the Committee on Disarmament. The Committee must remain, as its terms of reference indicate, a body for genuine negotiations based on the equal participation of all the States of which it is composed. There is little need to add that we shall applaud any progress that may be made by the great Powers towards disarmament in forums other than that of our Committee. Nevertheless, we think it would be dangerous for the international institutions created by those same Powers if their organs could not fulfil the tasks entrusted to them because they were stricken by paralysis as a result of the attitude of the Powers in question.

Allow me to express the fear that the Committee on Disarmament is threatened by yet another danger. My delegation refuses to accept the idea of a body turned in upon itself and closed to the outside world. One of the great contradictions of our time is that the population of our planet, while generally aware of the dangers of mass destruction threatening it, has come to accept not only the present situation but also the probability that it will continue to worsen. It is true that, beyond a certain level, the worsening of the nuclear threat loses practical significance. Nevertheless, voices are raised to reject the inevitability of nuclear war.

The members of the Committee on Disarmament will not succeed in accomplishing the task entrusted to them if the voices raised against the very idea of a nuclear war do not find their echo in our deliberations.

The theme of our discussions covers vast areas whose complexity and gravity in part explain the difficulties we are encountering. The fact remains, however, that the Committee on Disarmament owes it to itself to make its own contribution to the accomplishment of the tremendous task of achieving general and complete disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I thank the distinguished representative of Algeria for his statement and also for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

Mr. AHMED (Pakistan): Mr. Chairman, the members of the Pakistan delegation and I are very happy to see you preside over the proceedings of the Committee on Disarmament at this crucial phase of its work. We believe that the high qualities of wisdom and patience which you have so effectively demonstrated during the past two weeks will enable the CD to resume its negotiations very quickly and create the necessary conditions for moving towards the formulation of concrete agreements on the various items on its agenda.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express our deep appreciation for the constructive efforts of your predecessor, Ambassador Terrefe of Ethiopia,

I have been greatly touched by the warm welcome extended to me by you and my colleagues on the Committee. While reciprocating their sentiments, may I add that I feel honoured to be a part of this assembly of distinguished diplomats from whose vast experience and wisdom I shall seek to benefit in the course of our joint endeavours in the CD.

(Mr. Ahmed, Pakistan)

The first year in the decade of the 1980s has witnessed a quantum increase in the level of international tensions, the outbreak and aggravation of conflicts in various areas of the world, the emergence of a pervasive climate of insecurity and an atmosphere of confrontation between States and ideologies.

The continued foreign military occupation of Afghanistan, a non-aligned and Islamic country, is cause for special concern. As the Foreign Minister of Pakistan stated on 9 February at the Conference of the non-aligned countries held in New Delhi, "this occupation is tantamount not only to a violation of (Afghanistan's) political independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity but also a threat to the stability of the region. It has heightened international tension; it has damaged détente and resulted in the intensification of Superpower rivalry and competition in the region of the Indian Ocean and the Gulf". Pakistan favours a political solution to the situation in Afghanistan. As a sponsor of the relevant General Assembly resolution of 20 November 1980, Pakistan will be guided by its provisions in the trilateral talks between itself, Iran and representatives of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, to be organized and held by the United Nations Secretary-General.

My delegation shares the concern which has been expressed in the Committee and elsewhere about the serious escalation in the global arms race, especially among the major nuclear-weapon Powers. That \$500 billion are squandered annually on weapons of increasingly greater destructive capability, while the majority of mankind subsists in conditions of poverty and destitution, is a sad commentary on modern civilization. Even more tragic is the dangerous possibility that the perverse logic of a "balance of terror" may lead mankind to commit deliberate or accidental suicide. The world cannot but witness with rising trepidation the evolution of strategies envisaging a "limited" nuclear war, the development of new weapons systems, such as the cruise and mobile missiles and the neutron bomb, and the contemplation of a renewed programme for anti-ballistic missiles. If these projections are translated into actual policy, a new and complex dimension will be added to the nuclear arms race, making the task of future negotiations more difficult, if not impossible.

Yet, the representatives on this Committee are practitioners of peace and we cannot afford to lose hope, despite the sobering realities of our world today. We can derive some comfort from the fact that neither of the Superpowers has ruled out the need for further talks on strategic or medium-range nuclear weapons. My delegation believes that, whatever the judgements about SALT II, it is indispensable for the revival of a climate of international stability that the dialogue between the United States of America and the Soviet Union on the limitation and reduction of nuclear armaments be continued and intensified. We hope that until such time as these talks are renewed, both sides will observe the limitations accepted in the SALT II agreements.

It is quite understandable, of course, that the outcome of the negotiations on nuclear weapons between the Superpowers will be largely influenced by a demonstration by each of its commitment to abide by the accepted norms of international conduct enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, especially in relation to various situations of tension and conflict that exist around the world.

(Mr. Ahmed, Pakistan)

In the framework of current realities, it is indispensable to revive mutual trust and confidence, not only between the Superpowers and their military alliances, but also between them and the majority of the small and medium States of the third world. A major element of the present international atmosphere of confrontation is the fact that the two Superpowers have much too large a conception of their "legitimate security interests". The security of the States in a given region, such as the Persian Gulf, is a matter of concern exclusively of these States. The intervention of "limited military contingents" or "rapid deployment forces" both constitute unwarranted interference in the affairs of these States. Pakistan believes that the cause of peace and security in such regions would be enhanced by the establishment of a military equilibrium between the States in the region, including our part of the world. Pakistan has offered to enter into negotiations with one of its neighbours to reach agreement on a mutually acceptable and balanced ratio of forces between the two countries. We are prepared to pursue such negotiations together with other States in the region.

Despite the self-evident importance of the relations between the two Superpowers and their respective military alliances, my delegation is convinced that genuine disarmament can only be achieved by a process which takes into account the security concerns of all States, large and small. Such a process can be evolved only in the Committee on Disarmament. Unfortunately, the former co-Chairmen of the CCD do not seem to have taken the necessary political decisions to repose their faith in this Committee to undertake substantive disarmament negotiations.

The plight of the nuclear-test-ban treaty is perhaps the best illustration of this approach. For several years negotiations on this subject, accorded the highest priority by the international community, have been removed from the multilateral framework to restricted talks between three of the nuclear-weapon States. The progress in these trilateral negotiations has been extremely slow because of differences in perceptions between the two Superpowers regarding the impact of a test ban on their security. From the information made available so far about these talks, it appears that the treaty being assembled by the three Powers will bear little or no resemblance to the comprehensive test ban which the General Assembly has demanded for so long; nor is it likely to attract the wide adherence emphasized by the General Assembly at its special session devoted to disarmament. In the circumstances, we feel that this agreement under negotiation should be recognized for what it is -- a temporary moratorium on nuclear testing by the United States, the United Kingdom and the USSR, and should be implemented by them as an indication of their commitment to the goal of nuclear disarmament. At the same time, the CD should be enabled to initiate negotiations on a truly comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty.

The Pakistan delegation expresses the hope that the Committee on Disarmament will also be enabled to undertake substantive negotiations on the question of nuclear disarmament during its 1981 session. We believe that an ad hoc working group should be set up for this purpose and charged with the following specific tasks: first, to define with greater clarity some of the concepts such as "mutual balance", "equal security" and "strategic equivalence", which are so frequently utilized in relation to nuclear disarmament; secondly, to elaborate the various stages in the process of nuclear disarmament identified in paragraph 50 of the Final Document and the responsibilities of each of the nuclear-weapon Powers at each stage in the process; thirdly, to clarify the relationship between nuclear

(Mr. Ahmed, Pakistan)

and conventional disarmament, and fourthly, to identify the various kinds of machinery that would be required to verify and monitor, in an effective way and on a non-discriminatory basis, the implementation of various measures of nuclear disarmament. It is our conviction that such a contribution by the CD will, among other things, assist in the further talks on nuclear disarmament which we hope will take place between the Superpowers. On the other hand, if the CD were to be prevented from making even such a preliminary exploration of the subject, it will inevitably increase the growing and widespread scepticism among non-nuclear-weapon States about the sincerity of the Superpowers' commitment to pursue in good faith the goal of nuclear disarmament.

The Pakistan delegation also attaches considerable importance to the vital objective of preventing a nuclear war. We share the view that this can be achieved through an international agreement for the complete prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. Of course, we recognize that the current perceptions about the need for a balance of conventional forces in Europe impinges on the prospects of a nuclear non-use agreement. We hope, therefore, that the ongoing talks in Vienna will lead to mutual understanding about a balance of conventional forces in Europe in the very near future. We have noted with interest the proposals which have been made at the review meeting in Madrid of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe regarding measures to promote confidence and security in that region.

My delegation continues to believe that there are no insuperable political or technical obstacles to the nuclear-weapon States' assuring the non-nuclear-weapon States, especially the non-aligned countries, that they will not be threatened or attacked by nuclear weapons. Pakistan has sought to evolve an international agreement on this proposition for nearly a decade and we are gratified that this objective was endorsed by the General Assembly at its special session devoted to disarmament and by this Committee. The proposal to formulate an international convention to provide effective assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States has received overwhelming support from the Non-Aligned Movement and the Islamic Conference as well as by the United Nations General Assembly.

Unfortunately, in the negotiations undertaken under the aegis of the CD, it has not been possible to achieve very substantial progress towards this goal, although it has been recognized that renewed efforts are necessary "to reach agreement on a common approach acceptable to all which could be included in an international instrument of a legally binding character". The most fundamental difficulty in evolving a common approach is that some of the nuclear-weapon Powers do not seem to be prepared to go beyond the unilateral declarations they made at the General Assembly's special session on disarmament, even though the Final Document adopted at that session, "noted" these declarations and, after doing so, urged the nuclear-weapon Powers to conclude effective arrangements to assure the non-nuclear weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

At the current session of the CD, the Pakistan delegation will make yet another effort to evolve a "common approach" which could be included in an "international instrument of a legally binding character". The search for such a "common approach" must start from the fundamental proposition that, until nuclear disarmament is achieved, the nuclear-weapon Powers are under an obligation to assure all non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Any condition or restriction which one or more nuclear-weapon Powers wish to attach to such assurances must be examined from the standpoint of whether or not such conditions negate the effectiveness and credibility of their assurances and if these are

(Mr. Ahmed, Pakistan)

acceptable to the other nuclear-weapon Powers and the non-nuclear-weapon States. Taking into account the fact that all the limitations contained in the unilateral declarations of some of the nuclear-weapon Powers are related to their preoccupations with their nuclear security alliances, Pakistan has proposed that at the initial stage, the assurances of non-use should be provided to the vast majority of non-nuclear-weapon countries which are outside these alliance systems, i.e. the non-aligned and neutral countries of the world. We hope that this proposition will receive close attention this year as the means to evolve a compromise on a 'common approach'.

Another difficulty encountered in the negotiations is the effort of some of the nuclear-weapon Powers to utilize this subject to extract further obligations regarding nuclear non-proliferation from non-nuclear-weapon countries. Pakistan is not opposed to giving commitments regarding non-proliferation, if this can be done on a universal and on a non-discriminatory basis. We have made several proposals for this purpose, including the idea of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. But we do not believe that the subject of security assurances is the appropriate modality for the extension of such non-proliferation obligations, although the elaboration of effective and credible security assurances will have an important and positive impact on the prospects for non-proliferation.

While adhering to the position that the most appropriate modality for such assurances is an international convention, my delegation is prepared to explore other possible alternatives, including the adoption, as an interim measure, of an appropriate resolution of the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. In our view, the most effective action which the Security Council could take on the issue is to call on the nuclear-weapon Powers to give categorical and unconditional assurances to the non-nuclear-weapon States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against them. Any approach based on some of the present conditional and restricted declarations made by the nuclear-weapon Powers would not be productive or acceptable to my delegation.

Reports alleging that chemical weapons have been used in certain current conflicts, together with the contemplated decisions by some States to refurbish their chemical weapon arsenals, have made this Committee's efforts to prohibit chemical weapons more urgent but also, I suspect, more difficult. My delegation was quite encouraged by the progress made last year in the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons in defining the issues involved in the negotiation of a convention. We feel that although, owing to circumstances which are well known, it has not been possible as yet to give the Working Group a more precise mandate, it should be able to build on the work accomplished last year by further elaborating the areas of agreement and attempting to narrow the differences on other points. My delegation will participate to the best of its ability in these efforts and seek to explain the suggestions and ideas which it advanced in the Committee last year regarding the contents of a multilateral convention banning chemical weapons. My delegation is of the view that the Ad Hoc Working Group should as soon as possible be entrusted with the specific task of negotiating such a multilateral convention.

Pakistan will also support the effort to reach agreement on a convention prohibiting radiological weapons. However, we do hope that during this session the sponsors of the "main elements" of an RW convention will prove more responsive to the concerns and proposals advanced by other States and in particular by members of the Group of 21. We believe that close attention to the elaboration of an RW convention is necessary not only because of whatever may be the intrinsic value of the instrument but also, and even more importantly, because of its inevitable influence on the negotiation of other multilateral disarmament measures on the agenda of the CD, such as the test-ban treaty.

(Mr. Ahmed, Pakistan)

During its 1981 session, the CD will have to intensify its negotiations on a comprehensive programme of disarmament. My delegation believes that by drawing upon the various general documents on disarmament elaborated recently within the United Nations, it should not prove overly difficult to identify the measures of disarmament which should be included in the comprehensive programme. Perhaps the first task of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the item should be precisely to prepare a list of such measures. Yet the comprehensive programme will be truly meaningful if it contains two essential features. First, it should constitute a political and binding commitment on all States to implement the measures that are set out in the programme. Secondly, the programme should include at least an indicative target for its final implementation -- which Pakistan has suggested should be the year 2000 -- as well as time-frames for the accomplishment of the various stages of the process of disarmament envisaged therein. Apart from these two fundamental issues, negotiations in the Working Group would also need to address such matters as the specificity with which each disarmament measure will be set out in the comprehensive programme and the linkages, both political and temporal, between such disarmament measures.

The comprehensive programme of disarmament, if it is elaborated as a politically meaningful instrument, will constitute the centre-piece of the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The CD would make a crucial contribution to the second special session if it were to achieve agreement on the comprehensive programme and on the priority items on its agenda, particularly the comprehensive test-ban treaty, a convention on chemical weapons and an international instrument on security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States. At its second special session devoted to disarmament, the General Assembly will no doubt pass judgement on this Committee on the basis of the results achieved on these matters, especially in the context of the review of its membership.

There are also some other questions regarding the CD which the General Assembly ought to consider at its forthcoming special session. The most fundamental among these is the specific relationship between this body and the United Nations General Assembly. The insistence by some States on the fiction that the CD is an organ entirely outside the framework of the United Nations has created situations, particularly with regard to the participation in its work of non-member States, which are entirely contrary to the consensus reached at the General Assembly's first special session devoted to disarmament that all States Members of the United Nations should be able to participate fully in the work of the CD, to circulate documents and attend its meetings.

The 1981 session of the CD is taking place at a time of grave peril to international peace and security. Today, the large and mighty nations of the world seem to have reached the judgement that military force can be successfully used to achieve their national objectives. The world is poised for a new and more dangerous spiral in the arms race. It should be our endeavour in this Committee to reverse such judgements, to utilize our collective wisdom to arrest the impulse towards mutual annihilation, to breathe life into the search for security through disarmament. Let me assure you that the Pakistan delegation will not lag behind in this noble and yet desperate endeavour which is in the fundamental common interest of all nations.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I thank the distinguished representative of Pakistan for his statement and I should also like to thank him for his kind words addressed to the Chair.

Mr. TERREFFE (Ethiopia): Mr. Chairman, I should like first of all to congratulate you on your assumption of the chairmanship of the Committee on Disarmament for the current month. Your diplomatic skill and tact have already contributed to a speedy decision on the difficult task of organizing the work of the Committee and enabling the four ad hoc working groups established last year to continue their work without delay. My delegation extends its appreciation and pledges its full co-operation with you in discharging your responsibility during this crucial month.

I would also like to extend a warm welcome to our new colleagues and distinguished representatives in the Committee on Disarmament, Ambassador El Reedy of Egypt, Ambassador Mansur Ahmad of Pakistan, Ambassador Malita of Romania and Ambassador Bagbeni of Zaire. May I also renew my appreciation to Mr. Jaipal, Secretary of the Committee and Representative of the Secretary-General, and to his colleagues in the Secretariat for their valuable assistance during my chairmanship. Finally, I would like to express my sincere appreciation for the kind words that you Mr. Chairman, and so many other distinguished representatives have addressed to me for serving as Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament during the month of August 1980 and the interim period extending to the commencement of the 1981 session. It was a rewarding experience and a great privilege for me to have served as your Chairman and to present the report of the Committee for 1980 to the United Nations General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session.

This year's session of the Committee on Disarmament has started at a time when renewed international tensions have exacerbated the arms race, dangerously leading to the reversal of the process of détente and revival of the cold war, while at the same time the risk of nuclear confrontation continues to persist.

One cannot fail to note the extensive military build-ups in the various regions of the world. The ratification of SALT II has been delayed; a hard-line policy and higher military budgets are being advocated, and the deployment of the neutron bomb is again being recommended by a nuclear-weapon Power, despite the fact that this move was condemned by the international community when it was first announced. My delegation is distressed by the deteriorating international scene and the increasing military activities in the regions of the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean. The decisions of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the United Nations and the Non-Aligned Movement declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace have been completely ignored. The so-called "quick intervention force" poses a grave concern to the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of certain States in these regions and their rights freely to engage in peaceful development are thus constrained by the current international climate. The frantic efforts in establishing and expanding a network of military bases and facilities in the countries of the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf areas is giving rise to serious tension. In the light of such developments, my delegation cannot but express its deep concern at the deterioration of peace and stability in the region as well as the policy of increasing interference in the internal affairs of States.

(Mr. Terrefe, Ethiopia)

My delegation will actively participate in the work on the various items of our agenda at the appropriate time. But let me point out here the importance we attach to the preparations for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and the items concerned with the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, the conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, and the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present.

Ethiopia, together with other States, has for a long time called for a moratorium on nuclear explosions of all types as a major step toward halting the arms race and gradually reversing its course until general and complete disarmament can be achieved.

My delegation has therefore supported the idea of negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed.

The ratification of the SALT II Treaty and the commencement of negotiations for a SALT III agreement, as well as early negotiations on the nuclear weapons situation in general, remain of paramount importance and urgency.

In numerous resolutions the General Assembly has urged the nuclear-weapon Powers to work towards the goal of general and complete disarmament and to respond to the pressing need for an end to the arms race and the prevention of nuclear war. Renewed commitments to implement these resolutions will, I am sure, facilitate the work of the Committee on Disarmament.

In its resolution 35/46 entitled, "Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade", the United Nations General Assembly entrusted the Committee on Disarmament "urgently to negotiate with a view to reaching agreement, and to submit agreed texts where possible before the second special session devoted to disarmament", and lists four priority items on three of which, namely, chemical weapons, radiological weapons and security assurances, ad hoc working groups had been established, the fourth item being that of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. My delegation draws attention to this resolution in order to underline the necessity of pressing for sustained efforts during this year's session and to underscore the heavy responsibility that awaits the Committee.

While we express satisfaction at the decision of the Committee that the four ad hoc working groups established last year should continue their work, the Ethiopian delegation would like to emphasize the urgent need for the establishment of two further ad hoc working groups, namely, on a nuclear-test ban and on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, important items on which the United Nations General Assembly has entrusted the Committee with a clear mandate.

(Mr. Terrefe, Ethiopia)

In considering the question of nuclear disarmament, we cannot ignore the frequent number of nuclear false alarms which have been painfully highlighted and brought to our attention by a number of statements made in this Committee. In view of the some 17,000 nuclear warheads possessed by the major nuclear-weapon Powers, the magnitude of such reported system failures is indeed frightening.

Authoritative studies have shown that a comprehensive test-ban treaty can be concluded, given genuine willingness and sincere commitment by all the parties involved. The creation of an ad hoc working group for this purpose can facilitate negotiations toward this goal. The working groups established last year have already proved useful in initiating modest substantive work in their respective areas. In the present circumstances, we are convinced of the importance of starting serious negotiations and we feel the establishment of these additional working groups would in no way hinder or interfere with the trilateral negotiations.

The expeditious manner in which the Committee has taken a decision on its agenda and programme of work during the past two weeks has resulted in a saving of a full month as compared with the position of the Committee a year ago at this time. Encouraged by this performance, my delegation would like the Committee to give early consideration to the proposals which call for the creation of other additional working groups.

In his message to this Committee, the Secretary-General of the United Nations pointed to the preoccupation of all of us when he stated: "What we need now are co-operative endeavours by all nations, and in particular the major military Powers, to enter into serious negotiations based upon concrete proposals in order to reach genuine disarmament agreements." Speaking about a nuclear-test ban and nuclear disarmament, the Secretary-General said, "It has often been stressed that in a nuclear war there can be no winners, but only losers. As we now enter the Second Disarmament Decade, there is real need to prove that we are seriously addressing ourselves to the most pressing problems on the disarmament agenda."

It is also our view that these issues deserve priority attention by the Committee.

Such are the preliminary comments we wish to make at this stage. My delegation accordingly will dwell further upon the items of negotiations when they are considered in formal as well as informal meetings of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I thank the distinguished representative of Ethiopia for his statement and I should also like to express my gratitude to him for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): Mr. Chairman, the first item on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament and on our work programme for this week is the item entitled, "Nuclear test ban". This item is so important that one is tempted, each time it recurs on our agenda, to make an elaborate statement. However, I shall be brief this morning because I believe that almost everything that ought to be said in support of the urgent conclusion of a nuclear-test-ban treaty has been stated at one time or the other during the past 25 years of its consideration by the United Nations General Assembly, by the old Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, by the CCD (our predecessor), and now by the CD itself. If a treaty banning all nuclear tests has not been concluded up till now, it is solely because of the lack of political will on the part of the nuclear-weapon States that should take the lead in the negotiation of such a treaty. Technical barriers to the conclusion of such a treaty have been fully explored; the central importance of such a treaty in the task of ending the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and the development of new types of such weapons and its central importance in the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons have been universally acknowledged in the consensus view expressed in paragraph 51 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. All the nuclear-weapon States subscribed to that consensus view that the tripartite negotiations then in progress (in 1978) should be concluded urgently and the result submitted for full consideration by the multilateral negotiating body with a view to submitting a draft treaty to the General Assembly at the earliest possible date. This was the consensus to which all the nuclear-weapon States subscribed in 1978.

At the tail end of the 1980 session of the Committee on Disarmament, the three nuclear-weapon States which have been conducting negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-test ban submitted to the Committee a report which for the first time was quite substantive. Unfortunately, the timing of the report did not enable the Committee to discuss it in any great detail. However, several delegations did welcome the substantive nature of the report and emphasized the need to make rapid progress on the road to the multilateral negotiation of such a treaty. The delegations of India, Netherlands, Australia, Mexico and indeed my own, to mention only a few, made some very pertinent comments and asked some very relevant questions. Unfortunately, the comments and the questions turned out to be no more than monologues on the part of those who made the comments and asked the questions, since the tripartite negotiators could not respond. Of course, they had no time. But even if they had had the time, in the context of the discussions which we have been conducting in the past on this subject, I doubt if they would have responded anyhow.

The objection during the 1980 session of the Committee on Disarmament to the commencement of multilateral negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty in the Committee was sustained throughout the session by two of the three nuclear-weapon States which have been conducting the tripartite negotiations. It is widely known now that during the Review Conference of the Parties to the non-proliferation Treaty, which took place in Geneva from 11 August to 7 September 1980, all three nuclear-weapon States, indicated informally that they would support multilateral negotiation at this session of the Committee on Disarmament. Nothing has happened since the Review Conference to warrant a change of position on the part of any of the three nuclear-weapon States concerned. Indeed, it seems to me that the fact that the second Review Conference of the Parties to the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty failed to adopt a

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

final document must introduce greater urgency to the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The NPT was conceived as an important measure to be complemented by other measures for an effective régime of non-proliferation. It was not meant to constitute the whole structure. Failure to adopt the necessary complementary measures has created a sharp division among the Parties to the NPT and is no doubt likely to reduce its effectiveness.

The requirement of non-proliferation for the 1980s demands the urgent conclusion of some of these additional measures, of which a comprehensive test-ban treaty is perhaps the most basic.

At its thirty-fifth session, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted two resolutions on the subject of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. In these resolutions it reaffirmed its conviction that "a treaty to achieve the prohibition of all nuclear-test explosions by all States for all time is a matter of the highest priority and constitutes a vital element for the success of efforts to prevent both vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons". The General Assembly also affirmed its conviction that the conclusion of such a treaty would create a favourable international climate for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, to be held in 1982. The General Assembly then requested the Committee on Disarmament to take the necessary steps, including the establishment of a working group, to initiate substantive negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty as a matter of the highest priority at the beginning of its session to be held in 1981. It urged all States members of the Committee to support the creation of such an ad hoc working group which should begin the multilateral negotiation of a treaty for the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests. One of the two resolutions adopted urged members of the Committee to use their best endeavours in order that the Committee may transmit to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session the multilaterally negotiated text of such a treaty. The other resolution called upon the Committee on Disarmament to exert all efforts in order that a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty may be submitted to the General Assembly no later than at its second special session devoted to disarmament, to be held in 1982.

Need I mention another resolution, to which my distinguished colleague from Ethiopia referred just a short while ago, that containing the declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, in which the General Assembly listed, among the measures on which the Committee on Disarmament should submit agreed texts by the time of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the subject of "A comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty".

Thus the General Assembly has set a time-frame of just about 18 months, at the most generous, for the Committee on Disarmament to undertake and complete negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. I do not believe that this is an unrealistic time-frame, given the enormous amount of material with which the Committee can proceed if it does decide to discharge this priority responsibility. I should recall what I said at our plenary meeting on 10 February, that a comprehensive test-ban treaty would be an indispensable contribution of this Committee to the success of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

A consensus having been reached in the Committee on the efficacy of working groups as the best method of undertaking negotiations and arriving at decisions on issues before the Committee, I believe that we will be able to take this first step necessary to embark on a real dialogue and on negotiation on a CTB. Such a working group will no doubt give us the opportunity of exchanging views and obtaining clarifications from the tripartite negotiators who, my delegation appreciates, did submit a somewhat substantive report. It is, however, a report that has to be discussed; the negotiators cannot expect us to swallow, "hook, line and sinker", all that is contained in their report.

For a start, and in the light of the informal undertaking given by the three nuclear-weapon States during the Review Conference of the Parties to the non-proliferation Treaty that they would support multilateral negotiation, my delegation would hope that the view expressed in the report of the trilateral negotiators submitted to the CD before the Review Conference, in which they indicated their belief that their separate negotiations or separate negotiating forums provided the best way forward, has now been discarded; it has been overtaken by the informal undertaking which they gave during the Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT.

In any case, if the brief comments made by some members in the one-day debate which we had on the report of the trilateral negotiators are accepted as an indication, then it should be clear to the trilateral negotiators that the members of the Committee do have ideas as to the nature and content of an effective multilateral instrument on the cessation of nuclear-weapon testing. The earlier these views can be discussed, other views exchanged and negotiations conducted the better it seems to me it will be for all concerned.

I gave an example during our last session, and I repeat it now: the fate of the submission made by the nuclear-weapon States on the subject of radiological weapons should make it clear that the Committee cannot be taken for granted and that the depository of ideas in these matters does not lie exclusively with the nuclear-weapon States. It is my hope, therefore, that, at the conclusion of the plenary discussion of this item we can, under your wise guidance, embark on informal consultations to reach quick agreement on the setting up of a working group whose objective will be to assist the Committee to fulfil the hope reposed in it by the General Assembly and produce the text of a comprehensive test-ban treaty not later than at its second special session devoted to disarmament.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): The representatives of the States members of the Committee on Disarmament, like those who represented their countries in the multilateral negotiating bodies known by the abbreviations ENDC and CCD and all who have taken part in discussions in the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament questions, no doubt know very well the particular importance Mexico attaches to the limitation of nuclear weapons, not as an end in itself but as a first step towards what is described in paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament as the "progressive and balanced reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, leading to their ultimate and complete elimination at the earliest possible time".

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

This interest has invariably been borne out by the actions of the representatives of Mexico in all multilateral and regional bodies that are concerned with disarmament, whether deliberative or negotiating bodies. To quote but one example as an illustration, it is only necessary to recall the active participation of the delegation of Mexico, ever since 1969, when the United States of America and the Soviet Union began at Helsinki the talks on the limitation of strategic arms known by the abbreviation SALT, in the negotiations conducted annually in the United Nations which led to the approval of numerous General Assembly resolutions on that subject, the last of which, resolution 35/156 K, was adopted by consensus on 12 December 1980.

In view of the foregoing and of the obvious impact that the success or failure of the SALT talks will have as regards nuclear disarmament which, according to the Final Document, merits the highest priority in the negotiations entrusted to the Committee, the delegation of Mexico feels that the Committee should at all times be kept duly informed of any events of any significance which may occur at the international level in matters relating to those talks. This would appear the more advisable if it is borne in mind that the General Assembly, at its special session in 1978, stated unambiguously 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".

The Mexican delegation accordingly considers it appropriate to draw the attention of the Committee on Disarmament, for its information, to the Declaration approved by the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues at the conclusion of its third session which was held recently in Vienna, from 6 to 8 February 1981, and was presided over by Mr. Olof Palme, the former Prime Minister of Sweden, and in which a number of other distinguished statesmen from Europe, America, Africa and Asia participated.

It is for this reason that we have asked the secretariat to reproduce, as a working paper of the Committee -- which it has done in Document CD/143 -- the text of that declaration preceded by a brief explanatory introduction and with an annex containing a complete list of the members of the Commission.

Since the declaration -- which is entitled "The SALT process: the global stakes" -- is one of those that it is customary rightly to describe as self-explanatory, I shall merely mention, by way of epilogue, my delegation's pleasure in associating itself with what is stated in the first paragraph of the declaration which reads:

"The future of the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT) is a global issue and not simply an issue in Soviet-American relations. It is, therefore, the duty of peoples everywhere to make known their views about the vital importance of an early and serious resumption of the SALT process."

The point of view thus expressed by the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues furthermore faithfully reflects what the United Nations General Assembly stressed in its last resolution on the subject of the SALT talks -- one to which I have already referred and which I quoted in my statement at our opening meeting, on 3 February -- when it urged the two States participating in the talks always to take "particularly into account that not only their national interests but also the vital interests of all the peoples are at stake" in these negotiations.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I thank the distinguished representative of Mexico for his statement. The list of speakers I have before me for this morning's meeting is exhausted. I should like to know if any other delegation wishes to speak. Apparently not.

I should like now, before adjourning the meeting, to revert briefly to the subject of the ad hoc working groups whose Chairmen we have appointed today. These groups are now in a position to begin their work, and I am planning to hold a consultation meeting with the Chairmen this afternoon in order to discuss informally with them how the groups should embark on their work. I presume the Committee agrees with me that the groups should meet as soon as possible, and the Secretariat has prepared the informal document you have before you, dated 17 February, containing a time-table of meetings for this week. These are, of course, purely tentative suggestions on the part of the Secretariat, which can be discussed this afternoon at the meeting with the Chairmen of the working groups.

I should like to state that the meeting I am proposing to hold with the Chairmen of the working groups can be held on the sixth floor of the Secretariat building, above door 9, near the offices of the Disarmament Centre, where we can make use of a small conference room.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.