

COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

CD, PV.170
8 April 1962
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTEENTH PLenary MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 8 April 1962, at 10 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. Yoshio OKAWA

(Japan)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria:

Mr. M. MATI
Mr. M. BELKAID
Mr. A. TAFFAR

Argentina:

Mr. J.C. CARASALES
Miss N. NASCIMBENE

Australia:

Mr. D.M. SADLEIR
Mr. R. STEELE
Mr. T. FINDLAY

Belgium:

Mr. J.M. NOIRFALISSE
Miss de CLERQ

Brazil:

Mr. C.A. de SOUZA e SILVA
Mr. S. de QUEIROZ DUARTE

Bulgaria:

Mr. K. TELLALOV
Mr. I. SOTIROV
Mr. K. PRAMOV

Burma:

U MAUNG MAUNG GYI
U THAN TUN

Canada:

Mr. G.R. SKINNER

China:

Mr. TIAN JIN
Mr. LIN CHENG
Mr. FENG ZHENYAO

Cuba:

Mr. L. SOLA VILA
Mr. P. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA
Mr. J. LUIS GARCIA

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. J. STRUCKA
Mr. A. CIMA

Egypt:
Mr. E.A. EL REEDY
Mr. I.A. HASSAN
Mr. M.N. FAIMY

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

France:
Mr. J. de BEAUSSE
Mr. M. VILLETTE

German Democratic Republic:
Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. J. MOEPERT

Germany, Federal Republic of:
Mr. H. WEGENER
Mr. N. KLINGLER

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

India:
Mr. A. VENKATESWARAN

Indonesia:
Mr. N. SUPRESNA
Mr. I. DAMANIK
Mr. B. SIMANJUNTAK
Mr. A. BAHRIN

Iran:
Mr. M.J. MAHALLATI

Italy:
Mr. M. ALESSI
Mr. C.M. OLIVA
Mr. E. DI GIOVANNI

Japan:
Mr. Y. OKAWA
Mr. M. TAKAHASHI
Mr. K. TANAKA
Mr. T. ARAI

Kenya:
Mr. D.D. DON NANJIR
Mr. J. MURIU KIBOI

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

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

Morocco: Mr. S.M. RAHALLI
Mr. M. CHRAJBI

Netherlands: Mr. F. van DONGEN
Mr. H. WAGENMAKERS

Nigeria: Mr. G.O. IJEWERE
Mr. W.O. AKINSANYA
Mr. T. AGUIYI-IRONSI

Pakistan: Mr. M. AHMAD
Mr. M. AKRAM

Peru: Mr. J. BENAVIDES de la SOTTA

Poland: Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. B. RUSSIN
Mr. J. CIALOWICZ
Mr. T. STROJWAS

Romania: Mr. T. MELESCANU

Sri Lanka: Mr. A.J. JAYAKODDY
Mr. H.M.G.S. PALIHAKKARA

Sweden: Mr. C. LIDGARD

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. L.A. NAUMOV
Mr. V.F. PRYAKHIN
Mr. N.M. IPPOLITOV

United Kingdom:

Mr. D.M. SUMMERHAYES
Mr. L. MIDDLETON
Mr. J.I. LINK
Miss J.E.F. WRIGHT

United States of America:

Mr. M.D. BUSBY
Ms. K. CRITTENBERGER
Mrs. M.E. HOINKES
Miss S. BURKE

Venezuela:

Mr. O. AGUILAR PARDO

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. VRHUNEC
Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC

Zaire:

Mr. OSIL GNOK

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

Mr. R. JAIPAL

Deputy Secretary of the
Committee on Disarmament:

Mr. V. BERASATEGUI

The CHAIRMAN: I declare open the 170th plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament.

Before I take up the list of speakers, I would like to draw your attention to the informal paper circulated by the secretariat this morning on the timetable for meetings to be held by the Committee and its subsidiary bodies during the coming week. As you know, Monday is a holiday and, therefore, there will be no activities. That means that we will have approximately one week to complete the work of the Committee if we wish to conclude our deliberations on 20 April. Since the Working Groups have not yet submitted their reports, they will have to do so during the coming week and we will probably need to hold plenary meetings on Monday, 19 April, and Tuesday, 20 April, to consider and adopt the special report to the General Assembly. Under these circumstances, I see no alternative but to increase the number of meetings of the subsidiary bodies next week and also to use all the time available for the consideration of the draft report. In that connection, you may note that we will not be holding a plenary meeting on Tuesday, since no delegations have expressed the wish to speak on that particular day. We can use the time thus made available to hold an informal meeting at 10 a.m. on 13 April to discuss the subjects included in the timetable.

After that, hopefully, we can proceed to the consideration of the draft report. You will recall that it was agreed that the Committee would establish an open-ended drafting group to consider the draft report to the General Assembly. I suggest that we try to hold the first meeting of this drafting group after the informal meeting on Tuesday. This drafting group will meet in Conference Room I.

If there is no objection, I will consider that the Committee adopts the timetable.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): Mr. Chairman, I thank you and the Secretariat for again submitting such a very precisely worded timetable. However, knowing that delegations are quite adverse to having concurrent meetings, I would like to point out the following: on Tuesday, 13 April, at 3 p.m. time has been set aside for the Ad Hoc Working Group on Radiological Weapons. In view of the way the work in that Working Group is proceeding, that meeting may not be necessary and I will be in touch with the Secretariat to find out whether and at what time we can cancel the meeting so that the Working Group on Chemical Weapons can have the main room allotted to it.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Ambassador Wegener for this useful information.

May I take it that the Committee agrees to the adoption of the timetable, tentatively, I would say, for the coming week?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: According to our programme of work, the Committee should have started its consideration of item 8 of its agenda today. That item deals with the consideration of the reports of subsidiary bodies and the consideration and adoption of the special report to the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. However, as members know, the reports of subsidiary bodies are not yet available for consideration by the plenary and the Committee has agreed that an open-ended drafting group should deal with those parts

(The Chairman)

of the draft report of the Committee which have been made available by the Secretariat. Therefore, members may wish to make full use of rule 30 of the Rules of Procedure, according to which members wishing to make statements on any subject relevant to the work of the Committee may do so.

I have on my list of speakers for today the representatives of India, the United States of America, the Netherlands, Mongolia, Nigeria, Yugoslavia, Egypt, the United Kingdom, China and Belgium.

I now give the floor to the first speaker on my list, the representative of India, His Excellency Ambassador Venkateswaran.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to welcome you, the representative of a brotherly country from Asia, as Chairman of our Committee for this crucial month of April. Members of the Committee are already familiar with your dedication to the cause of disarmament and your impressive qualities of sincerity and wisdom. I have no doubt that, during this month when the Committee must above all agree upon its report to the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, our work will benefit from your patience, skill and guidance. May I on behalf of my delegation pledge to you our fullest co-operation in the discharge of your duties and wish you every success?

The Secretariat has circulated to all Committee members the text of a note (document CD/273 of 6 April 1982) transmitted by the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations in New York to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and containing the views of the Government of India on the substantive issues related to the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, as well as suggestions for the prevention of nuclear war.

Paragraph 18 of the Final Document of the first special session states unequivocally and I quote: "Removing the threat of a world war-- a nuclear war -- is the most acute and urgent task of the present day. Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation".

The question of human survival must clearly, therefore, take precedence over narrow conceptions of security of individual nation States or groups of States. The use of the nuclear weapon, which is a weapon of mass destruction, would recognize no national or regional boundaries, lead to indiscriminate destruction and loss of life and endanger the very continuation of the human species itself. On what basis then can any State continue to insist that it has the right to seek its security through the espousal of pernicious doctrines that are predicated on the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons? We cannot and must not allow this state of affairs to continue.

Today the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war has become even more ominous than ever before. It is no mere coincidence that, in several countries of Europe, a continent which is already over-saturated with nuclear and conventional weapons of the most destructive kind, popular mass movements against nuclear weapons are gathering greater momentum each day. More recently, in the United States of America, there has been similar rising popular concern and anxiety over the grim reality of nuclear war, leading to bipartisan resolutions being introduced in the United States Congress, for urgent measures to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race. The first resolution of this kind introduced in the United States Senate by Senators Kennedy and Hatfield states in its preamble and I quote:

(Mr. Venkateswaran, India)

"Whereas the greatest challenge facing the earth is to prevent the occurrence of nuclear war by accident or design,

Whereas the nuclear arms race is dangerously increasing the risk of a holocaust that would be humanity's final war, and

Whereas a freeze followed by reductions in nuclear warheads, missiles and other delivery systems is needed to halt the nuclear arms race and to reduce the risk of the nuclear war".

And this preambular paragraph was followed by a solemn call upon the United States and the Soviet Union "to achieve a mutual and verifiable freeze on the testing, production and further deployment of nuclear warheads, missiles and other delivery systems".

India cannot but agree with the philosophy and approach expressed in the preamble to this resolution of the United States Senate. As the Committee is aware, India has, in its note to the Secretary-General, specifically called for a complete freeze on nuclear weapons as a step towards nuclear disarmament. Our approach, of course, is more comprehensive in nature and consists of two inseparable elements, namely, (i) a complete cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons; and (ii) a cut-off in the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. Once this is achieved, international safeguards, on a universal and non-discriminatory basis, could be applied to all nuclear facilities of all States to prevent the diversion of fissionable material for weapons purposes.

The idea of a freeze is not new. In 1964, the United States itself proposed in the ENDC "a verified freeze of the number and characteristics of strategic nuclear offensive and defensive vehicles". This proposal was put forward on the basis of a generally accepted approach to disarmament. I can find no better words to describe this approach than to quote from the statement made by the representative of the United States in the ENDC on 31 January 1964. He said and I quote: "This proposal (the proposal for a verified freeze of the number and characteristics of strategic nuclear offensive and defensive vehicles) is patterned after measures which have **already** been successfully negotiated, measures having a common general philosophy. This philosophy is that a logical first step is to freeze things where they are and thereby remove future obstacles to disarmament".

In recent years, however, this generally accepted approach to disarmament has been abruptly set aside in favour of the dangerous approach which, in effect, flies in the face of the facts and is that the road to disarmament lies through a build-up of armaments. It should be clear to anyone that such a policy of negotiating from so-called positions of strength can only lead to a further escalation of the arms race and increase the risk of the outbreak of a nuclear war. The argument frequently used in favour of an arms build-up as a prelude to disarmament is that it would give one's real or potential adversary an "incentive" to seek disarmament. The history of the arms race proves the contrary, namely, that such an approach, far from being a prelude to disarmament has in fact been a prelude to successive and ever more dangerous spirals in the arms race. No State can be frightened into accepting disarmament but, on the other hand, it can, of course, be frightened into undertaking a matching or even greater arms build-up of its own.

In any event, when one is dealing with weapons of mass destruction, such as nuclear weapons, notions of superiority and balance or deterrence have little meaning. The over-kill capacity of existing nuclear arsenals makes numbers meaningless. In the

(Mr. Venkateswaran, India)

opinion of the great majority of military strategists, there will be little or no effect on the so-called nuclear balance, even if existing nuclear arsenals are reduced by 50 per cent or more. Surely, no one would then be able to deny that an immediate freeze on nuclear weapons would achieve little more than a freeze of the existing so-called nuclear balance, which is claimed to be a key element in the prevention of nuclear war.

We totally reject the notion that disarmament can be pursued only on the basis of so-called parity or balance. If we were to accept this notion, then the vast majority of us which are non-nuclear-weapon States would, in fact, have to reassess our renunciation of the manufacture and acquisition of nuclear weapons and acquire nuclear arsenals of our own. For only then, by this self-same logic of the major nuclear-weapon Powers, would we be in a position to persuade others to undertake nuclear disarmament. Any acceptance of the notion that the road to disarmament lies through pressuring others with a build-up of more armaments could only result in such absurd conclusions being drawn.

India has put forward its proposal for a freeze of nuclear weapons in response to United Nations General Assembly resolutions 36/81 A and B pertaining to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. It is our sincere hope that the nuclear-weapon States will respond to the appeal contained in General Assembly resolution 36/81 B, which was adopted by consensus, and submit without further delay "their views, proposals and practical suggestions for ensuring the prevention of nuclear war".

The situation that we face today is extremely critical. Measures for the prevention of nuclear war and for the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament can no longer wait or be a hostage to the capricious state of relations between two major nuclear-weapon States and their allies. The time has come to recognize that the danger we all face from a possible nuclear war, either by accident or design, is truly global in character and demands a global solution. Partial measures which deal with only certain aspects of this grave problem facing mankind can never offer hope of enduring success.

Before I conclude, I would like to touch briefly on the question of chemical weapons. Until now, we looked upon the progress achieved in the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons of this Committee with a degree of optimism and encouragement. However, this optimism has been marred by recently announced decisions to commence what is in effect a new and more dangerous arms race in chemical weapons. Here again, the curious logic which has been used to justify the undertaking of the development and production of new and more destructive types of chemical weapons, particularly binary weapons, is that the so-called adversary must be given an "incentive" to engage in disarmament.

We cannot accept this strange premise which flies in the face of the facts. If we are to make progress in achieving an early prohibition of chemical weapons, it is absolutely necessary for every State to display a degree of caution and restraint in its conduct. It is our earnest hope that, at least at the second special session devoted to disarmament, if not earlier, all States possessing chemical weapons and those which have the potential further to develop their chemical weapons capability will undertake not to build up further their arsenals of these weapons and at the same time to refrain from the development, production and deployment of new types of chemical weapons. We are concerned that, unless early and effective action is taken to check this new trend of justifying an accelerated arms build-up on the ground that it will help towards negotiations on disarmament, the cause of disarmament itself will remain a mere mirage with its consequential dangers.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of India for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of the United States of America, Mr. Busby.

Mr. BUSBY (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, although Ambassador Fields has already expressed to you the congratulations of the United States delegation on your assumption of the chairmanship, I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal pleasure at seeing you in the Chair and to wish you every success in your difficult and demanding job.

My purpose in asking for the floor today is to introduce document CD/271-CD/CW/WP.32 co-sponsored by the delegations of the United Kingdom, Australia and the United States and entitled "Technical evaluation of 'Recover' techniques for CW verification".

The achievement of a complete and verifiable prohibition of chemical weapons is a goal which ranks near the top of the Committee's agenda. The Committee's discussions of general approaches to verification of a future CW prohibition have demonstrated that fundamental differences exist on verification issues. If meaningful progress is to be made on a chemical weapons convention, it is clear that progress must be made in resolving these issues.

Because of the variety of verification tasks to be dealt with in a CW prohibition, there can be no simple formula which can be applied in all cases. A variety of techniques, tailored to particular situations, will be required. Finding solutions to them will require active co-operation, imagination and expertise from all members of this Committee. It is in this spirit that my delegation has sponsored two briefings on the concept of remote continual verification ("recover").

The recover system is a unique global sensor-monitoring and data collection network being developed by the International Atomic Energy Agency for use primarily with regard to nuclear safeguards. However, it appears to the co-sponsors that the technology involved may have wider applicability. In particular, it is our view that the recover techniques may have potential application as one component of a broadly based CW verification system.

Document CD/271-CD/CW/WP.32 describes the remote continual verification concept and suggests a framework within which a technical evaluation of recover could be conducted under the auspices of the Committee. The results of such a technical evaluation would be used to determine the applicability of recover as one component of a CW verification system.

It is clear that the lack of agreement on issues in the area of verification and compliance is the principal obstacle to successful completion of this Committee's work on a complete and effective ban on chemical weapons. Document CD/271-CD/CW/WP.32 suggests a technical evaluation which could assist us by taking another step towards overcoming this obstacle. It could also serve as a confidence-building activity in which States would co-operate to develop and evaluate improved monitoring arrangements. For these reasons, we seek favourable consideration of this proposal and intend to propose the inclusion of this item in our work programme for the summer session.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of the United States of America for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of the Netherlands, His Excellency Ambassador van Dongen.

Mr. van DONGEN (Netherlands): I should like to avail myself of the provision of rule 30 of the Rules of Procedure to refer to agenda item 7 on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

The Netherlands welcomes the decision of this Committee to put this item on its agenda. We hold that the time is more than ripe to take up this subject; further delay would only increase its complexity, which is, even now, awesome. In his statement of 2 February 1982, Ambassador Fein outlined our approach to it. Having listened attentively to the arguments put forward by certain delegations, we acquiesced in its absence from the programme of work for the Committee's spring session. At the same time, we welcomed the decision to hold informal meetings to consider item 7; I hope that, on that occasion, I made our constant interest in the matter abundantly clear.

We are of course aware that a few nations play a preponderant role in the exploration and the use of outer space and that, for other members of this Committee, many of the technical aspects are hard to grasp. At the same time, the fact that possible arms competition in outer space would directly affect the military balance and therefore our joint security confers on us the right and even the duty to speak out.

When I do so today, my primary objective is to encourage further discussion and continued awareness that the major contribution can only come from the two great Powers and that a lasting solution is feasible only if the two of them can come to agree with one another.

The military use of outer space seems to have three main aspects:

(a) Military satellites are increasingly being used to fulfil functions of direct military relevance such as observation, navigation, communications and crisis monitoring;

(b) As a result, the same satellites are becoming high-priority military targets, since their elimination will directly affect the adversary's military capabilities. This has resulted in increased research, development and, in some cases, even tests of so-called interceptor satellites in orbit;

(c) Increased research in the field of directed-energy weapons, both high-energy laser and particle-beam weapons, has made it conceivable that they may be used both for space-based ballistic missile defence and as anti-satellite weapons.

We are, of course, aware of the fact that, since the 1960s, a number of international agreements have been concluded restricting the military use of outer space; of these, the 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, deserves special mention. This Treaty prohibits the placing in orbit around the earth of any objects carrying nuclear weapons of mass destruction, the installation of such weapons on celestial bodies and the stationing of such weapons in outer space in any other manner. It also calls for the complete demilitarization of the moon and other celestial bodies. Though it is an important step forward, the Outer Space Treaty leaves room for a variety of military activities in outer space. I note by way of illustration that none of the three ways of militarizing outer space which I outlined earlier is prohibited by the provisions of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty.

(Mr. van Dongen, Netherlands)

How can we fill this gap? There is, of course, the Soviet draft treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. We have, however, stated on several occasions that it is our considered opinion that this draft treaty does not meet our requirements. On the one hand, it seems that the complexity of arms control in outer space calls not for one comprehensive treaty, but, rather, warrants several instruments dealing with specific subject-matters. On the other hand, the Soviet draft treaty seems to allow for dangerous and inadmissible a contrario arguments that could undermine the provisions of the draft and indeed those of treaties already in force. The verification provisions will have to be scrutinized for their adequacy. Furthermore, the draft contains some baroque ornaments that have no place in a legal text.

For example, draft article 3 raises many questions about the character of the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. It seems to leave open the possibility of disabling space objects of other States parties if such objects are not placed in strict accordance with article 1, paragraph 1, of the draft treaty. Furthermore, the prohibition applies only to the space objects of other States which are parties to the treaty. These restrictions, together with the wording of article 1, paragraph 1, referring only to stationing, mean that the Soviet draft treaty does not prohibit the development, testing or production of "objects carrying weapons of any kind" or even their use under certain circumstances.

Another important point in this connection is that a clear definition of the term "weapon" is lacking.

With regard to the verification provisions of this draft treaty, it can be asked why the verification of the implementation of this treaty should be left exclusively to so-called "national" technical means of verification. These means were recognized for the first time as a legitimate method by the United States and the Soviet Union in the SALT agreements. However, what is adequate in a bilateral context is not necessarily adequate or acceptable in a multilateral context. And since we are talking about a multilateral draft treaty, it should in any case leave open the possibility of the further internationalization of the verification of this treaty.

Another observation with regard to the proposed verification régime is that it does not provide for recourse of any kind to international bodies in case of doubts or complaints about compliance or non-compliance with the treaty.

I would like to make some further observations on this subject.

First of all, in our view, the military uses of space by satellites can, thus far, on balance, be described as rather of a stabilizing nature. When we consider possible further measures to prevent an arms race in outer space, we can therefore not ignore developments in the elaboration of anti-satellite weapon systems, which should be regarded as a serious danger because of their destabilizing effect on international peace and security. The more satellites are used as the eyes and ears of modern military forces, the more crippling will be their loss through attacks with anti-satellite weapons. It is therefore entirely justified that General Assembly resolution 36/97 C, in addition to the provisions I referred to earlier, requested this Committee to consider, as a matter of priority, the question of negotiating an effective and verifiable agreement to prohibit anti-satellite systems as an important first step.

(Mr. van Dongen, Netherlands)

We are aware of the fact that anti-satellite weapons systems are now being developed and even tested. Achievements in the field of ballistic missile defence may also serve for the development of an anti-satellite capability. Is this not then the right moment for endeavours towards further arms control in outer space? Conversely, must we fear that the possibilities are diminishing or have already ceased to exist? To find the answer, we must investigate the rationale for developing an anti-satellite capability.

Two main arguments are usually put forward. One stems from a competitive and reactive concern: to deter the use of anti-satellite weapons by the other side and to prevent an imbalance in military capabilities. The other stems from a concern of the first party with the growing use of satellites by the other side with a view to enhancing its military capability; the growing use of satellites is then perceived by the first party as constituting a sufficient threat to justify an anti-satellite programme.

It seems to us that a verifiable agreement banning anti-satellite weapons altogether will constitute a durable solution for averting arms competition in outer space only if each side's anti-satellite programme is commensurate with, not a reaction to, the other's, whether real or anticipated. We would then be dealing with the question whether we should opt for mutual satellite vulnerability or for mutual satellite invulnerability.

The choice in favour of the former, the anti-satellite weapons option, could lead to a very expensive arms race in outer space with no guarantee for increased stability, probably quite the contrary. As I mentioned before, present research efforts in the field of directed-energy weapons, both high-energy laser and particle-beam weapons, have already made it conceivable to use these new weapons for space-based ballistic missile defence. It stands to reason that such developments will have serious implications for the present international situation.

As to the question of the priority to be given to the elaboration of a prohibition of anti-satellite weapons, it is our firm belief that the prerequisites for an agreement seem to exist: no State yet seems to possess a commanding lead in the relevant technology.

In choosing the option to ban anti-satellite weapons, one would have to consider that such a ban would be a step in the right direction from an arms control point of view, but that, at the same time, it would offer protection to satellites fulfilling vital military functions. I must admit that we have to think further about that side of the coin and decide whether a mutually acceptable solution can be found. Another complicating aspect is that satellites for observation, communications, navigation, meteorology, etc. can be used both for military and for civilian purposes. We are well aware that this dual-purpose character of satellite technology does not simplify our complicated task.

These are the observations I should like to limit myself to at this stage. We hope that the results of the informal discussions that are taking place can be evaluated during the period in May and June when the Committee on Disarmament does not meet. During the summer session, the Committee on Disarmament could then deal more formally with agenda item 7 and consider setting up an ad hoc working group on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (translated from Russian): The problem of preventing the spread of the arms race to outer space, that relatively new sphere of human activity, occupies an important place in the set of problems relating to the halting of the arms race and to disarmament.

In the past quarter of a century, since the start of the space era, the international community has been making unceasing efforts to ensure that space is used exclusively for peaceful purposes, for the social and economic progress of peoples.

The Soviet Union's initiative concerning the conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space therefore received wide support at the thirty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

Representatives of a large number of States, both in the First Committee and at plenary meetings of the General Assembly, expressed serious concern at the real threat that might be created unless a barrier to the spread of the arms race to outer space was erected in good time. In this Committee, too, many speakers have stressed the timeliness and importance of the Soviet proposal aimed at removing that danger.

In approving by an overwhelming majority resolution 36/99, which was submitted by Mongolia on behalf of the group of socialist countries, the General Assembly recommended the Committee on Disarmament to embark on negotiations with a view to achieving agreement on the text of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space.

In its statement in the First Committee, the Mongolian delegation clearly and succinctly expressed its position on this question. During the past twenty or more years, a whole system of treaties and agreements, both multilateral and bilateral, has been established prohibiting the stationing in outer space of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction.

I should like to name the most important among them. They are, first, the 1963 Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water; the 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies; the Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, approved by the General Assembly in 1979; the 1977 Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques, and many others.

However, we are regretfully compelled to note that, according to reports in the western Press, including that of the United States itself, an extensive programme is being developed for the creation of a whole series of systems of weapons to be used in outer space, such as systems of anti-satellite weapons, the deployment of anti-satellite mines, laser weapons and the development of huge anti-missile defence systems based in outer space, etc. Particular attention is being devoted in this connection to reusable vehicles of the "Shuttle" type.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

According to the United States review "Aviation Week and Space Technology", reusable spacecraft have been given the role of a connecting link between military centres on Earth and orbital operational stations, programme development for which has already entered the final stage.

From Press reports it transpires that the Pentagon strategists have also assigned the "Shuttle" programme a substantial role in the activation of military reconnaissance from space. Use will be made for this purpose of artificial satellites placed in orbit by a remote manipulator.

In short, there exists a real danger of the unleashing of an arms race in space. The world community naturally cannot remain indifferent in the face of such an escalation of activity to implement plans for the militarization of outer space designed to undermine the existing military balance and to initiate yet another spiral of the arms race including space weapons.

It should also be pointed out that the stationing of new types of weapons in outer space would have the most negative effect on co-operation among States in the exploration of outer space for peaceful purposes, the fruits of which the international community is enjoying on an ever-increasing scale. In that connection, I should like particularly to emphasize the great importance of the results of the activities of socialist States within the framework of the "Interkosmos" programme.

A year ago, there occurred an event of special significance in the life of the Mongolian people -- the joint Mongolian-Soviet space flight, as a result of which successful scientific research of exceptional importance to Mongolia's national economy was carried out.

In the light of the foregoing, the Mongolian delegation considers the Soviet Union's proposal to be timely and appropriate to the demands of the existing situation.

In saying this, I should like to stress that, in our view, this proposal pursues, inter alia, the important aim of halting the arms race as regards its main trend, that of the further qualitative refinement of weapons through the use of scientific and technological progress.

As is known, the General Assembly also approved resolution 36/97 C, which includes, inter alia, a request to the Committee on Disarmament to consider the question of conducting negotiations on the prevention of an arms race in outer space and, in particular, the prohibition of anti-satellite systems.

In that connection, my delegation shares the view of those who have expressed a wish to examine the question of anti-satellite systems in the context of other measures aimed at an over-all solution of the problem of preventing the spread of the arms race to outer space. That question is, moreover, taken into consideration in article 3 of the draft treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space as submitted by the Soviet Union and referred to in General Assembly resolution 36/99.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The Committee on Disarmament, taking into account the aforementioned recommendations of the General Assembly and the desire of the international community to create a reliable barrier to the transformation of outer space into an arena of the arms race, has included a new item on this question in the agenda of its 1982 session.

We have the impression that there is in the Committee broad understanding and agreement concerning the commencement, during the second part of the Committee's 1982 session, of concrete negotiations with a view to adopting effective measures aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space through the conclusion of an appropriate international treaty. The Mongolian delegation is in favour of an immediate start to such negotiations, and proposes the establishment of an ad hoc working group within the framework of the Committee. In that connection, I should like to recall that the group of socialist countries proposed the establishment of an ad hoc working group on this question in document CD/241.

We consider that the Committee could take a decision to establish the group, preferably before the completion of the work of the first part of the present session. In order to facilitate the speedy establishment of the ad hoc working group, the Mongolian delegation has submitted for the Committee's consideration working paper CD/272 containing draft terms of reference for the ad hoc working group, as follows:

"The Committee on Disarmament decides to establish, for the second half of its 1982 session, an ad hoc working group for the purposes of conducting negotiations on item 7 of the agenda, 'Prevention of an arms race in outer space' and agreeing on a text for a corresponding international treaty, taking into account all existing proposals and future initiatives in that respect.

The ad hoc working group shall submit a report on the progress of its work to the Committee on Disarmament before the completion of the second half of the Committee's 1982 session."

The draft treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space submitted by the Soviet Union, which could serve as a good basis for negotiations, is before the Committee.

We believe that in the continuing discussion of item 7 at informal meetings of the Committee, parties' positions are emerging. This may later facilitate preparations for the start of negotiations on this question at the Committee's summer session.

The Mongolian delegation is prepared to engage with interested delegations in consultations and exchanges of views on the elaboration of appropriate terms of reference for the ad hoc working group on the basis of document CD/272 with a view to reaching agreement on this urgent issue.

Mr. IJEWERE (Nigeria): Mr. Chairman, I was born on 9 April and I believe that good things always happen to me in April. One of the good things that I see happening this month is the fact that you are presiding over our deliberations at this crucial period. I am convinced that your well-known commitment to the cause of disarmament and that of the friendly country that you diligently represent, as well as your unassuming personality, will be an asset to this Committee as we prepare to round up the spring session in readiness for the first major event of the Second Disarmament Decade -- the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I pledge the full co-operation of my delegation in the accomplishment of your difficult task.

Your predecessor, Ambassador Mario Alessi, deserves our gratitude for the effective manner in which he steered the work of the Committee through the busy month of March. For one thing, my delegation will always remember the important developments that took place in the Committee under his chairmanship and the tireless efforts he made to start us on the way to meaningful discussions of the vital subject of a CTBT. Events may yet prove that, during his chairmanship, some important steps were taken in this regard.

My statement today will in the first instance be devoted to item 6 of the Committee's agenda, a comprehensive programme of disarmament. This agenda item no doubt deserves frank and honest assessment by all members of this Committee in view of the wide recognition of its significance as the "centrepiece" of the second special session. The fact that, at its current session, the Committee on Disarmament must complete the elaboration of the programme for adoption by the second special session reinforces the concern of my delegation about the present state of negotiations in the Ad Hoc Working Group and its modest achievement.

The considerable interest that my delegation has shown over the years in the comprehensive programme of disarmament is as old as the subject itself. Our position on the elements of the comprehensive programme was clearly stated in document CCD/555 of 24 February 1978, which was presented to the CCD and subsequently reviewed in statements and working papers that were later submitted to this Committee. My delegation has consistently been of the view that a comprehensive programme of disarmament is of foremost and urgent importance in the efforts towards general and complete disarmament. Basically, we believe in a global and all-embracing approach to bring about real disarmament and lasting peace and international security.

The Tenth Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament held in 1978 adopted by consensus the Programme of Action in the Final Document, which contains several important elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. Paragraph 109 of that consensus document requests this Committee to elaborate a comprehensive programme of disarmament:

"encompassing all measures thought to be advisable in order to ensure that the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control becomes a reality in a world in which international peace and security prevail and in which the new international economic order is strengthened and consolidated".

(Mr. Ijewere, Nigeria)

The declaration of the Second Disarmament Decade, which took the novel form of a strategy for disarmament in the 1980s and paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 36/92 F further justify and validate the significance and urgency attached to the completion of the programme at the current session of the Committee on Disarmament.

Since 1982 is the year of the first major event of the Second Disarmament Decade and the year when the second special session is expected to complete the blueprint -- a comprehensive programme of disarmament -- for global disarmament negotiations, our modest achievements and indeed the bitter fact that a completely bracket-free comprehensive programme still remains elusive as we approach this big event are a matter of regret to my delegation. In fact, the present position does not truly reflect how the forefathers conceived of the programme. The words of Alva Myrdal of Sweden, one of the early protagonists of the programme, are relevant here; she stated that:

"The history of disarmament should have been a series of positive, purposeful, effective steps towards the goal which is acclaimed by everybody. We are still waiting for a first decisive, or even a serious, step to be taken".

If the second special session is unable to agree on a consensus comprehensive programme of disarmament that combines specific measures into an integrated whole, the chances of mankind's survival until the year 2000 look uncertain.

Despite the considerable work done in the Ad Hoc Working Group since January 1982 under the skillful and able guidance of the disarmament stalwart, Ambassador Alfonso García Robles of Mexico, basic issues such as principles, objectives, stages of implementation and time-frames remain unresolved. This is also true for the measures, the nature of the programme, machinery, and procedures for implementation. The reason is not difficult to understand. The varying conceptual approaches and reticence on the part of some delegations to negotiate and give the necessary priority to specific measures to halt and reverse the arms race have been a major stumbling block. For those delegations, the well-thought-out package of co-ordinated measures, sequentially structured into four stages in document CD/223 submitted by the Group of 21, appear like a fairy tale in the world of an "unpredictable millinnum" in disarmament negotiations. Rather optimistically, such delegations opted for the so-called "Italian exercise", which sought to compile all measures and mechanically structure them into three "baskets" or phases of implementation without any clear-cut criteria. As was to be expected, the exercise has not provided the magic for success either, but, in spite of this frustrating situation, the interest of the Group of 21 in this important subject remains unshaken. The historical fact that the only clear chapter on "priorities" emerged under the able guidance of Ambassador de Souza e Silva of Brazil is proof of this continued interest.

A pertinent question at this juncture is: what is the fate of this document of hope for the overwhelming majority of the members of the Committee on Disarmament?

(Mr. Ijewere, Nigeria)

The increasing arms race, particularly in nuclear weapons, poses serious threats to the survival of mankind and my delegation continues to believe that disarmament negotiations could, in themselves, change the present situation through the reduction of mistrust and suspicion implicit in dialogue and negotiations. As a framework for sustained international action in the field of disarmament, the comprehensive programme of disarmament should contain "specific" measures that need be implemented within the shortest time possible to ensure that the goal of general and complete disarmament does not remain ever illusory in a world infested with striking advances in weapons technology. We also firmly believe that measures for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons should be strengthened to take account of the realities of the present world situation. For instance, the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa needs to be updated to reflect South Africa's nuclear capability and the increasingly intense collaboration between some Western Powers and the racist régime in South Africa in the development of its nuclear science and technology. My delegation sees any act of restraint in nuclear collaboration with apartheid South Africa as a significant contribution to the work of this Committee in the field of general and complete disarmament.

The close link between disarmament and development has also been consistently stressed by my delegation. It should by now be clear to us all that rising global expenditures on armaments have not only aggravated the problems of the developing countries in achieving an adequate level of economic and social development, but have also affected the current structural and economic crises facing some industrialized countries. It is obvious to my delegation that drastic reductions in these unproductive expenditures would provide enormous resources for the well-being of mankind.

Let me briefly comment on the questions of time-frames and the nature of the programme. The exchanges of views we have had so far in the Working Group and Contact Groups should by now dispel any doubts about the non-rigidity of time-frames. We are convinced that it is necessary, for the conduct of negotiations, to provide for a time limit by which negotiations on specific items are expected to be concluded. Such an indication would also be a sign of the commitment of States to the achievement of substantive progress in the field of disarmament. This is also true of the nature of the programme. My delegation sees the comprehensive programme as a once and for all agenda for negotiations leading to the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament. The programme should constitute an agreed framework for negotiations in the field of disarmament and elicit, from the outset, adequate political commitments by all States to the implementation of the programme. What therefore appears feasible and realistic for my delegation, in terms of binding obligations, is a solemn declaration by each country, at the highest political level, to ensure the adoption of the programme. This offers a possible alternative to the apparent lack of consensus in having a legally binding programme, which member States may sign and ratify at will, depending on the existing legislative processes in their different political systems.

At this stage of our work and given the time constraints, I believe that some reflection or soul-searching would now be appropriate to ascertain whether all

(Mr. Ijewere, Nigeria)

possibilities for compromise with a view to a clean programme have been explored in this Committee. Far from it. The will to negotiate is not forthcoming, if not totally non-existent, on the part of certain delegations. To those delegations, the many imponderables that affect disarmament negotiations, namely, the complexity of some measures for negotiation, verification and compliance and the international situation, especially the political relationship between the Superpowers, are necessary conditions for progress. Perhaps such an assessment offers a lop-sided justification for maintaining the status quo, but, for my delegation, a self-contained document like the comprehensive programme of disarmament, if implemented within the possible twenty-year time-frame originally proposed by my delegation, would considerably change the present trend of the arms race. Such an eventuality would also lend credibility to the determination of the Member States of the United Nations to live by the obligations they assume in declaring decades for the achievement of disarmament.

Time is short, but a genuine change of heart is still possible and my delegation will continue to offer its modest contribution.

Permit me now to comment briefly on item 4 of the Committee's annual agenda: Chemical Weapons.

My delegation would like to join other delegations which have expressed their pleasure at seeing Ambassador Sujka of Poland chairing the Working Group on Chemical Weapons. We are sure that, under his able chairmanship, the Group will make the necessary progress, as it did under the energetic chairmanships of Ambassadors Okawa of Japan and Lidgard of Sweden.

Chemical weapons are weapons of mass destruction and their terrible impact is next only to that of nuclear weapons. My delegation would therefore like to see this system of weapons banned for all time. Negotiations on a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons have been going on far too long and my country, a State Party to the Biological Weapons Convention, finds the present lack of progress on a CW convention unacceptable, since the close link between a BW convention and CW convention has been clearly spelt out in article 9 of the BW Convention. Those States which assumed obligations and were trusting enough to sign the BW Convention are still anxiously awaiting the military significant States to negotiate in good faith and to proceed to negotiations on the text of a CW convention.

After three years of negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament, the perennial question of verification has yet again been brought up to explain why progress should necessarily be slow in negotiating a CW convention. As far back as May 1978, Adrian Fisher, the United States representative to the CCD, stated that:

"The issues involved in complete and effective prohibition of chemical weapons are extremely complex. The political and technical issues involved are directly linked and thus must be dealt with at the same time. The development of an adequately verifiable disarmament measure which is designed to eliminate an entire class of weapons from the arsenals of

(Mr. Ijewere, Nigeria)

States and which also affects one of the major industries in many countries is a task which requires great care".

At this session, Ambassador Fields of the United States has again stressed the importance of verification and has even expressed a lack of confidence in the Soviet Union. My delegation stresses the importance of effective verification measures in any disarmament negotiations. However, we would merely like to state here that "100 per cent verification" is impossible and hence there must be an element of confidence among States. Consequently, a combination of international and national means of verification would be the most ideal for a CW convention. We note with regret that some western and socialist States continue to disagree on the proportions in which such means should be mixed. However, the working papers presented at this session and the Canadian paper contained in document CD/167 continue to form a good basis for negotiations.

My delegation would like to stress that we do not favour the conversion of chemical weapon facilities for "peaceful purposes", even if economically profitable, for this would only increase verification problems. My delegation does place importance on the destruction of chemical weapons and their means of production and we are therefore willing to study measures whereby means of production can be converted for destruction of stockpiles of chemical weapons. We believe that 10 years is a suitable time-frame for the destruction of CW agents and weapons systems after the treaty enters into force.

My delegation cannot support the use of chemical weapons under any circumstances and we are therefore disturbed to hear allegations of use in this Committee. Needless to say, the racist régime in South Africa has used chemical weapons. My delegation agrees with the view expressed by Ambassador Lidgard at our plenary meeting on 30 March 1982, namely, that the United States decision to build up its chemical weapons arsenal is more likely to lead to further escalation of the chemical weapons arms race than to the alleged purpose of promoting a chemical weapons convention.

The already irrational race in the nuclear field should have demonstrated to both parties that there can be no winners in a CW race. Confidence-building measures are urgently required and my delegation urges both parties to adopt such measures, since they can lead to the reduction of suspicions and thereby facilitate the conclusion of a CW convention.

It has been stated that disarmament is seldom fashionable. This is true. But certainly my delegation and the non-governmental organizations currently meeting in Geneva believe that it is a worthwhile cause. As we approach Easter, I merely wish to associate myself with the following view expressed by the British Council of Churches in 1972:

"We believe it our duty to pursue disarmament not just as a means to enhance security, or to effect economies, but as a clear Christian obligation, by which we mean that to use the human and material resources of God's creation to prepare for destruction is contrary to God's will for the human family".

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Nigeria for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Yugoslavia, Mr. Mihajlovic.

Mr. MIHAJLOVIC (Yugoslavia): Mr. Chairman, let me at the outset congratulate you on assuming the chairmanship for this month and assure you of the full co-operation of my delegation. I am sure that with your skill and patience you will succeed in carrying out your difficult task. I would also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Alessi, for the efficient job he did as our Chairman for last month. My delegation was particularly pleased to co-operate with him as the representative of a neighbourly and friendly country.

In the very brief period before the beginning of the second special session devoted to disarmament and the even briefer one left until the adjournment of the first part of the Committee's current session, the question arises as to what record the Committee on Disarmament will take with it to the second special session.

The Committee should answer this question in its special report on the state of negotiations on the various questions under consideration, in accordance with United Nations General Assembly resolution 36/92 F, which has requested it to do so. However, since it is very difficult to conclude from the draft report before the Committee what the state of negotiations on the various questions under consideration is, it will be up to each delegation to draw its own conclusions.

The Committee has probably never before been involved to such an extent in a series of formal and even more informal meetings and contact groups as it has been since the beginning of this year. All this activity is, as has been emphasized many a time, the result of the importance of the second special session.

The particular contribution to the second special session that the General Assembly has requested of the Committee is the comprehensive programme of disarmament, on whose elaboration the Ad Hoc Working Group has been working for two years already. We can freely say that the results achieved by the Ad Hoc Working Group on a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament would not have been possible without the outstanding involvement and high dedication to the cause of disarmament of its Chairman, the distinguished representative of Mexico, Ambassador García Robles.

The Ad Hoc Working Group has, unfortunately, not been able to reach agreement on some important parts of the comprehensive programme, particularly on its most important part, disarmament measures, which has mostly been kept between parentheses. The negotiators' differences of opinion with regard to the implementation of the programme according to stages and within established time-frames still exist. Agreement has also not been reached on the nature of the programme, which remains to be settled at the second special session. It is therefore necessary to decide on the basis for seeking solutions at the second special session.

It seems to us that the solutions should be sought bearing in mind the following elements. The comprehensive programme of disarmament must be conceived in such a manner that the taking of agreed measures would be conducive to the final objective:

(Mr. Mihajlovic, Yugoslavia)

general and complete disarmament under strict international control. It must be that which lies at the very core of its name: a comprehensive programme of disarmament. In order to be able to be this, the comprehensive programme of disarmament should provide for appropriate stages and appropriate time-frames for implementation, which should be broadly conceived and indicative in nature. Finally, it should be both a plan for the conduct of negotiations and a plan for the implementation of agreed measures, for it is obvious that an agreement on particular measures can be reached only through a process of multilateral negotiations.

The comprehensive programme of disarmament would not be needed if its role were merely to identify and make a list of measures, without at the same time prescribing definite dynamic action to carry them out according to established procedure and priorities. There are plenty of United Nations resolutions to this effect. We consider that the measures included in the programme should be specific enough not to leave any doubt that the countries which are invited to negotiate on them in due course should also be responsible for their implementation.

We cannot accept the notion that it is unrealistic to include even indicative time-frames for the initiation or conclusion of specific negotiations on measures because of unpredictable future international developments. Instead of adopting such a pessimistic and negative approach, it would be much better to make conscientious and determined disarmament efforts, which would surely help to make future international trends more predictable.

We agree that periodic reviews are very important in order to give impetus to the implementation of the programme and to make all the necessary adjustments in respect of stages and time-frames. These should be carried out on the basis of the then existing international atmosphere rather than on the basis of international developments predicted far in advance. This is, in our opinion, a more realistic approach.

By its character and content, the comprehensive programme of disarmament must necessarily differ to a considerable extent from existing documents, such as the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament or the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. This is the only way the second special session can create a basis for genuine progress in the field of disarmament.

The Committee will, unfortunately, not come before the second special session with any other result. Nevertheless, this time we shall not speak about the work of the other Working Groups which will continue after the second special session. It is perhaps possible that some of them may achieve greater success before the end of this year's session of the Committee on Disarmament than has been the case so far.

We would also like to mention that the Committee has not yet succeeded in establishing a subsidiary body on the nuclear test ban. The drafting group of eight member countries appointed by the Committee to formulate its mandate has so far been negotiating without success. The reason for this is, in our opinion, that some countries still maintain a very restrictive position with regard to the recognized priority of the nuclear test ban and to the multilateral negotiating character of the Committee on Disarmament. We hope, however, that these efforts will soon be crowned with success so that the Committee may at long last begin its consideration of this priority agenda item.

(Mr. Mihajlovic, Yugoslavia)

In this connection, it should be recalled that some new and earlier expressed doctrines and theories have been heard during the first part of the Committee's work this year. The most recent phase of the accelerated nuclear arms race and the opening of a new one in relation to the production of new chemical weapons are being justified by the need to achieve a military balance that has been disturbed. However, the establishment of this balance is always sought at an increasingly higher level or is being disturbed at such a level. Theory and practice, which aim to present the development of new weapons and the arms race as a nucle as an imperative of national defence interests and a way of seeking military balance, in reality represent an attempt to justify the arms race. Lasting and stable peace and international security can be achieved only through the halting of the arms race and the lowering of the level of armament by way of disarmament. In this process, the aim is to achieve undiminished security for all States at the lowest possible level of armament and military forces. Theory and practice, which presuppose an arithmetical balance of all types of weapons, instead of a general and approximate parity of force, which should be the basis for practical disarmament measures, are nothing more than a way of further intensifying the arms race.

The new theory, which has come as a complete surprise since it concerns a priority issue in the Committee's work that all of its members have adopted by consensus, refers to the statement that the nuclear test ban has become a long-term objective and that it will be possible and acceptable only after a significant reduction in nuclear armaments has been achieved.

What is particularly disturbing in this connection is that a long-standing recognized priority on the list of measures geared towards disarmament, for which solemn pledges were made within the framework of the partial test-ban Treaty and the NPT, now finds itself at the bottom of the list. This measure ought to have, among other things, contributed to the halting of the nuclear arms race, the strengthening of the régime of nuclear non-proliferation and the universality of the NPT.

The second special session devoted to disarmament will also consider, within the framework of the review of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations adopted at the first special session, the machinery for disarmament negotiations. We would, at this time, like to make a few preliminary observations on the possible improvement of the work of the Committee on Disarmament.

We consider, first of all, that negotiating within working groups has proven to be the most appropriate method of multilateral negotiation and that it should be maintained and perfected. To that end, if there are real prospects that an intensification of negotiations will lead to specific results, the Committee's working groups should not adjourn their work during the regular sessions of the General Assembly. This means that the Committee should be accorded more time to conduct negotiations. On the one hand, this requires delegations to organize themselves in such a way as to allow negotiations to be conducted simultaneously in several working groups. On the other hand, the Committee should be more rational in establishing its agenda. The Committee should create working groups for negotiation on all the priority disarmament issues and should, respectively, negotiate only those issues which concern either arms

(Mr. Mihajlovic, Yugoslavia)

limitations or disarmament. All other broader disarmament questions, such as confidence-building measures, the elaboration of different programmes of disarmament and so on, should, in our view, be relegated to the United Nations Disarmament Commission and to the working groups it would establish for that purpose.

We also think that there is room for the further democratization of the Committee's work; this would create even more favourable conditions for active participation by non-member States in the work of the Committee and its subsidiary bodies.

Greater involvement by the Committee in negotiations would make it necessary to alter existing practice, which has it that the Committee on Disarmament and the United Nations Disarmament Commission cannot meet concurrently.

In our opinion, the number of plenary meetings of the Committee should be kept to a reasonable minimum so that all the remaining time can be used for negotiations within working groups.

With a view to ensuring the greatest possible efficiency and saving time during consideration of organizational and procedural matters, the Committee should, instead of half-year and one-year programmes of work, have longer programmes of, let us say, two years, accompanied, of course, by all the necessary flexibility, should a different need arise.

As the single multilateral negotiating body, the Committee would take on even greater importance if the separate negotiations of particular members of the Committee on certain disarmament issues were transferred to it and conducted within a special sub-group that would be set up by the Committee's working group dealing with such issues.

Last but not least, we think that consideration should be given to the most effective way of preventing the Committee's work from being blocked on procedural or organizational matters. In our opinion, it might be necessary to consider the possibility of amending the existing Rules of Procedure for that purpose.

The Committee on Disarmament, as the single multilateral negotiating body which includes the 35 non-nuclear-weapon States and the five nuclear-weapon States, is the best forum for the conduct of disarmament negotiations. Let us hope that the Committee will not again fail this year to respond to the overwhelming desire of the Member States of the United Nations for the achievement of some results.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Mr. Mihajlovic for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Egypt, His Excellency Ambassador El Reedy.

Mr. EL REEDY (Egypt) (translated from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, at the outset allow me to express our pleasure at seeing you preside over the meetings of the Committee on Disarmament during this decisive and crucial month in its work. The sun of the renaissance in Asia rose in your country, which, throughout its modern history, has passed through both glorious and severe experiences. From all this emerged the modern Japanese personality, which plays a vital role in the international community's search for peace and fulfilment. In following your activities in this Committee, we have become convinced that, thanks to your diplomatic ability, professional talent and extreme modesty, no one can represent the Japanese personality better than you.

I would also like to express our deep appreciation to Ambassador Alessi of Italy, who guided the work of our Committee last month with wisdom and the greatest skill.

May we extend a warm welcome to Ambassador van Dongen of the Netherlands and Ambassador Vejvoda of Czechoslovakia, who with their past experience will undoubtedly enrich our work. We join previous speakers in expressing to our friend and colleague, Ambassador Malitza of Romania, our best wishes for full success in his new and important assignment.

In the past few days in our Committee, as we have been preparing our report to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, it is only rational that we should have focused our attention on the results of our work. This report is of particular significance in the light of the growing threats to peace and security in various regions of the world. Furthermore, world public opinion has become increasingly aware of the dangerous situation inherent in the continued stockpiling of arms of mass destruction and the elaboration of new programmes for the further accumulation of such arms. As a result, people have become more and more aware and fearful of the consequences. All this takes place at a time when it is becoming increasingly difficult for the third world countries to sustain respectable living standards, one of the basic reasons for this being the arms race and lack of progress in the field of disarmament and arms limitations.

It is only normal that, at its second special session devoted to disarmament, the General Assembly should undertake to assess everything that has been accomplished in the field of disarmament since the first special session and the adoption of the Final Document.

We consider that we have to play an important role in assisting the General Assembly in carrying out this evaluation. We realize that the members of our Committee may hold different views on the matter, but such divergences should not prevent us from performing this task. It could even be useful and healthy for the special report we shall submit to reflect the dialogue in which different views were expressed on the assessment of our Committee's work and the reasons which have so far impeded any achievement.

(Mr. El Reedy, Egypt)

For our part, we consider that the responsibility for failure to achieve any real progress in the field of disarmament during this period and the years preceding it falls entirely upon the shoulders of the nuclear States. The countries of the third world have spared no efforts and still strive to promote disarmament, but they remain unable to bring about any change in the political will and action of the major Powers. They continue to be the victims of the continued arms race and of the prevailing policies and doctrines which entail the possible use of arms of mass destruction as a viable option.

In the course of more than three years, the Committee on Disarmament has remained unable to carry out any negotiations on the most serious matter entrusted to it, namely, nuclear disarmament issues. All this, despite the pressing reality and increasing pressure by the world community and the dozens of resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in this respect.

Because we feared that our Committee would start and end its spring session without any tangible results, we suggested at the beginning of this session that it should use the time available to it to make some modest achievements which we could report to the General Assembly.

Now we have reached the final days in the work of our Committee without having done so. Nevertheless, we still believe that it behoves us to use the remaining few days in an attempt to make some progress even if it should be continued in New York prior to the second special session.

In this connection, I would like to emphasize the following points.

Our success in elaborating a draft comprehensive programme of disarmament is of special and additional importance since it will provide world public opinion with proof that there is a serious commitment to work, on the basis of a unified approach, for the creation of a world free from the permanent threat of a war in which arms of mass destruction could be used and in which we could achieve general and complete disarmament.

We therefore take note with appreciation of the efforts made by the Ad Hoc Working Group on a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament under the chairmanship of Ambassador García Robles to arrive at a draft text. We pay a tribute to this Group for the success achieved in agreeing on a unified text of the chapter on priorities. We note with satisfaction its attempts to reconcile views and positions on the chapters dealing with objectives and principles. In this regard, a special word of tribute is also conveyed to Ambassador de Souza e Silva of Brazil, Ambassador de La Gorce of France and Ambassador Herder of the German Democratic Republic.

We express the hope that, through further constructive dialogue, the efforts of the Group concerning the crux of the programme -- namely the chapter on measures -- will be crowned with success.

It remains for us to invite delegations to show the same flexibility as the Group of 21 with regard to the nature of the programme and the time-frames for its implementation. We should all agree that the real value of this programme lies in the commitment to implement it within reasonable and flexible time-frames.

(Mr. El Reedy, Egypt)

We believe that we are entitled to feel cautiously optimistic about the limited success achieved in the Committee's consideration of the topic of a nuclear test ban, for, at present, serious negotiations are being held to define the mandate of a working group to deal with this item. We are indeed grateful to Mr. Alessi, the outgoing Chairman, for his initiative in starting these negotiations.

We share the opinion that the question of verification of compliance is crucial to the conclusion of a convention on a comprehensive and final nuclear test ban. We nevertheless hold the view that, even if this aspect enjoys a degree of priority in our negotiations, it is not an end in itself, but, rather, an integral part of other elements aimed at reaching the ultimate goal, the conclusion of a convention on a comprehensive test ban. Consequently, the definition of the mandate of the working group must be in keeping with the general objective contained in the Final Document of the first special session and in conformity with the numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the matter. This is an objective on which the hopes of world public opinion are pinned. Agreeing on it would be an achievement by our Committee and will testify to the seriousness of our endeavours, so that we can, at the next session of the Committee on Disarmament through the working group on whose mandate we hope to agree during this part of our session, pursue our efforts towards this goal.

We also believe that the question of effective international arrangements to assure the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is one of the urgent topics in respect of which a number of steps should be taken at the forthcoming special session. If it is not feasible here to achieve progress on this issue, it might be possible to pave the way for the second special session to formulate a categorical guarantee by the nuclear Powers not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. We can think of more than one formula to confer a binding character on such commitments and to widen their scope and increase their effectiveness in order to give a stronger sense of security to the non-nuclear-weapon States, the majority of which are non-aligned or neutral States that have officially renounced the nuclear weapon option and submitted their nuclear facilities to international safeguards.

I also believe that it is still possible to agree on the principle of setting up an ad hoc working group on the prevention of an arms race in outer space so that the working group can begin its activities during the next part of our session.

These are some of the matters we deemed it useful to raise in a last attempt at achieving some progress in our work here.

However, the essential truth remains that, as far as the continuation of the arms race and the failure to curb it and to achieve disarmament are concerned, the present situation is one which the world can no longer tolerate. The nuclear Powers and particularly the two Superpowers are the ones basically responsible for this. During the next special session devoted to disarmament, the General Assembly should examine the serious consequences of the continuation of such a situation.

We can see that all the peoples of the world, whether in the North or in the South, in the East or in the West, are determined to refuse to live under the spectre of nuclear war. They are resolved to control the arms race and reverse its course. The second special session is duty bound to deal with this fact.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Ambassador El Reedy for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of the United Kingdom, His Excellency Ambassador Summerhayes.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): It is a great pleasure to welcome you to the Chair this month and to express my delegation's thanks to Mr. Mario Alessi, your predecessor during the month of March. My intervention this morning will be brief. It is on a matter which is a cause of grave concern not only to my country, but to the international community as a whole, and which has a direct bearing on the climate in which we conduct our work.

I wish to draw attention to the serious situation which has arisen as a result of the invasion and occupation of the Falkland Islands by Argentina. This flagrant and illegal use of force and the failure of Argentina to withdraw in defiance of a mandatory Security Council resolution runs counter to all the principles which guide our work in this Committee and constitutes a grave setback to the cause of arms control and disarmament. We call on the Argentine Government to withdraw its forces immediately in accordance with the mandatory resolution of the Security Council, resolution 502.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Ambassador Summerhayes for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to Minister Tian Jin of China.

Mr. TIAN JIN (China) (translated from Chinese): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on the content of the special report. The Chinese delegation is grateful to the Secretariat for the efforts it has made to draft the outline of a special report to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The international community is concerned with the work of the Committee on Disarmament, which functions as the single multilateral negotiating body on disarmament. The special report of the Committee on Disarmament will become one of the major documents of the second special session, as well as one of the important reference documents for the preparation of other documents at the second special session. We therefore believe that the special report should reflect not only the situation at the current session and the activities carried out by the Committee on Disarmament since its establishment, but also concisely describe where progress has and has not been made and why, so as to acquaint all Member States of the United Nations with the work done by the Committee on Disarmament.

Proceeding from these considerations, we think that the report should mainly reflect in a brief way the views and differing opinions of the various sides on major items, as well as on the situation of disarmament. Organizational and other routine matters should be described as briefly as possible and lists of documents might be annexed to the report, thus making it clear-cut, short and convenient for all Member States of the United Nations to read and study.

Mr. NOIRFALISSE (Belgium): Mr. Chairman, I will, with your permission, leave it to Ambassador Onkelinx to congratulate you on your assumption of the chairmanship of our Committee and to thank your predecessor, Ambassador Alessi.

As the representative of the country currently holding the presidency of the Council of Ministers of the European Communities, I would like to inform the Committee on Disarmament of the position adopted on 2 April 1982 by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Ten with regard to the Falkland Islands case, to which the Ambassador of the United Kingdom has just referred.

The text of the statement by the Ten reads as follows:

"The Foreign Ministers of the Ten condemn the armed intervention in the Falkland Islands by the Government of Argentina, in defiance of the statement issued on 4 April by the President of the Security Council of the United Nations, which remains seized of the question.

They urgently appeal to the Government of Argentina to withdraw its forces immediately and to adhere to the appeal of the United Nations Security Council to refrain from the use of force and to continue the search for a diplomatic solution."

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Mr. Noirfalisse for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

At the opening of this meeting, I read out the names of those speakers who had put their names on the list for today. Since then, a number of other delegations have approached the Secretariat, or the Chair, to have their names included. For today, I have taken these names down. I feel, however, that it might be appropriate in the future that delegations which wish to speak, in addition to those whose names the Chair has announced at the outset, should perhaps raise their hands when I enquire if there are any other speakers. I think that has mainly been the practice of this Committee in the past and feel that this might help to prevent possible confusion and misunderstanding. I now give the floor to the representative of the Netherlands, His Excellency Ambassador van Dongen.

Mr. van DONGEN (Netherlands): With your permission Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer to the issue raised by my distinguished colleague from the United Kingdom. The Netherlands position on this issue is clear and unambiguous. The Netherlands Foreign Minister was one of the signatories of the joint declaration just read out by the distinguished representative of Belgium, the country holding the presidency of the European Communities. That declaration leaves no room for doubt about our full agreement with Security Council resolution 502. There has undoubtedly been a breach of international law and the principles of the United Nations Charter, which we are committed to live by. The Netherlands has consistently and invariably held that the use of force in international relations, wherever and whenever it may occur, must be condemned. It will therefore come as no surprise that, as the representative of the country that has the honour to have been chosen as the seat of the International Court of Justice, I can but repeat what we very deeply believe in, namely, that the rule of law must be upheld. We therefore have no hesitation in supporting the position formulated in Ambassador Summerhayes' statement.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Ambassador van Dongen for his statement. The representative of Argentina has asked for the floor to speak in exercise of his right of reply. In the meanwhile, I have received applications for the floor. I have received requests for inclusion in the list of speakers from the delegations of France, Italy, Peru, Venezuela, Brazil and the United States of America. So I respectfully wish to ask Ambassador Carasales when he would like to take the floor in exercise of his right of reply? I give the floor to Ambassador Carasales.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, the conduct of the Argentine delegation over the years since this Committee's establishment shows that it has never brought up matters that are not within the Committee's specific jurisdiction and, on this occasion, it was certainly not the Argentine delegation which provoked this debate. As on other occasions, other delegations have considered it appropriate to refer in this Committee to matters which are foreign to it. Although the Argentine delegation finds this regrettable, it is certainly not about to shrink from consideration of this subject if members wish to discuss it in this forum.

How history changes! The representative of a country which imposed itself by force on four continents, subjugating peoples and territories to satisfy its insatiable appetite for new colonies, is now complaining today because a country which was unjustifiably attacked five times in its history by that great Power has dared to recover one of those colonies and restore it to the territorial heritage to which it belongs and from which it was seized by force in 1833.

The situation in the South Atlantic was not provoked by the Argentine Republic. Civilians who were working peacefully in South Georgia, with valid documentation and with the knowledge of the United Kingdom, and carrying out a commercial operation planned more than one year ago were given an ultimatum to withdraw immediately. A warship was sent to the area with Royal Marines on board to expel them by force; nuclear submarines were dispatched to the area; in the British Parliament, the Government stated that no means, no means, would be spared to ensure that its position prevailed. Should Argentina submit neckly to this new show of force? That policy of force has been a constant tradition with regard to my country.

We were attacked in 1806, 1807, 1833, 1840 and 1848. The Malvinas were occupied by force and the Argentine administration and population were expelled in 1833; an act of aggression was committed in 1833 and has continued ever since, day in, day out, because the occupation of a foreign territory by force is an act of aggression, because that territory is Argentine territory and has always been Argentine territory and no country can invade its own territory. The recovery operation which took place in the Malvinas was one of a very special nature. No act of force is carried out without bloodshed -- the shedding of foreign blood, I should say. Not one drop of British blood was spilt, although there were Argentine dead and wounded, but the fact that no British blood was spilt was not a coincidence, the result of circumstances or because they were British, they were invulnerable. It was because there was a special order that every effort should be made not to harm anyone at all, even the occupying armed forces. You can imagine how much self-restraint the Argentine soldiers had to show when they saw their comrades fall and yet they still endeavoured successfully, not to spill a single drop of British blood in the recovery of our territory. The people of the Argentine Republic have nothing against the Government and the people of Britain. On the contrary, they would like to have the best relations with them, but this will never be possible while any part of Argentine territory is occupied by people who took it from us by force. I repeat once again that it is Argentine territory, and it is not only the Argentine Republic which says that it is.

(Mr. Carasales, Argentina)

The non-aligned movement, which has been in the forefront of all decolonization efforts, has also considered this question. I could recall many of the movement's declarations, but it is enough to quote only two or three. The Declaration of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries in Lima stated that the non-aligned countries, "without prejudice to ratifying the validity of the principle of self-determination as a general principle for other territories, strongly support in the special and particular case of the Malvinas Islands, the just claim of the Argentine Republic and urge the United Kingdom actively to continue the negotiations recommended by the United Nations in order to restore the said territory to Argentine sovereignty and thus put an end to that illegal situation", I repeat "to that illegal situation, which still persists in the southern part of the American continent". The Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Sri Lanka in 1976, expressly stated that: "In the special and particular case of the Malvinas (Falkland Islands), the Conference firmly supported the just claim of the Argentine Republic and urged the United Kingdom actively to pursue the negotiations recommended by the United Nations for the purpose of restoring that territory to Argentine sovereignty, thus ending that illegal situation that still prevails in the extreme southern part of the American continent" and the movement's resolutions continue in the same vein, the most recent being the one adopted when the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of non-aligned countries attended the latest General Assembly of the United Nations and it was stated that the meeting firmly reiterated its support for the right of the Argentine Republic to obtain the restoration of the Falkland Islands and exercise its territorial sovereignty over them.

The Argentine Republic has negotiated the problem unsuccessfully for over 15 years and it has spent more than 130 years trying in vain to settle the dispute, with no reply from the United Kingdom. The Argentine Republic is still ready to negotiate, however, as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Argentine Republic recently stated: "The Argentine Republic is not threatening anyone, the Argentine Republic is not engaged in hostilities against anyone, we are not interested in an armed confrontation with anyone and we are ready to negotiate diplomatically all the problems we have with the United Kingdom, except sovereignty, because that is not negotiable".

That is and continues to be my country's position and, in this context, we see the threat of very serious conflicts. Today Her Majesty's fleet is sailing south, as it did 150 years ago, ready once again to attack the Argentine Republic 10,000 kilometres from its bases, in yet another attempt to impose the colonial yoke on a part of Argentine territory, to seek to retain by force one of the last remnants of its Empire, and this is not the first time it has tried to do so in recent decades. In short, it is going to try to repeat its "exploit" of 1833. I can assure you that, this time, it is not going to find it so easy.

Mr. de BEAUSSE (France) (translated from French): Mr. de La Gorce will undoubtedly want to congratulate you himself on your assumption of the chairmanship and to thank the distinguished representative of Italy for the way in which he performed the duties of Chairman during the month of March.

(Mr. de Beausse, France)

France condemned Argentina's military aggression against the Falkland Islands archipelago from the outset. It did so in the Security Council and when it participated in the drafting of the statement which the distinguished representative of Belgium has just read out to the Committee. France considers that this armed attack constitutes a clear violation of the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations, which forbids the threat or use of force in international relations. Such a violation cannot but undermine the climate of confidence between States which must be maintained if the work of our Committee is to run smoothly. That is why my delegation endorses the appeal made by the United Kingdom delegation to the Argentine Government requesting it fully to implement the resolution adopted on this matter by the Security Council.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Mr. de Beausse for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

I give the floor to Ambassador Alessi of Italy.

Mr. ALESSI (Italy) (translated from French): I would first like to repeat my delegation's congratulations and sincerest wishes, which I had the pleasure of extending to you when I handed the chairmanship over to you. Having listened to the statements made by the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom and subsequent speakers, I would like to recall that my Government, which deplored the intervention by Argentina's armed forces in the Falkland Islands and renewed the appeal to negotiate made by the Security Council of the United Nations, fully shares the position of the ten member countries of the European Economic Community just stated by the distinguished representative of Belgium. My Government's attitude reflects an assessment of the situation which, while taking into account the traditional ties of friendship that link the Italian and Argentine peoples, cannot ignore the principles of international legality or concerns about the consequences which a serious deterioration in relations between the United Kingdom and Argentina might have for peace and stability in the world and, therefore, for the cause of disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Italy, Ambassador Alessi, for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

Mr. BENAVIDES de la SOTTA (Peru) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, the head of my delegation will shortly inform you of the satisfaction which its members feel at seeing you in charge of the work of our Committee.

Permit me now to make a short statement concerning a matter that was brought up unexpectedly and at the last minute in this meeting.

My delegation has always maintained, as a matter of principle, that our Committee should in no case be used to raise matters of particular political interest that have nothing to do with its functions, but, rather, tend to reduce its effectiveness as the single multilateral forum for disarmament negotiations.

(Mr. Benavides de la Sotta, Peru)

It is also on principle that my delegation has opposed attempts artificially to involve the Committee in matters which are extraneous to its purpose and which, while they may be legitimate in other precincts, can, in this Committee, only provoke -- as we have just seen -- unnecessary polemics that cannot but cause consternation among delegations which, like my own, maintain normal and friendly relations with the parties directly concerned in the affair in question, an affair whose prompt solution, by peaceful means, is deserving of the most intensive and disinterested efforts of the entire international community. We are opposed to the settlement of international disputes through the use or the threat of force.

My Government issued an official statement on this matter a few days ago, but we do not believe that it is either necessary or fitting to repeat it in the Committee. For that reason, we regret that other delegations should have considered it appropriate to take such action with regard to their own statements.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to thank Mr. Benavides for his statement and also for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. AGUILAR PARDO (Venezuela) (translated from Spanish): Firstly, Sir, permit me to congratulate you on behalf of our delegation on your assumption of the chairmanship of the Committee on Disarmament.

Our delegation has always been opposed to the discussion in this or any other forum of matters that are not within its competence. However, the statements made in this forum compel our delegation to read out the text of the statement issued by the Venezuelan Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 2 April of this year, and I quote:

"The Venezuelan Ministry of Foreign Affairs is following with the greatest interest the development of the situation in the Malvinas and is in permanent contact with the Venezuelan diplomatic missions which are able to provide the most accurate information.

The Venezuelan position as regards the attainment of peace and the struggle against the vestiges of colonialism is known to all. It is to be noted that serious efforts must be made to ensure the peaceful resolution of situations of historical injustice inherited from previous generations, since intransigence or indifference may lead to a dangerous exacerbation of feelings and situations that no one wants.

It is not appropriate at this time to adopt definite positions or to pronounce value judgments until more extensive and precise information on all the circumstances is available. In keeping with its tradition, Venezuela naturally regrets any occurrence that may lead to bloodshed and hopes that the problem will ultimately be peacefully and fairly solved. At the same time, it earnestly hopes that calm and a spirit of understanding will prevail so that there will be no aggravation of the situation".

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to thank the representative of Venezuela for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

Mr. de SCUZA e SILVA (Brazil): Mr. Chairman, some of the statements we have heard this morning prompt my delegation to make the following statement:

The historical background of the Brazilian position with regard to the question of the Malvinas Islands dates back to 1833, when the Government of Brazil gave an affirmative answer to the appeal made by the Argentine Government about British action in the archipelago. In his reply to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Argentina, the Brazilian Minister for Foreign Affairs stated that it would give instructions to the Brazilian representative in London to render assistance to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina in his representations to the British Government and to exert his good offices to the extent possible.

Last Tuesday, 6 April, in Brasilia, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Brazil summoned the Ambassadors of the Argentine Republic and of the United Kingdom and handed each of them an identical diplomatic note, in which Brazil, inspired by the steadfast friendship that unites it to both nations, formulates a forceful appeal to both Governments to make every effort to achieve a peaceful settlement of the dispute and expresses the confidence of the Brazilian Government that the two countries will find a solution to the question dividing them, in accordance with the best interests of their peoples and of peace.

Mr. BUSBY (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, having listened to the statements of other speakers on this particular subject, I would like to make a brief statement. The United States Government is firmly on record as deploring the use of force to resolve international disputes. That is a firm and continuing view held by my Government and it is certainly applicable in this situation. The United States voted for and strongly supports the Security Council resolution which was adopted last Saturday and demands an immediate cessation of hostilities and an immediate withdrawal of Argentine forces from the Falkland Islands and calls upon the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to resolve their differences through the achievement of a diplomatic solution. As is well known, the United States has offered its good offices to both parties in an attempt to reach a peaceful settlement of the dispute. As some delegations may be aware, Secretary of State Haig, at the invitation of both Governments, is visiting London and Buenos Aires. The United States has stated in various bodies, including this Committee, its firm view that progress in arms control and disarmament negotiations cannot be made in an atmosphere of international tension. We have also stated on repeated occasions our view that Article 24 of the United Nations Charter requires all States to build the international confidence necessary for achievement of the goals we all seek. The unfortunate situation which exists today regarding the Falkland Islands underscores this fact. We are hopeful that a peaceful solution will be found and I can pledge the full support of my Government to that end.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I will reserve my comments on your assumption of the Chairmanship for another occasion.

The views expressed by the delegation of Argentina make it doubly important for my delegation to speak in support of the statement made earlier by the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom. As one of the co-authors, my country also fully

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic of Germany)

identifies with the declaration of the Foreign Ministers of the ten countries of the European Community, as just read out by the distinguished representative of Belgium. In the decision it took on 7 April, the Cabinet of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, presided over by Chancellor Schmidt, again condemned the invasion of the Falkland Islands by Argentina and has characterized it as a flagrant violation of Argentina's obligation under international law to settle international disputes peacefully and to renounce the use of force in relations between States. The Cabinet confirmed the fact that the Federal Republic of Germany, jointly with its European partners, will continue to give strong support to the United Kingdom, a friend and ally, in its endeavours to reach a peaceful settlement of the conflict. In addition, the Cabinet decided to suspend all arms deliveries to a country which continues to commit an act of aggression and a violation of international law and refuses to align itself with the mandatory resolution of the United Nations Security Council. My delegation fervently hopes that efforts at negotiations will lead to a peaceful settlement and will undo the attack and abuse of international law, which we deplore.

Mr. DON NANJIRA (Kenya): Mr. Chairman, my delegation would first of all like to welcome you to the chairmanship of this Committee for the month of April. I also extend our appreciation and gratitude to Ambassador Alessi of Italy for the excellent leadership and guidance he gave the Committee last month.

The discussion we are having on the question of the Falkland Islands is an unforeseen development and I have no instructions on it at this time. But as the representative of a country whose President is the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, I wish to restate the well-known and consistent policy of my Government and, indeed, of all the countries of Africa, on the question of international peace and security and the settlement of international disputes, namely, that the use of force should be avoided in the settlement of disputes among all States. In this regard, we would strongly urge the two parties to this dispute to resolve their differences by peaceful means. We hope that peaceful means will be resorted to and that a mutually acceptable settlement will soon be reached by the two Governments.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Mr. Don Nanjira for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Cuba.

Mr. SCLA VILA (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, you explained that, following the closure of the list of speakers, a number of delegations put down their names to speak, but that was a natural consequence of the fact that a matter was raised in our Committee which does not fall within its mandate and which surprised many of the delegations here.

Our delegation has always spoken out against the idea that the Committee should devote itself to questions outside its terms of reference since that is a way of diverting attention from our work and of attempting to link a supposed international situation with disarmament efforts.

With regard to the situation in the Malvinas, the movement of non-aligned countries has consistently supported Argentina's right to exercise sovereignty over that part of its territory. We are struck by the fact that this question has been raised at a time when it is not just in the Southern Atlantic, as a result of action by Argentina or by the United Kingdom, that the international situation is tense, but that no account has been taken -- and we could bring this point up ourselves at the next session -- of the South African régime's continuing acts of aggression against the population of Angola, the situation created by Israel's annexation of the Golan Heights, the situation in which the Palestinians now find themselves in Gaza and the West Bank, the situation in

(Mr. Sola Vila, Cuba)

the Caribbean, concerning which the veto was recently used in the Security Council to block a call for peace and negotiations-- and yet matters are raised that are alien to our Committee. Our delegation is opposed to these positions and we reserve the right, should such situations continue, to bring before the Committee matters which are foreign to our Committee and also represent threats to international peace and security.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, permit me to reserve the expression of our satisfaction at seeing you in the Chair for when we deal with one of the items on the Committee's agenda.

My delegation's position concerning the Committee's functions is well-known. We stated it in 1980 and in 1981 and it is not to deal now with a situation that we deeply regret and that is, in geographical terms, taking place in the western hemisphere that we are going to change it.

For those who may be interested, the position of the Government of Mexico concerning the question of the Malvinas was stated in considerable detail by the Secretary for Foreign Affairs the day before yesterday in a Press release; it is thus public and well-known. Permit me to say only that, in keeping with our position of principle, emphasis was placed in that statement on the Mexican Government's belief that all States must make every possible effort to settle their disputes by the peaceful means made available to them by the Charter of the United Nations and that they must do so with the aim of reaching a solution within a reasonable period of time.

Mr. SADLEIR (Australia): Mr. Chairman, I intervene in view of the present discussion concerning the Falkland Islands and, in particular, in the light of the statement made by the distinguished representative of Argentina. I have listened to and considered most carefully what the distinguished representative had to say and feel that I should make some comment on that although I do not intend to say much, as very little needs to be said. There is nothing in that statement that justifies, or could possibly justify, the act of naked and unprovoked aggression in which the State which he represents has for some days now been engaged. To the extent that there was an attempt at justification, it seemed to be that we should all be acting not on the principles of the 1980s-- the principles on which we base our work in this Committee-- but on those of an earlier and darker age, namely, the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Australia condemns in the strongest possible terms the invasion and occupation of the Falkland Islands. It is an act which cares nothing for the principle of self-determination and the wishes of a small and isolated population without the means to defend itself. It is an act of contempt for Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the United Nations Charter, which condemn coercion and the use of force as a means of settling international disputes. It is an act that defies the basis of mandatory resolutions of the Security Council. It is an act that consigns to cynicism the principles, indeed the very reason of being, of this Committee.

There has been, from several speakers, the argument that matters extraneous to the work of this Committee and to its mandate should not be raised. How should we define matters which are directly related to the work of the Committee? Last year, mention was made in this Committee-- and most of us strongly condemned the attack-- of the nuclear facilities of one State by another. Neither State was a member of the Committee. The situation now before us-- as on that occasion-- threatens not only international peace and stability, but the climate in which we are to negotiate arms control and disarmament. Since the parties to the dispute over the Falkland Islands are both members of the Committee on Disarmament, the relevance, I should have thought,

(Mr. Sadleir, Australia)

was painfully obvious. The situation which one State has created by its own single-handed efforts is a most dangerous one. In that light, I call upon the Argentine Government to reflect most carefully on the consequences of its actions and, while there is still time, to withdraw at once its armed forces from the territory that it so wantonly occupied.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): I would like to reaffirm the support of India for the consistent position of the non-aligned movement that the Malvinas, otherwise known as the Falkland Islands, should be restored to Argentine sovereignty. My delegation expresses the sincere hope that, even at this stage, further conflict and clash of arms can be avoided. We trust that better counsel will prevail and that a peaceful diplomatic solution can be found for this issue.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief because it is not my wish to prolong discussions extraneous to this Committee. I should simply like to say two things: on the one hand, there have been repeated invocations of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations-- which my delegation values and esteems-- but I cannot fail to point out that it is strange that those principles should be invoked to prolong indefinitely a colonial situation that has been an affront to the deepest feelings of the Argentine people for more than 150 years. And this will be the consequence of the invocation of such principles, an invocation whose only purpose is to safeguard or defend the United Kingdom in its present situation in one of its last colonial redoubts. The argument of self-determination has also been invoked. I have already read out what the movement of non-aligned countries, which is unquestionably the most ardent defender of this principle in the international community, thinks of the invocation of this principle. To give this right to colonists who were brought in by the occupying Power and who replaced the original population is a solution that would have extraordinary repercussions in the present circumstances.

As I recalled a moment ago, the Argentine Republic has, through the person of its Foreign Minister, manifested its complete willingness to negotiate and it is, and always has been, the objective of my country to find for this question a peaceful solution having as its only consequence the restitution of my country's sovereignty over this part of its territory. And that is what my country has been doing for 150 years. We cannot be accused of having lacked patience. The countries of the NATO alliance that now advocate the course of negotiation are the ones which, when, in 1965, the United Nations adopted its first resolution urging the parties to negotiate their dispute, put up the most stubborn opposition to the conduct of any form of negotiation. Perhaps if they had at that time subscribed to the desire of the great majority of the Members of the United Nations and urged the parties to negotiate this dispute, taking into account the interests and not the wishes of the Islands' inhabitants, the United Kingdom would have displayed a different attitude during the negotiations that we have been conducting for the past 15 years without making the slightest progress on the substantive issue. That is all, Sir.

Mr. SKINNER (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I regret taking the floor at this late hour, but I feel obliged to add the name of Canada to those countries which have condemned, in the strongest possible terms, this unconscionable act of aggression by Argentina in the southern Atlantic. We are unaware of any resolution by the non-aligned movement in any part of the world which has ever supported this kind of act of aggression. That being said, we regard this act as a violation of the United Nations Charter, as well as in defiance of the appropriate Security Council resolution. We have, in company with a number of other countries, withdrawn our Ambassador. I would also like to say that we are still hopeful that there is a possibility for a peaceful settlement to this-- and the word that I have written down here is "dispute" -- but it should probably be a different word.

Mr. SUTRESNA (Indonesia): Mr. Chairman, I, too, apologize for taking the floor at this late hour, but I think that it is my duty to convey my delegation's feeling of regret at the turn of events in the Committee this morning. Frankly, my delegation has been taken by surprise by the matter which is under discussion and is now developing in the Committee. Indonesia's position on decolonization is well-known and I do not think it is appropriate to repeat and to restate it here in this forum. However, permit me to convey the appeal of Indonesia to both parties to the dispute, with which Indonesia has enjoyed, and continues to enjoy, excellent relations, that those parties to the dispute, should do their best to refrain from any action which might further deteriorate relations between them. It is with this appeal that we, the Indonesian delegation here, wish to express the hope that those countries will do their best to achieve a peaceful solution to the problem.

Mr. MAHALLATI (Iran): I would like to apologize to the Committee for taking its time at this late hour and to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on your assumption of the chairmanship. You have already shown your competence and ability in presiding over us in this forum. I would also like to express my congratulations and gratitude to your predecessor, Ambassador Alessi, for his fruitful chairmanship during the month of March.

If this Committee is a proper forum to discuss the question of one country's use of force against another, then, I believe the matter of the brutal invasion of my country by the Iraqi régime which has resulted in the occupation of the territory of the Islamic Republic of Iran and has caused tremendous economic and human loss on both sides, has priority for consideration in this Committee. Regarding the question of the Falkland Islands, I would like to state that my delegation has always condemned any act of colonization.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Ambassador Mahallati for his statement and also for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. Are there any other delegations who would wish to take the floor at this stage? Since that does not seem to be the case, I thank you for your contributions. I have counted 29 speakers this morning and that is quite a record number of speakers for this Committee.

I wish to recall, for the benefit of those representatives who were not here at the beginning of this meeting, that I stated there would be no plenary meeting on Tuesday, 13 April. There will instead be an informal meeting of the Committee at 10 a.m. to consider item 7 of the agenda and Working Paper No. 62 on new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. That meeting will be followed by a meeting of a drafting group—an open-ended drafting group that will consider the draft of the special report to the second special session.

The next plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 15 April at 10 a.m. I have one announcement to make, at the request of the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Negative Security Assurances. The Working Group on Negative Security Assurances will hold an informal meeting at 3 p.m. this afternoon in Conference Room V.

Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan): Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to state that the meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group will be a formal meeting, not an informal one.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to correct myself: the meeting to be held at 3 p.m. in Conference Room V this afternoon will be a formal meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Negative Security Assurances which will have interpretation and full services.

The plenary meeting stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.