

COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV. 135
7 July 1981
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIFTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 7 July 1981, at 10.30 a.m.

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. A.P. Venkateswaran	(India)
<u>later:</u>	Mr. S. Saran	(India)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. M. MATI

Argentina: Mr. C. CARASALES
Mr. J.M. OTEGUI
Miss N. NASCIBENE

Australia: Mr. R. STEELE

Belgium: Mr. J.M. NOIRFALISSE

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

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. I. SOTIROV
Mr. R. DEYANOV
Mr. P. POPTCHEV

Burma: U SAW HLAING
U NGWE WIN

Canada: Mr. G. SKINNER

China: Mr. YU Peiwen
Mr. YU Mengjia
Mr. SA Benwang

Cuba: Mr. P.N. MOSQUERA

Czechoslovakia: Mr. P. LUKES

Egypt: Mr. A. EL REEDY
Mr. I.A. HASSAN
Mr. N. FAHMY

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

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

German Democratic Republic: Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. H. THIELICKE
Mrs. H. HOPPE

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

Hungary: Mr. I. KOMIVES
Mr. F. GAJDA
Mr. C. GYORFFY

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

Indonesia: Mr. F.M. SIDAK

Iran: Mr. J. ZAHIRNIA

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

Japan: Mr. M. TAKAHASHI

Kenya:

Mexico: Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES
Mrs. Z. GONZALEZ Y REYNERO

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

Morocco: Mr. M. CHRAIBI
Mr. M. ARRASSEN

Netherlands: Mr. H. WAGENMAKERS

Nigeria: Mr. OLU ADENIJI
Mr. W.O. AKINSANYA
Mr. T. AGUIYI-IRONSI

Pakistan: Mr. M. AKRAM

Peru: Mr. A. THORNBERRY

Poland: Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. J. CIALOWICZ

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

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

Sweden: Mrs. INGA THORSSON
Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. L. NORBERG
Mr. G. EKHOLM
Mr. J. LUNDIN
Mr. H. BERGLUND
Mr. S. ERIKSSON

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. V.M. GANJA
Mr. V.F. PRYAKHIN
Mr. M.M. IPPOLITOV
Mr. T.F. DMITRICHEV

United Kingdom: Mr. D. SUMMERHAYES
Mrs. J.I. LINK

United States of America: Mr. C. FLOWERREE
Mr. F.P. DESIMONE
Miss K. CRITTENBERGER
Mr. R. SCOTT
Mr. J. MISKEL

Venezuela:

Mr. RODRIGUEZ NAVARRO

Mr. O.A. AGUILAR

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. VRHUNEC

Mr. B. BRANKOVIC

Zaire:

Mr. O. GNOK

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

Mr. R. JAIPUL

Deputy Secretary of the
Committee:

Mr. V. BERASATEGUI

The CHAIRMAN: Distinguished delegates, I declare open the 135th plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament. The item on our agenda today is "New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons", but of course members are at liberty to make statements on other issues on our agenda, in accordance with rule 30 of our rules of procedure.

Mr. VOUTOV (Bulgaria): Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to congratulate you, the representative of friendly India, upon the assumption of the high office of Chairman of the Committee during this important period of the annual session. Your delegation is contributing a great deal to the activities of this body, and we look forward to your leadership in the efforts to secure some positive results during the current session of the Committee.

I should not fail to pay tribute at the same time to your predecessor, Ambassador Imre Komives of Hungary, who displayed enviable energy in setting in motion the summer part of our annual session.

May I, through you, Mr. Chairman, welcome the new leaders of the delegations of Argentina, Iran, Sri Lanka and Venezuela. As you have just stated, today, according to the programme of work, the Committee should start discussing the question of new weapons of mass destruction and radiological weapons. However, as you also said, any delegation has the right to discuss any question on the agenda, and as I withdrew the name of my delegation from the list at our last meeting, today I will return to items 1 and 2 of our agenda, which have the highest priority, being the items on the nuclear test ban and the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. While presenting briefly some considerations of my delegation in regard to the current state of our discussions both formally and informally, I am compelled to look into some wider aspects of these vital issues.

The position of the Bulgarian delegation on the urgent need to achieve a complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests is well known, and I need not present it in detail now. We support the proposal of the Group of 21 for the creation of an ad hoc working group on this subject, and we insist on the active participation in it of all five nuclear-weapon States. We regret the suspension of the trilateral negotiations, for we believe that their outcome was to provide a basis for the future treaty, and that is why we call for their early resumption. On our part, we are contributing to the limited activities that the Committee on Disarmament carries out in this field, and here I have in mind the group of seismic experts elaborating co-operative measures to detect and identify seismic events. Bulgaria is regularly represented in this group by one of its leading seismologists. At the same time, however, without underestimating the useful work of the group of seismic experts, our delegation shares the view of the distinguished representative of Mexico, Ambassador García Robles, who reminded us recently that as early as the late 1950s internationally renowned experts from both East and West concluded that there were no technical barriers for verifying a complete and general test ban. It is not even necessary to turn to the qualitative leap of technological advance in the field of seismology to reach the conclusion that both in the late 1950s and today, in the early 1980s, the decisive factor in achieving a complete and general test ban remains the political will of the nuclear-weapon States.

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

Taking into consideration the positive and constructive position of the Soviet Union, we appeal to the western participants in the suspended trilateral negotiations to display the long overdue constructive approach that the world awaits from them.

A good and meaningful beginning could be their consent to start truly multilateral negotiations in the framework of an ad hoc working group in this Committee. In this connection, we share the anxiety and the reasoning of the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, India, Mexico, Yugoslavia and others in the Group of 21, expressed in their statements in the Committee during this session.

Unfortunately, we face a similar situation on item 2 of our agenda, "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament". The delegations of the socialist countries, two and a half years ago, tabled a reasonable ground-laying proposal relating to the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons of all types and their gradual reduction until their complete elimination is achieved, that is to be found in the well-known document CD/4, whereby the socialist countries initiated the idea of starting early negotiations in the CD on the complex issues of nuclear disarmament.

During the extensive discussions that have followed the introduction of this document, the Soviet delegation and the other socialist delegations have answered numerous questions and have expressed their readiness to study any other constructive ideas for multilateral negotiations on this item. While proposing the creation of an ad hoc working group, as was noted the other day by Ambassador Herder, the leader of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic, we are not turning the issue of the creation of a working group into a fetish; we stand ready to discuss any sensible proposal and our rules of procedures provide us with certain possibilities in this respect.

However, the CD is confronted now with the refusal of the western countries to start even preliminary negotiations in this field. We have respect for their legitimate security interests and we attach great importance to the principle of undiminished security for all participants during the process of disarmament. But we cannot accept the assertion that nuclear weapons and the ever-perpetuated nuclear arms race are a sound base for strengthening the security of any State or international security at large.

At the 12th Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party held in April 1981, the Secretary-General of the Party and President of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, stressed the significance of the peace initiatives drawn up and proclaimed at the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and underlined their potential for strengthening the course towards détente, restoring and increasing confidence among States and eliminating the danger of nuclear war. The realization of these noble tasks requires meaningful and constructive negotiations, above all in the sphere of nuclear disarmament. In the context of the present state of international relations, the rejection of negotiations on nuclear disarmament is a sign of dangerous negativism. The CD should not tolerate a situation where certain States use every means to oppose the constructive proposals concerning the initiation of multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

In the opinion of our delegation, this Committee should no longer shirk the top priority issues relating to the weapons that threaten the very existence of our civilization. We should no longer keep them as ritual items on our agenda and make statements instead of engaging in meaningful negotiations on reducing the nuclear danger.

Against the background of mounting awareness by world public opinion of the urgent need for nuclear disarmament negotiations in the field of both intercontinental and medium-range missiles, it is utterly embarrassing to see the Committee on Disarmament spending more than a year in discussion over the creation of an ad hoc working group on the top priority item on its agenda. When are we to expect any concrete suggestion from the West on how to proceed in relation to this item? We are not begging for negotiations and, as President Brezhnev stated at the meeting of the Supreme Soviet on 23 June: "The might of the peace forces opposing the potential aggressor today is greater than ever before. But we know something else; the very nature of modern weapons is such that, if they were used, the future of all mankind would be at stake".

The statement of the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union, Ambassador Issraelyan, that we heard at our previous plenary meeting, has underlined that point in a convincing manner and at the same time exposed the dangerous character of the schemes of those who dream of "a limited nuclear war". Let me quote also the leader of the British Labour Party, Mr. Michael Foot, who stated recently: "We resolutely demand meaningful international negotiations -- not preludes to negotiations and not negotiations about negotiations, but serious negotiations aimed at eliminating the danger of war and mutual annihilation".

During the informal meetings we have had both during the first part of the annual session and during the last three weeks, many delegations have put forward different ideas, proposals and suggestions relating to these two items. Most of them are reflected in the synthesis of the discussion on items 1 and 2, a very useful document for which we are grateful to the secretariat of the Committee. We believe that an eventual working group on item 2 should concentrate on establishing or identifying a number of concrete issues that could usefully become the subject of multilateral negotiations. It is our conviction that the proposal of the socialist countries contained in document CD/4 will take a prominent place among them.

I would like to conclude this statement by bringing to the notice of the Committee an excerpt from the speech of the President of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, at the International Meeting-Dialogue "For détente, peace and social progress" held in Sofia in May this year:

"Let us not lock up ourselves in the fortress of suspicion; let us sit down and engage in a dialogue permeated by mutual desire to solve the problems in the interest of peaceful coexistence -- this is the challenge of the day, this is today a sign of realistic statesmanlike thinking and political conduct. Those who have failed to understand this have missed the most significant feature of the contemporary situation."

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the next speaker, I would like to welcome Mrs. Inga Thorsson who has joined us today and to whose statement next Thursday I am sure we are all very keen to listen.

Mr. MALITA (Romania) (translated from French): Taking the floor for the first time under your chairmanship, I cannot refrain from expressing, together with my long-standing esteem for you as a colleague, the thought that you are bringing to us a precious breath of humanism generated by the great philosophies of your country, India, philosophies which have sought an alternative to violence and force as a vindication of hope in the moral and intellectual quality of man. I am sure that under your chairmanship the month of July will prove an auspicious one for our work.

I also wish to take the occasion to pay tribute to the efforts of Ambassador Komives, who may congratulate himself on having, like his predecessors during this session, achieved some visible and tangible results.

May I also welcome our colleague from Venezuela, Ambassador Rodríguez Navarro, and assure him of our full co-operation.

My statement today will be devoted to nuclear issues, which have formed the subject of our discussion under the items entitled "Nuclear test ban" and "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament".

The Romanian delegation has already amply stated its views on the absolute priority that should be given to nuclear disarmament in the Committee's activities. As the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu, has said: "Nothing and no theory on military balance can justify arms increases. We realize that a balance must be maintained during the process of disarmament so that security of every party remains unaffected: however, this must be done, not through the escalation of armaments, but through their diminution, through the systematic and continuous reduction of military expenses and troops, through a progression to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons under appropriate international control". This position of my country was also expressed recently in the appeal for peace launched by the Grand Congress of Workers' Councils and in the appeal by the Grand National Assembly of Romania to the parliaments of the countries signatories of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference.

It is difficult to put forward fresh arguments in favour of starting negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Our colleagues on the Committee have made clear in their excellent statements the advisability and more particularly the urgency of starting such talks, and I would not wish to repeat what they have said. The pressing appeals of the United Nations General Assembly, the movements of scientists, the activities of non-governmental organizations in favour of halting the nuclear arms race and, if you permit me to say so, the unusual frequency of articles on the subject in the international press, all bear witness to the profound concern and anxiety of Governments and of people everywhere before the risks of thermonuclear conflict.

(Mr. Malita, Romania)

Thus, while taking as my starting-point the priority that attaches to the subject that appears first on our agenda, I feel obliged at the same time to take account of the difficulties as to the precise way in which it can be dealt with. As you yourself have emphasized in your eloquent statements as representative of India and as Chairman of the Committee for this month, everything argues for starting such negotiations in a multilateral framework. For the fact is that there has been a completely new qualitative development in the nuclear-weapons field. In the past, the question of multilateral negotiations would have been a rather academic one, because the non-nuclear-weapons countries considered that negotiations were a matter for those who, possessing the tools of deterrence, at the same time accepted the risks of their destruction.

Today, however, we are all nuclear-weapon States, not in the sense that we possess nuclear weapons but as potential victims of nuclear destruction.

Can the fact that they are targets for nuclear weapons and that there is no valid system of guarantees against such use of nuclear weapons be expunged from the consciousness of peoples? No country is any longer safe from the possibility of nuclear destruction, and the blocking of discussion on that subject is an infringement of the very principle of the equal security of all States.

The problem before us, therefore, is not whether multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament are desirable, urgent or a matter of priority, but how to start such negotiations.

The vast majority of the Committee's members consider that the establishment of working groups on the subjects of (1) a nuclear test ban and (2) the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, offers the best practical approach. Specific proposals to this effect have been submitted by the Group of 21 and by the socialist countries. However, it has not been possible to achieve a consensus in this connection, and a number of arguments against the proposed bodies have been advanced during our discussions.

One argument, of a more general nature, is that the deterioration of international relations makes nuclear disarmament negotiations inopportune and inoperative. In reply to that argument, I will take the liberty of quoting from a statement made by Sir John Simon, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom, at the League of Nations Disarmament Conference in 1932:

"Even now, voices are heard which declare that the moment is not opportune. The paradox is pointed out that, while disarmament is being discussed at Geneva, in the Far East armaments are being

(Mr. Malita, Romania)

employed, bombs are dropping from the sky, troops are now on the move ... I do not agree with those who suggest that this paradox makes our meeting inopportune. I would rather declare that these sombre events illustrate and reinforce the urgent necessity of undertaking and discharging our task."

We share this view and we believe that, particularly in the nuclear age, the difficulties that exist at the international level ought not to inhibit but rather to stimulate negotiations.

The well-documented statement by His Excellency, Ambassador Issraelyan, the head of the delegation of the USSR, at the plenary meeting on 2 July 1981, has given us a picture of the intolerable consequences of failure to achieve results in halting the nuclear arms race.

Another argument that is frequently advanced concerns the link between nuclear disarmament and the security of the nuclear-weapon States and their allies. The existence of such a relationship cannot be denied. But we find it difficult to understand why this link should prevent us from starting negotiations. We believe that it argues in favour of a discussion on the security perceptions of all States and accordingly of the establishment of a subsidiary body of the Committee in which we could discuss the relevant problems openly and honestly, with the necessary respect for the position and interests of each. The balance necessary for the security of all can and should be achieved at progressively lower levels of armaments in general and of nuclear armaments in particular. Greater security at lower cost is in the interests of all.

The complexity of nuclear problems has also been presented as an obstacle to the establishment of working groups. Yet we have to recognize that human intelligence has succeeded in finding solutions to much more complex problems. Developing micro-processors that use human language, putting an artificial intelligence on silicon chips, penetrating the mysteries of the living cell, or even managing the economic and social affairs of a big city like Geneva, say, are problems of a complexity exceeding that of nuclear-weapon systems. Thus, to claim that the complexity of nuclear disarmament -- which, when all is said and done, can be dealt with in terms of probabilities we learned about at grammar school -- is an obstacle to our activities, is a paralysing idea which blocks all our deliberations.

Consequently, we cannot accept the idea that the complexity of the subject should be used as an argument against the starting of negotiations. A problem does not increase in complexity because of the magnitude and scope of the effects involved.

(Mr. Malita, Romania)

The absence of concrete proposals for nuclear disarmament has also been invoked against the setting up of a working group. A mere list of Committee documents on nuclear disarmament -- CD/4, CD/72, CD/109, CD/134, CD/141, CD/180, CD/181 -- is enough to refute this argument. In addition there are all the various proposals on nuclear disarmament that have been put forward in the United Nations, among which I should like to mention the Indian proposal on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and the Canadian proposal on halting the production of fissionable materials for military purposes, also presented in this Committee.

It is for all these reasons that the Romanian delegation supports the proposal made by the delegations of India, Pakistan and Mexico on the need to adopt a formal decision of the Committee, in plenary meeting, on the proposals for the establishment of working groups on the questions of a nuclear test ban and nuclear disarmament.

If, contrary to all logic and in dereliction of its responsibilities, the Committee proves unable to adopt the decision necessary for the establishment of such groups, the Romanian delegation cannot view this matter as closed. We believe that no single delegation nor the Committee as a whole can assume the responsibility for our proceeding merely to record our failure.

Like the Brazilian delegation, as was pointed out by its distinguished leader, Ambassador de Souza e Silva, our delegation has made no secret of the fact that as far as we are concerned the establishment of a working group is not an end in itself.

If, for reasons that escape us, working groups cannot at present be established to carry out the urgent and necessary priority task of starting negotiations on nuclear disarmament, we are nevertheless convinced that the Committee's rules of procedure offer us the possibility of finding other practical means of fulfilling our mandate. With this in mind, the Romanian delegation proposes the establishment of an ad hoc sub-committee of the Committee to deal with nuclear questions. Rule 23, in chapter VII of the rules of procedure, on the organization of work, provides for the possibility of establishing such a body.

We wish to emphasize that from the point of view of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, it is inconceivable that the theoretical priority the Committee has given to nuclear disarmament questions by their inclusion in its agenda should not be reflected in practice by the establishment of bodies able to deal effectively with these questions.

Mr. Saran (India) took the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately, Ambassador Venkateswaran has been called away on urgent and pressing business, but he will rejoin us in a very short while. On his behalf I would like to thank the representative of Romania, Ambassador Malita, for the very kind words he addressed to the Chair and particularly the very generous remarks he made about my country.

Mr. VRHUNEC (Yugoslavia): Mr. Chairman, it is a particular honour and pleasure for me to congratulate you on your taking up of the duties of Chairman of the Committee for the month of July. You represent a country to which we are linked by traditionally good, friendly and most sincere relations that are founded on the common interests of the non-aligned movement. There is no doubt that your experience and well-known diplomatic abilities will give new, urgently needed impetus to the work of our Committee in order that we may take significant steps forward in the process of negotiations in the field of disarmament.

I would also like to congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Imre Komives, for the exceptional work he did as Chairman for the month of June.

I avail myself of this opportunity to greet our new colleagues, Ambassador Rodríguez Navarro from Venezuela, Ambassador Carasales from Argentina, Ambassador Jalali from Iran and Ambassador Jayakoddy from Sri Lanka, and to wish them success in their work.

Taking the floor in today's debate, I would like to point out that I am not doing so because I have something new or important to say. The Yugoslav delegation has on several occasions, as is after all the case with all the delegations members of the Committee, taken the opportunity to express our basic position and to submit proposals as to how to initiate the process of disarmament. We consider that the problem is not due to an absence of proposals or suggestions for the successful work of the Committee, but rather to the fact that the Committee finds itself in the unsatisfactory situation that, because of a lack of political will on the part of a certain number of members to engage in substantive negotiations on the problems that are on the Committee's agenda, it is unable to perform its principal functions and to fulfil the obligations laid upon it as the only multilateral negotiating body in this field.

This time, I take the floor first of all to stress that the Yugoslav delegation associates itself with all those who have voiced their disapproval of the fact that the Committee, despite its having met for three years, has not succeeded in substantively opening negotiations on two of the most important as well as urgent issues, namely, a comprehensive test ban and the halting of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. In voicing our disapproval and concern over the present situation, I would like to emphasize that the arguments presented to the Committee by two member delegations against the setting up of two working groups on these items have not convinced us of the justification of their opposition. On the contrary, we deem these arguments unjustified, unfounded and unconvincing and we therefore cannot accept them.

Many questions have been raised by the Group of 21 with regard to nuclear disarmament during the work of the Committee. They have, nevertheless, remained unanswered. This is why we associate ourselves with the request made by India which you, Mr. Chairman, tabled in your remarks, seeking an answer to these questions as early as possible so that we may be able jointly to create a means for finding a way out of the existing unsatisfactory situation. We do this all the more since the East European socialist countries have also opted for this. The present situation is even

(Mr. Vrhunec, Yugoslavia)

more disquieting in view of the fact that during the past years several solemn declarations and decisions have been adopted by various forums within and outside the United Nations in which all countries without exception have committed themselves to launching negotiations on nuclear disarmament. It is particularly significant that all of us adopted the decisions of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, including the Governments of the two countries members of the Committee which oppose the creation of working groups. We therefore have a full formal and moral right to ask the CD to deal with the issue of nuclear disarmament and to organize negotiations on the subject. In spite of this, however, the Committee is still blocked and has no clear prospect of the opening of permanent negotiations on nuclear disarmament. It is thus right to ask the question whether the refusal to open negotiations on nuclear disarmament in the Committee means that the Governments of the two delegations voluntarily renounce the obligations they assumed under the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session? Does it mean that by that token these Governments do not want nuclear disarmament? If this were the case, it would be extremely disquieting. We are nevertheless inclined to believe that it is only a transitory occurrence since the achieving, as soon as possible, of concrete positive results in the work of the Committee represents one of the most important conditions for the safeguarding of peace, the strengthening of international security and the realization of equitable international co-operation based on the Charter of the United Nations. This, however, cannot be achieved without opening the process of nuclear disarmament. This is why we hope there will be consensus with regard to the setting up of working groups or other appropriate bodies which would initiate the negotiations on an issue of such importance for the future destiny of the world. At this juncture I would like to stress, as we have done on several occasions, that in the event of the contrary, my delegation is not prepared to assume any responsibility for the absence of a solution to the question of nuclear disarmament and the consequences this entails for international relations as a whole.

It can often be heard in the Committee and elsewhere that the over-all international situation is not favourable for the opening of negotiations on disarmament. I would once again like to point out that such an attitude cannot be accepted, as is very clearly formulated in the final document of the Ministerial Meeting of the non-aligned countries that was held in New Delhi this year. The non-aligned countries are of the opinion that the situation is exactly the opposite. Progress in the field of disarmament and the taking of genuine disarmament measures would have a considerable positive influence on the improvement of international relations and would create conditions for finding a way out of the existing crises -- both political and economic. Of special significance in this connection is the freeing of resources that are now spent on armaments and their reallocation for development needs, and in particular for the more accelerated development of the developing countries which would put a stop to the unfavourable world economic trends, poverty, hunger and other misfortunes, and would give rise to more stable and harmonious development. It is constantly being said that the world economy is in a crisis and that inflation cannot be stopped. However, it is clear that as long as we continue to spend such enormous sums for such unproductive purposes as armaments, it cannot be expected that it will be possible to curb inflation and to give a more significant impetus towards lifting the world's economy out of stagnation or

(Mr. Vrhunec, Yugoslavia)

stagflation. The process of disarmament would open the possibility for these huge material and intellectual resources to be used, not for destruction but for giving a new impetus to the world's economy and creating favourable conditions for entering a new period of prosperity for all countries without exception.

This is why today there is no task that is more urgent than to work for the opening of a genuine disarmament process, and especially nuclear disarmament.

In this connection, we highly appreciate the efforts of those countries members of the Committee which strive for the settlement of particular issues on the Committee's agenda. We think that the work done by the working groups is going in the right direction and that no efforts should be spared in order that such a trend can continue.

However, there is reason for thought as to how the work of the Committee and its bodies can be improved. In the opinion of the Yugoslav delegation, this can be done in two ways. First, negotiations should concentrate on the most important questions, which should be approached as concretely as possible in order that we may arrive at agreed texts of conventions on these subjects as soon as possible. The framework of the mandates should be adapted to this task so that negotiations will not be brought unnecessarily to a standstill.

Secondly, the time available for negotiations should be used better and more fully. We should try to have as few procedural debates as possible and fewer general and extensive discussions and statements. We should also consider the possibility of extending the duration of the session, especially of the working groups, when this is indispensable to the negotiations. If there really is a political will on the part of all to conduct substantive negotiations aimed at reaching the earliest possible agreement on particular issues which are the subject of negotiations, then we ought not to interrupt the deliberations of the working groups nor should they work for only a few months a year. The same criterion should also be decisive in determining the duration of the Committee's sessions. Nevertheless, if there is no readiness for genuine negotiations, the extension of the period of negotiations in itself cannot contribute to more effective and successful work by the Committee.

The Yugoslav delegation thinks that the application of these two methods would improve the work of the Committee and the working groups in terms of both quality and quantity. We are ready to examine and adopt every proposal aimed at promoting and accelerating the negotiating process, when obvious political will has been shown by all really to conduct substantive negotiations. If the contrary is the case, it is better not to conceal with pointless meetings the fact that the Committee is not fulfilling the role and tasks laid upon it by the world community.

The CHAIRMAN: On behalf of Ambassador Venkateswaran I would like to thank His Excellency Ambassador Vrhunec for his statement and for the very kind words he has addressed to the Chair. I would now like to consult the Committee about the informal consultations which were scheduled for this afternoon at 3.30 p.m. in Conference Room 1. Since we now have some time at our disposal it has been suggested that we might hold our informal consultations at the end of this plenary meeting in this room. If there is no objection I shall adjourn the plenary meeting and begin our informal consultations in this room in five minutes' time. Is that acceptable to the members of the Committee?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I adjourn this plenary meeting I would like to make a short announcement on behalf of the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Radiological Weapons. The Chairman of the Working Group on Radiological Weapons will hold informal consultations on 9 July at 9 a.m. in the conference room of the Disarmament Unit on questions relating to the definition and scope of the prohibition. The informal consultations will have an open-ended character. The Chairman would like to request the participation of the delegations of the United States, the USSR, Sweden, Yugoslavia, India, Venezuela and Australia, which have submitted proposals on these questions. The next plenary meeting will be held on Thursday, 9 July at 10.30 a.m. This meeting stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.