

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

APPENDIX IV

VOLUME I

Index of Statements by Country and Subject
and Verbatim Records of the Committee on Disarmament
in 1979

Chronological		Alphabetical	
PV	Country/Speaker	Country/Speaker	PV
<u>I. Organization and Procedures</u>			
1	Algeria	Algeria	1
2	Mexico	Argentina	5,15,19
	France	Australia	2,49
	Sri Lanka	Belgium	3,19
	Australia	Bulgaria	11,18
	Sweden	Burma	8
	USSR	Canada	4,23
	United Kingdom	Cuba	4
		Czechoslovakia	7,20,25
3	Yugoslavia	Egypt	5
	Italy	Ethiopia	5,8
	Pakistan	France	2
	Venezuela	German Democratic Republic	6,16,19,36,49
	Belgium	Germany, Federal Republic of	5
		Hungary	9,17,49
4	Cuba	India	9,49
	Canada	Indonesia	6
	United States	Iran	6,45
	Japan	Italy	3,29
	Romania	Japan	4
	Nigeria	Kenya	6
		Mexico	2,26,28,30,35
5	Poland	Mongolia	12,39
	Egypt	Morocco	7
	Ethiopia	Netherlands	6,8,16,42
	Argentina	Nigeria	4,17,31
	Germany, Federal Republic of	Pakistan	3,17
6	German Democratic Republic	Poland	5
	Netherlands	Romania	4,23,30
	Zaire	Sri Lanka	2,46,49
	Kenya	Sweden	2
	Iran	USSR	2,8,15,17, 19,32,43, 49
	Indonesia	United Kingdom	2,15,49
7	Czechoslovakia	United States	4,15,35,43
	Morocco	Venezuela	3
8	Burma	Yugoslavia	3
	USSR	Zaire	6
	Netherlands		
	Ethiopia		
9	India		
	Hungary		
11	Bulgaria		
12	Mongolia		

Chronological		Alphabetical	
PV	Country/Speaker	Country/Speaker	PV
I. <u>Organization and Procedures</u> (Cont'd)			
15	USSR Argentina United States United Kingdom		
16	German Democratic Republic Netherlands		
17	USSR Pakistan Hungary Nigeria		
18	Bulgaria		
19	Argentina USSR German Democratic Republic Belgium		
20	Czechoslovakia		
23	Canada Romania		
25	Czechoslovakia		
26	Mexico		
28	Mexico		
29	Italy		
30	Mexico Romania		
31	Nigeria		
32	USSR		
35	Mexico United States		
36	German Democratic Republic		
39	Mongolia		
42	USSR Netherlands		
43	United States		
45	Iran		
46	Sri Lanka		
49	German Democratic Republic USSR Australia Hungary India United Kingdom Sri Lanka		

Chronological		Alphabetical	
PV	Country/Speaker	Country/Speaker	PV
II. <u>Nuclear Test Ban</u>			
2	Mexico Australia Sweden United Kingdom	Argentina Australia Belgium Bulgaria Burma Canada Czechoslovakia Egypt Ethiopia France German Democratic Republic Germany, Federal Republic of Hungary India Iran Italy Japan Kenya Mexico Mongolia Morocco Netherlands Nigeria Pakistan Poland Romania Sri Lanka Sweden USSR United Kingdom United States	5 2, 47, 49 19 34 8 4, 47 20, 25, 47 5, 48 5 52 6 5, 16 9, 17 9, 47, 49 6, 45 3, 18 4, 16 6 2, 34 34 7 6, 16, 46 4, 17, 26, 39 3, 17, 47 5 23, 37 47, 49 2, 16, 36, 46 33, 49 2, 46 4, 33
3	Italy Pakistan		
4	Canada Nigeria United States Japan		
5	Poland Argentina Germany, Federal Republic of Egypt Ethiopia		
6	German Democratic Republic Kenya Iran Netherlands		
7	Morocco		
8	Burma		
9	Hungary India		
16	Sweden Japan Netherlands Germany, Federal Republic of		
17	Pakistan Hungary Nigeria		
18	Italy		
19	Belgium		
20	Czechoslovakia		
23	Romania		
25	Czechoslovakia		
26	Nigeria		
33	United States USSR		
34	Mexico Mongolia Bulgaria		

Chronological		Alphabetical	
PV	Country/Speaker	Country/Speaker	PV
II. <u>Nuclear Test Ban</u> (Cont'd)			
36	Sweden		
37	Romania		
39	Nigeria		
45	Iran		
46	Netherlands Sweden United Kingdom		
47	Australia Pakistan India Czechoslovakia Sri Lanka Canada		
48	Egypt		
49	USSR Australia India Sri Lanka		
52	France		

Chronological		Alphabetical	
PV	Country/Speaker	Country/Speaker	PV
<u>III. Cessation of the Nuclear Arms Race and Nuclear Disarmament</u>			
1	Algeria	Algeria	1,28
2	Mexico	Australia	2, 28, 39
	Australia	Belgium	3
	USSR	Bulgaria	11,18,34
	Sweden	Burma	8
	United Kingdom	Canada	4,39
	France	Cuba	5,8,28
		Czechoslovakia	6,18,25
3	Italy	Egypt	5,37,40
	Venezuela	Ethiopia	5,38
	Yugoslavia	France	2,28,52
	Belgium	German Democratic Republic	6,8,36,39,41,49
	Pakistan	Germany, Federal Republic of	5,33,39
4	Canada	Hungary	9,17,36
	United States	India	9,24,39,49
	Japan	Indonesia	6
	Romania	Iran	6,45
	Nigeria	Italy	3
5	Cuba	Japan	4,16,39
	Poland	Kenya	6,34
	Egypt	Mexico	2,28,33
	Germany, Federal Republic of	Mongolia	12,33,34,39,44
	Ethiopia	Morocco	7
6	German Democratic Republic	Netherlands	6,46,28
	Netherlands	Nigeria	4,26,39
	Kenya	Pakistan	3,17
	Iran	Poland	5,8,28,33
	Indonesia	Romania	4,23,28,37
	Czechoslovakia	Sri Lanka	49
7	Morocco	Sweden	2,16,33,36
		USSR	2,8,17,25,36,38,41,49
8	USSR	United Kingdom	2,33,28,39
	Poland	United States	4,23,33,46,28
	German Democratic Republic	Venezuela	3
	Cuba	Yugoslavia	3
	Burma		
9	India		
	Hungary		
11	Bulgaria		
12	Mongolia		
16	Sweden		
	Japan		

Chronological		Alphabetical	
PV	Country/Speaker	Country/Speaker	PV
III. <u>Cessation of the Nuclear Arms Race</u> <u>and Nuclear Disarmament (Cont'd)</u>			
17	Pakistan Hungary USSR		
18	Bulgaria		
20	Czechoslovakia		
23	Romania United States		
24	India		
25	Czechoslovakia USSR		
26	Nigeria		
28	Mexico Australia France Algeria United States Netherlands Poland Romania Cuba USSR		
33	United States USSR Germany, Federal Republic of United Kingdom Poland Mexico Mongolia Sweden		
34	Mongolia Bulgaria Kenya		
36	Hungary USSR Sweden German Democratic Republic		
37	Egypt Romania		
38	Ethiopia USSR		

Chronological		Alphabetical	
PV	Country/Speaker	Country/Speaker	PV
III. <u>Cessation of the Nuclear Arms Race</u> <u>and Nuclear Disarmament (Cont'd)</u>			
39	German Democratic Republic United Kingdom Canada Australia Mongolia Japan Nigeria Germany, Federal Republic of India		
40	Egypt		
41	German Democratic Republic USSR		
42	Mongolia		
45	Iran		
46	Netherlands United Kingdom		
49	German Democratic Republic USSR India Sri Lanka		
52	France		

Chronological		Alphabetical	
PV	Country/Speaker	Country/Speaker	PV
<u>IV. Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons</u>			
2	United Kingdom	Algeria	37
3	Pakistan	Argentina	37
4	Canada	Belgium	36
	Nigeria	Bulgaria	37
5	Cuba	Burma	8
	Poland	Canada	4,39
	German, Federal Republic of	Cuba	5
6	German Democratic Republic	Czechoslovakia	25,36
	Iran	Egypt	37
7	Morocco	Ethiopia	38
8	Burma	France	37,52
9	India	German Democratic Republic	6,36,49
	Hungary	German, Federal Republic of	5,37
12	Mongolia	Hungary	9,36,49
17	Pakistan	India	9,39,49
23	Romania	Iran	6,45
25	Czechoslovakia	Mexico	37
34	Mongolia	Mongolia	12,34,44
36	Hungary	Morocco	7
	USSR	Netherlands	36
	Sweden	Nigeria	14
	Belgium	Pakistan	3,17,37
	Netherlands	Poland	5,37,49
	Czechoslovakia	Romania	23,37
	German Democratic Republic	Sweden	36
37	Egypt	USSR	36,49
	Venezuela	United Kingdom	2,37
	Algeria	United States	37
	Pakistan	Venezuela	37
	Romania	Yugoslavia	37
	Poland	Zaire	37
	United States		
	United Kingdom		
	Argentina		
	France		
	Germany, Federal Republic of		
	Zaire		
	Yugoslavia		
	Mexico		
	Bulgaria		

Chronological		Alphabetical	
PV	Country/Speaker	Country/Speaker	PV
	<u>IV. Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons (Cont'd)</u>		
38	Ethiopia		
39	India Canada		
44	Mongolia		
45	Iran		
49	German Democratic Republic Poland USSR Hungary India		
52	France		

Chronological		Alphabetical	
PV	Country/Speaker	Country/Speaker	PV
<u>V. Chemical Weapons</u>			
2	Mexico Australia Sweden USSR United Kingdom	Australia Belgium Brazil Bulgaria Burma Canada Czechoslovakia Denmark */ Egypt Ethiopia Finland */ France German Democratic Republic Germany, Federal Republic of Hungary India Iran Italy Japan Kenya Mexico Mongolia Morocco Netherlands Nigeria Poland Romania Spain */ Sri Lanka Sweden USSR	2,31,44 19 26,32 31 8,29,45 23,45 25,44 44 5,31 5 43 43,47,52 6 5,29,42 9,31 9,24,31,39,49 6,45 3,9,29,47 4,22,31,47 6,29 2,31 44 7 6,8,30,49,52 4,31 29,43,49 30 42 46 2,29,36,46 2,31,32,33 44,46,49
3	Italy	United Kingdom	2,29
4	United States Japan Nigeria	United States Venezuela	4,31,33,43 29
5	Egypt Ethiopia Germany, Federal Republic of	Zaire	31
6	Netherlands Kenya German Democratic Republic Iran		
7	Morocco		
8	Burma Netherlands		
9	Italy Hungary India		
19	Belgium		
22	Japan		
23	Canada		
24	India		
25	Czechoslovakia		
26	Brazil		
29	Venezuela Poland Germany, Federal Republic of Italy Sweden United Kingdom Kenya Burma		
30	Romania Netherlands		

*/ Non-member States of the Committee on Disarmament.

Chronological		Alphabetical	
PV	Country/Speaker	Country/Speaker	PV
V. <u>Chemical Weapons</u> (Cont'd)			
31	Hungary Australia Egypt Nigeria United States USSR Bulgaria Zaire Japan Mexico India		
32	USSR Brazil		
33	USA USSR		
36	Sweden		
39	India		
42	Germany, Federal Republic of Spain */		
43	Poland France Finland */ United States		
44	Mongolia USSR Czechoslovakia Denmark */ Australia		
45	Iran Burma Canada		
46	USSR Sweden Sri Lanka		
47	Japan Italy France		
49	USSR Poland Netherlands India		
52	Netherlands		
52	France		

*/ Non-member States of the Committee on Disarmament.

Chronological		Alphabetical	
PV	Country/Speaker	Country/Speaker	PV
	<u>VI. New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons</u>		
2	USSR United Kingdom	Australia	41
3	Yugoslavia Italy	Bulgaria	11,45
4	Cuba Romania United States	Burma	8
5	Poland	Canada	42
6	Kenya	Cuba	4,41
7	Morocco	Egypt	40
8	Burma	France	40
9	Hungary	German Democratic Republic	41
11	Bulgaria	Germany, Federal Republic of	41
12	Mongolia	Hungary	9,40
32	USSR	India	49
33	United States USSR	Iran	45
34	Mongolia Kenya	Italy	3,42
40	France Poland Hungary Egypt USSR United States	Kenya	6,34
41	German Democratic Republic Cuba Germany, Federal Republic of USSR Australia	Mongolia	12,34,44
42	Canada Italy	Morocco	7
44	Mongolia	Poland	5,40,49
45	Bulgaria Iran	Romania	4
46	Sri Lanka	Sri Lanka	46,49
49	Poland USSR India Sri Lanka	USSR	2,32,33,40
		United Kingdom	41,49
		United States	2
		Yugoslavia	4,33,40
			3

Chronological		Alphabetical	
PV	Country/Speaker	Country/Speaker	PV
	<u>VII. Consideration of other areas dealing with the Cessation of the Arms Race and Disarmament and Other Relevant Measures</u>		
	<u>1. Outer Space</u>		
22	Italy	Italy	22
	<u>2. Demilitarization of the Sea-Bed</u>		
2	Sweden	Sweden	2
5	Poland	Poland	5
	<u>3. Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace</u>		
6	Indonesia	Indonesia	3
	<u>4. B.W. Convention</u>		
2	United Kingdom	Australia	31
4	Romania	Burma	45
31	Australia	Denmark	44
	Nigeria	Mongolia	44
44	Denmark	Nigeria	31
	Mongolia	Romania	4
	USSR	USSR	44
45	Burma	United Kingdom	2
	<u>5. Convention on Environmental Warfare (ENMOD)</u>		
	<u>6. Conventional Disarmament</u>		
2	Mexico	Australia	2
	France	Belgium	3
	Australia	Egypt	5
	United Kingdom	France	2
	Sweden	Germany, Federal Republic of	5
3	Yugoslavia	Iran	45
	Italy	Italy	3
	Belgium	Mexico	2
4	United States	Morocco	7
		Sweden	2
5	Germany, Federal Republic of	United States	4
	Egypt	Yugoslavia	3
6	Zaire	Zaire	6
	Kenya		
7	Morocco		
45	Iran		

Chronological		Alphabetical	
PV	Country/Speaker	Country/Speaker	PV
<u>VII. Consideration of other areas dealing with the Cessation of the Arms Race and Disarmament and Other Relevant Measures (Cont'd)</u>			
<u>7. Regional Disarmament</u>			
<u>(a) General</u>			
2	France Sweden	Belgium France Germany, Federal Republic of Kenya Romania Sweden	3,19 2 5 6 4 2
5	Germany, Federal Republic of		
6	Kenya		
19	Belgium		
<u>(b) European Security and Reduction of forces in Europe</u>			
2	Sweden USSR	Germany, Federal Republic of Italy Pakistan Romania Sweden USSR	5 3 17 4 2 2,49
3	Yugoslavia Italy	United States Yugoslavia	4 3
4	United States Romania		
5	Germany, Federal Republic of		
17	Pakistan		
37	Romania		
49	USSR		
<u>8. Arms Trade and Transfers</u>			
2	United Kingdom	Germany, Federal Republic of Iran Italy Kenya Poland United Kingdom United States Venezuela	5 45 3 6 5 2 4 3
3	Venezuela Italy		
4	United States		
5	Poland Germany, Federal Republic of		
6	Kenya		
45	Iran		
<u>9. Reduction of Military Budgets</u>			
2	Sweden United Kingdom	Iran Morocco Pakistan Poland Romania Sweden United Kingdom United States	45 7 3 5 4 2 2 4
3	Pakistan		
4	United States		
5	Poland Romania		
7	Morocco		
45	Iran		

Chronological		Alphabetical	
PV	Country/Speaker	Country/Speaker	PV
<u>VII. Consideration of other areas dealing with the Cessation of the Arms Race and Disarmament and Other Relevant Measures (Cont'd)</u>			
<u>10. Disarmament and Development</u>			
2	France Sweden	Ethiopia Egypt	5 5
3	Venezuela	France Kenya	2 6
4	Romania United States Nigeria	Indonesia Iran Morocco	6 6 7
5	Poland Egypt Ethiopia	Nigeria Poland Romania Sweden	4 5 4 2
6	Zaire Kenya Iran Indonesia	United States Venezuela Zaire	4 3 6
7	Morocco		
<u>11. Disarmament Decade</u>			
2	Mexico	Egypt	5
5	Egypt	Mexico	2
<u>12. Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament</u>			
2	Mexico	Egypt	5
4	Romania	Italy	29
5	Egypt	Mexico	2
26	Nigeria	Nigeria	26
29	Italy	Romania	4
<u>13. General and Complete Disarmament</u>			
2	Mexico France Australia Sweden USSR United Kingdom	Australia Belgium Burma Bulgaria Canada Cuba	2 3,19 8 11 4 4
3	Yugoslavia Italy Pakistan Venezuela Belgium	Czechoslovakia Ethiopia Egypt France	7,25 5 5 2
4	Cuba Canada Romania Nigeria	German Democratic Republic Germany, Federal Republic of Hungary	6 5 9
5	Poland Egypt Ethiopia Germany, Federal Republic of	Indonesia Italy Kenya Mexico Mongolia Morocco Nigeria Pakistan Poland Romania	6 3 6 2 12 7 4 3 5 4

Chronological		Alphabetical	
PV	Country/Speaker	Country/Speaker	PV
<u>VII. Consideration of other areas dealing with the Cessation of the Arms Race and Disarmament and Other Relevant Measures (Cont'd)</u>			
<u>13. General and Complete Disarmament (Cont'd)</u>			
6	German Democratic Republic Zaire Kenya Indonesia	Sweden USSR United Kingdom Yugoslavia Zaire	2 2 2 3 6
7	Czechoslovakia Morocco		
8	Burma		
9	Hungary		
11	Buglaria		
12	Mongolia		
19	Belgium		
25	Czechoslovakia		
<u>14. Special Session of the General Assembly</u>			
<u>(a) Final Document of the First Special Session (including paragraph 125)</u>			
1	Algeria	Algeria	1
2	Mexico Sri Lanka Sweden	Argentina Belgium Burma Cuba	5 3 8 4
3	Yugoslavia Italy Pakistan Venezuela Belgium	Czechoslovakia German Democratic Republic India Indonesia Iran	7 49 49 6 45
4	Romania Cuba Nigeria	Italy Kenya Mexico	3 6 2
5	Poland Argentina	Mongolia Morocco Netherlands	12 7 6
6	Netherlands Kenya Indonesia	Nigeria Pakistan Poland	4 3 5,49
7	Czechoslovakia Morocco	Romania Sri Lanka Sweden	4,23,30,37 2,49 2
8	Burma	Venezuela	3
23	Romania		
30	Romania		
37	Romania		
45	Iran		

Chronological		Alphabetical	
PV	Country/Speaker	Country/Speaker	PV
	<u>VII. Consideration of other areas dealing with the Cessation of the Arms Race and Disarmament and Other Relevant Measures (Cont'd)</u>		
	<u>14. Special Session of the General Assembly</u>		
	(a) <u>Final Document of the First Special Session (including paragraph 125)</u>		
49	German Democratic Republic Poland India Sri Lanka		

CD/PV.1
24 January 1979
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIRST MEETING
held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva
on Wednesday, 24 January 1979 at 11 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. M.A. BOUTEFLIKA

(Algeria)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria:

Mr. M.A. BOUTEFLIKH
Mr. R. BOUDJAKDJI
Mr. A. BENKALI
Mr. A. FASLA
Mr. A. BENSMAIL
Mr. N. KERROUM

Argentina:

Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS
Mr. F. JIMENEZ DÁVILA
Mr. A.N. MOLteni

Australia:

Mr. A. SHARP PEACOCK
Mr. L.D. THOMSON
Mr. A.J. BEHM
Ms. M.S. WICKES

Belgium:

Mr. H. SIMONET
Mr. J.A.R. SCHOUMAKER
Mr. P. NOTERDAEME
Mr. P. BERG
Mr. G. VAN DUYSE

Brazil:

Mr. G.A. MACIEL
Mr. L.P. LINDENBERG SETTE
Mr. A. CELSO DE OURO PRETO
Mr. C.A. SIMAS MAGALHAES

Bulgaria:

Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. I. PETROV
Mr. I. SOTIROFF

Burma:

U SAW HLAING
U THEIN AUNG
U THAUNG HTUN

Canada

Mr. R. HARRY JAY
Mr. J.T. SIMARD
Mr. G.A.H. PEARSON

Cuba:

Mr. P. TORRAS
Mr. L. SOLA VILA
Mr. F. ORTIZ RODRIGUEZ
Mrs. V. BROWDOSKY JACKIEWICH
Mr. C. PAZOS BECEIRO
Mr. R. VALIENTE
Mr. R. LOPEZ GARCIA

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. M. RŮŽEK
Mr. V. TYLMER
Mr. J. JIRŮŠEK

Egypt:

Mr. O. EL-SHAFEI
Mr. F. EL IBRASHI
Mr. M. EL-BARADEI

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. TERREFE
Mr. G. ALULA

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. S. KAHN
Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. G. PFEIFFER
Mr. H. SCHNEPPEN
..
Mr. J. PÖHLMANN
Mr. H. MÜLLER

Hungary:

Mr. M. DOMOKOS
Mr. C. GYORFFY
Mr. A. LAKATOS

France:

Mr. J. FRANCOIS-PONCET
Mr. P-C. TAITTINGER
Mr. F. DE LA GORCE
Mr. Y. PAIGNIES
Mr. J. RIGAUD
Mr. J. BLOT
Mr. J-L. GERGORIN
Mr. F. BEAUCHATAUD
Mr. M.S. HESSEL
Mr. J. FEVRE
Mr. L. DELAMARE
Mr. BRESSOT

India:

Mr. C.R. GHAREKHAN
Mr. S.T. DEVARE
Mr. S. SOBHWAL

Indonesia:

Mr. A. SANI
Mr. A. KAMIL
Mr. M. SIDIK
Mr. I. DAMANIK

Iran:

Mr. M. FARTASH
Mr. D. CHILATY
Mr. D. AMERI

Italy:

Mr. N. DI BERNARDQ.
Mr. F. FERRETTI
Mr. M. MORENO
Mr. C. FRATESCHI
Mr. G. VALDEVIT

Japan:

Mr. M. OGIOS
Mr. T. NONOYAMA
Mr. Y. KIKUCHI
Mr. T. IWANAMI
Mr. Y. NAKAMURA

Kenya:
Mr. K. MWAMZANDI
Mr. C. GATEIRE MAINA
Mr. G.N. MUIIU

Mexico:
Mr. A. GARCÍA ROBLES
Miss A. CABRERA
Miss L.M. GARCIA

Mongolia:
Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
Mr. L. BAYART

Morocco:
Mr. A. SKALLI
Mr. M. CHRAÏBI

Netherlands:
Mr. R. FEIN
Mr. A.J. MEERBURG

Nigeria:
Mr. O. ADENIJI
Mr. K. AHMED
Mr. T.O. OLUMOKO
Mr. B.C.M. IHEKUNA
Mr. R.A. FATUNASE

Pakistan:
Mr. J.K.A. MARKER
Mr. I.A. AKHUND
Mr. M. AKPAM

Peru:
Mr. A. DE SOFO
Mr. J. AURECH MOLTERO

Poland:
Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. H. PAĆ
Mr. S. KOFIK
Mr. M. KRUCZYK

Romania:
Mr. I. RADULESCU
Mr. C. ENF
Mr. G. TINCU

Sri Lanka:

Mr. A.C.S. HAMEED
Mr. I.B. FONSEKA
Miss M.L. NACANATHAN
Mr. R.P.E. JAYASINGHE
Mr. A.C.A.M. NUHUMAN

Sweden:

Mr. H. BLIX
Mrs. I. THORSSON
Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. L. NORBERG
Mr. J. PRAWITZ
Mr. J. LUNDIN

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. Yu. K. NAZARKIN
Mr. A.M. VAVILOV
Mr. E.D. ZAITSEV
Mr. V.A. VERTOGRAOV
Mr. Yu. V. KOSTENKO
Mr. M.G. ANTIUKHIN

United Kingdom:

Mr. N.H. MARSHALL
Mr. C.L.G. MALLABY
Mr. C.K. CURWEN
Mr. P.M.W. FRANCIS

United States of America:

Mr. A. FISHER
Mr. C. FLOWERREE
Mr. A. AKALOVSKY
Mr. R. HAGENGRUBER
Ms. B. MURRAY
Mr. M.L. SANCHES
Mr. A. YARIOLINSKY

Venezuela:

Mr. R.C. CASTILLO
Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT
Mr. H. ARTEAGA
Miss D. SZOKCLOCZI
Mrs. R. LISBOA DE NECER

Yugoslavia:

Mr. N. PESIC
Mr. M. VRIJUNEC
Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIĆ
Mr. D. DJOKIĆ

Zaire:

Mr. L.K. CHIRI MWAMI
Mr. B. BUKAYI
Mr. M. ESUK

Director-General of the
United Nations Office at Geneva:

Mr. L. COTTAFVI

Assistant Secretary-General
for Disarmament:

Mr. R. BJÖRNERSTEDT

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): In accordance with paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly and document AS/1024 containing the list of States members of the Committee on Disarmament, the responsibility of convening the Committee has fallen to Algeria. My country therefore has the honour to chair the first meeting of the Committee on Disarmament. The Algerian delegation is aware of the honour conferred on it and wishes to assure all members that it will spare no effort in contributing to the success of our deliberations and to advance the cause that we propose to defend together.

In view of the growing impatience of peoples who refuse to accept the idea that injustice and poverty are indissociable from man's destiny and that war is bound up with what has been called a biological necessity, we would like to believe that the signs which, while still faint, herald a gradual lifting of the restrictions which have always prevented each individual from playing his rightful role in what is a matter of concern to all, are truly the harbingers of a future in which mankind, drawing only on the liberating potential of science, will ultimately come to terms with itself. Today's dream will become the promise of tomorrow's reality as controversial, but innovative and constructive actions make their mark, since they tend to shatter the petrified concepts of the past.

It is in this context that the first special session ever devoted by the United Nations General Assembly to disarmament should be viewed, a session which constitutes an important turning point in the efforts of the international community to put an end to the arms race and to create a momentum which can set in motion a genuine process of disarmament. The participation of all States Members of the United Nations in this special session, the fact that many countries were represented at the highest level and the quality of the deliberations are evidence, if evidence is needed, of the importance of the tenth special session and of the awareness, on the part of all peoples, of the gravity of the danger threatening mankind and of the urgent need to eliminate it. The adoption by consensus, at the end of that special session, of a Final Document defining the principles which should guide future disarmament negotiations, setting out a programme of action, and establishing international machinery to deal with disarmament questions is clear proof that, because of the importance they attach to such questions, all

(The Chairman)

peoples have let it be known that they too are concerned and that they can be called on to make their contribution to the establishment of the foundations of lasting international peace and security.

The special session devoted to disarmament was convened as the Disarmament Decade was drawing to a close and almost 20 years after the adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of the historic resolution proclaiming general and complete disarmament as the ultimate goal; and we are forced to note that no real progress has been made in that direction and that mankind, witnessing an increasingly frenzied arms race, is still confronted by the threat of its own annihilation. Yet previously there had been no lack of meritorious efforts or praiseworthy initiatives. But, in a world made smaller by progress and in the presence of a danger the nature of which has been changed by the development and power of new weapons, the patterns and approaches had remained the same, being based on a conception of international relations characterized by mistrust which, over the centuries, has continually given rise to devastating conflicts.

It is to the credit of the movement of non-aligned countries that, since its establishment in 1961, it has worked tirelessly for the establishment of a new international order which takes account of the new realities of our world and meets the aspirations of peoples, and that it took the initiative in the convening of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament last June, at which an attempt was made to break away from earlier patterns and to evolve a new approach which would help set in motion a genuine process of disarmament. In this way, the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament were reaffirmed and international machinery was devised to deal with all aspects of disarmament problems and to operate effectively.

The machinery established provides for two types of body, one a deliberative body, namely, the Disarmament Commission, composed of all States Members of the United Nations, and the other a negotiating body -- the Committee on Disarmament, with limited membership. Today's opening of the work of the Committee on Disarmament, following the organizational session of the Disarmament Commission, marks the final stage in the establishment of this machinery, which assuredly represents the most satisfactory result of the tenth special session.

(The Chairman)

However, such machinery can play an important role only in so far as States demonstrate political will which, as emphasized in the Final Document of the tenth special session, remains the decisive factor for the implementation of genuine disarmament measures, and the Committee on Disarmament is precisely the forum in which such political will should be demonstrated and given effect. This is a measure of the immensity of the task before the members of this Committee who cannot hope to accomplish it except by pursuing further the new approach outlined at the tenth special session. In particular, it is of paramount importance that the consensus reached in June 1978 as a result of the spirit of compromise shown on all sides, should not be short-lived and that every State, resisting the temptation to revert to its original position, should continue to strive to understand the legitimate interests and needs of others and agree to take them into account. This is the prerequisite for the elaboration of a set of disarmament measures which is the task of such a difficult and complex nature to be tackled by our Committee in accordance with the Programme of Action and priorities defined in the Final Document of the tenth special session.

The disarmament venture, and in particular the task of our Committee, can be carried out successfully only with the participation of all, since the truth of the matter is that all countries are confronted equally with the same danger and that they all have an interest in eliminating it. As far as our Committee is concerned, the requirement of universal participation and the need for limited membership inherent in any negotiating body have been reconciled by means of equitable geographical representation, a rotating chairmanship system, and by affording States which are not members with the opportunity of contributing if they wish to do so. It is to be hoped that China, whose presence among us is essential for the implementation of any programme of general and complete disarmament, will soon take its rightful place here in our midst.

The Committee on Disarmament will live up to the hopes placed in it only if it succeeds in breaking away from earlier approaches. The lack of real progress in the field of disarmament was first attributed to the impracticability of achieving the goal of general and complete disarmament in the foreseeable future. But the adoption of a supposedly more realistic approach, based on attempts to reach partial agreements, did

(The Chairman)

not produce the results anticipated because the goal of general disarmament was lost sight of and efforts were concentrated on measures involving non-armament and the quantitative limitation of arms.

Each of us is, of course, convinced of the need to be realistic, but each of us is equally convinced that any partial disarmament agreement is bound to carry in it the ferment of other measures which go further towards attainment of the ultimate goal. Any partial agreement, the conclusion of which is considered to be a matter of priority, must be conceived and implemented as part of a general disarmament programme. Aware both of the vital need not to lose sight of the ultimate objective of general disarmament and of the urgent needs of the moment, the United Nations General Assembly has recommended that our Committee should undertake, on a priority basis, at its first session, negotiations concerning a treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and concerning a treaty or convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all types of chemical weapons and on their destruction. It also calls upon the Disarmament Commission, as the deliberative body, to give priority consideration, at its first session in May 1979, to the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament to be considered by our Committee as soon as possible.

The Committee on Disarmament, as the negotiating body, must also assume its full responsibility in formulating disarmament measures. It should embark on genuine negotiations with a view to bringing about the conclusion of agreements which would be the work of all, and should not allow itself to be confined to hasty consideration of drafts prepared elsewhere and to which it could at best make only minor changes. Bilateral or trilateral efforts must, of course, be encouraged; however, they cannot be a substitute for the deliberations of the Committee or deprive them of all substance. This is the only way of taking account of the interests and requirements of each party and of promoting the universal accession essential for the effective implementation of the agreements concluded.

While all States are concerned with the work of disarmament, the nuclear-weapon Powers, and above all those which possess the largest nuclear and conventional arsenals, have a special responsibility in that regard, and their obligations are proportionate to that responsibility. The non-nuclear-weapon States, and in particular the non-aligned countries which voluntarily remain outside the interplay of military alliances formed round the principal nuclear-weapon Powers, are, since they themselves

(The Chairman)

have refrained from acquiring nuclear weapons, entitled to make demands with regard to the establishment of an adequate system of guarantees of security and free access to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

In any event, the implementation of effective disarmament measures, and hence the very effectiveness of the action of our own Committee, depend on the political will of States, particularly that of the nuclear-weapon Powers, to promote a genuine disarmament policy. Once this political will exists, it will necessarily be exercised simultaneously in all spheres of international relations. Any significant progress in the field of disarmament will automatically be accompanied by an extension and deepening of détente, as well as by the structural changes essential in international economic relations. Such is the true significance that must be given to the close link now universally recognized to exist between disarmament, development and international security. In particular, the elimination of colonialism and racial segregation, the cessation of any policy of imperialist domination, the relaxation of tensions and settlement of local disputes are decisive factors in establishing a climate of confidence necessary for the formulation and implementation of effective disarmament measures.

The Committee on Disarmament has less than four years to work out such measures and at last embark upon a genuine process of disarmament. In 1982, the United Nations General Assembly will devote a second special session to disarmament, thereby expressing its conviction that, between now and then, a real and coherent political will will have made it possible to conclude agreements which, by virtue of their content and their scope, will finally bring the beginnings of a solution to one of the most serious problems confronting our world, thereby at last fulfilling the unanimous expectation of peoples.

In the delicate stage through which we are now passing, changes are proving both necessary and inevitable. We must believe that and facilitate their advent, since they carry in them the promise of the solution to problems on which the future of mankind depends. That means that the new spirit inspired by the tenth special session must be maintained if we do not wish to thwart this noble hope once again. It also implies the vital need to sustain the momentum thus created and to work constantly and tirelessly for the conclusion of genuine disarmament agreements. Lastly, it means the heavy responsibility of our Committee which is thus the ideal place in which mankind must demonstrate the lucidity and self-sacrifice necessary for its own survival.

Mr. COTTAFVI (Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva):
Distinguished delegates, I have the honour to read to you the message conveyed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the opening session of the Committee on Disarmament:

"I extend my warm greetings to the members of the Committee on Disarmament as you convene for your first meeting in Geneva today. Had the thirty-third General Assembly not been prolonged, I would have personally welcomed you as the occasion is one which may well open a new phase of the disarmament effort.

"The Committee on Disarmament is an indispensable instrument of the international disarmament strategy contemplated in the Final Document unanimously adopted at the tenth special session of the General Assembly. Based on a comprehensive approach which alone can be an adequate response to the challenge of the arms race, this strategy contemplates a careful balance and fruitful interaction between the deliberative forum and the negotiating body for achieving genuine disarmament under effective international control. Naturally, the task will devolve on this Committee to help translate into action the objectives defined by the General Assembly and the Disarmament Commission. Mindful of the vital, indeed the crucial, nature of this role, I felt gratified by the series of measures that were taken at the tenth special session to make the negotiating body more effective and less removed from the security concerns of the membership of the United Nations.

"The composition of the Committee ensures better representation to different regions and is designed to assimilate diverse viewpoints in the negotiating process. This can provide the basis for a solid consensus on substantive issues. In this respect, I welcome the participation of France in this Committee which, I have no doubt, will greatly benefit its work. It is my hope that, at the earliest possible time, all the five nuclear-weapon States and permanent members of the Security Council will be represented at the negotiating table as they were at the tenth special session of the General Assembly during the elaboration of the Final Document.

"This Committee will henceforth work with the awareness of greater interest in its progress among Member States of the United Nations. I attach special importance to the decision that States which are not members of this Committee will be entitled to participate in the discussion of the proposals or working papers which they may submit and also to express views on question of particular

(Mr. Cottafavi)

concern to them. It is also appropriate that the Committee will, as a rule, open its plenary meetings to the public. Disarmament is a cause which, in its very nature, requires universal involvement and a steady mobilization of world public opinion. This will not be possible without public consciousness of the effort that is being made and the obstacles that are to be surmounted. I trust that the greater access to the work of this Committee will encourage the engagement of the intellectual resources of the world community in the quest for ways to reverse the process caused by the revolution in weaponry which followed the Second World War.

"These improvements in the machinery for substantive negotiations would justify a measure of confidence in the success of this Committee's work. Yet the final test remains what it always has been: the conclusion of practical disarmament agreements capable of ending the arms race. The present situation provides little reason for complacency in this regard. We must face the regrettable fact that, for the last two years, results have been lacking in disarmament negotiations. A recognition of this fact is reflected in the large number of resolutions adopted at the thirty-third General Assembly on questions relating to disarmament.

"Once again, the General Assembly has attached the highest priority to the conclusion of agreements on a comprehensive test ban and the prohibition of chemical weapons. I urge the parties in the trilateral or bilateral negotiations on these subjects to resolve the remaining issues so that drafts of agreements on both may be submitted for consideration by the Committee and later by the General Assembly. While negotiations with limited participation can be useful for formulating texts which could serve as the basis for further consideration in the Committee, they can cause a sense of frustration when they fail to produce results even after a reasonable period of time. I hope that the work of this Committee will not be hampered by this factor. But if it is, I would invite the membership, including naturally the parties in those parallel negotiations, to consider ways and means to bring them within the purview of the Committee. There could, at least, be a regular system of reporting which would provide the membership with concrete information on areas of agreement and divergence. The Committee's views could thus be taken into account by the parties in the negotiations.

(Mr. Cottafavi)

"There are nuclear questions which are being discussed in other forums. A major effort in this field is embodied in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. Although it is a bilateral process and the issues involved are uniquely intricate, success in reaching a SALT II agreement could give an impetus to progress towards nuclear disarmament. Nonetheless, there are a number of other questions relating to nuclear disarmament with which the membership of the United Nations shows increasing concern. I trust, therefore, that the significant contribution made through the resolutions of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly on nuclear matters will be appropriately reflected in this Committee's agenda.

"The Committee on Disarmament will no doubt follow the priorities listed in the Final Document of the tenth special session. Without prejudice to these or to the sequence of consideration determined by the Committee, I would like to mention some of the issues on which attention needs to be focussed at the present stage.

"It is gratifying that the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America has moved closer to becoming the first international agreement in the field of disarmament involving the five nuclear-weapon States. I hope that this precedent will be followed by further concerted action toward the establishment of other nuclear-weapon-free zones.

"The non-proliferation regime needs to be strengthened and I expect that the Preparatory Committee of the Second Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which will meet shortly, will provide a workable basis for an in-depth consideration by the Conference of all questions within the Treaty's scope.

"The question of the strengthening of security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States has attracted some useful discussions during various sessions of the General Assembly. This Committee has been requested to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session on this subject. I feel that, if progress can be achieved on this question, an important element of stability will be introduced in the international situation, with beneficial effects on other disarmament questions.

"The Committee on Disarmament may wish to consider how to evolve an agreed approach for prohibiting new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons.

(Mr. Cottafavi)

"In the field of conventional disarmament, the Committee is in a position to make valuable contributions. It might, for example, consider the advisability of framing general principles to provide guidance for regional action when, in view of the specific conditions of a region, the parties concerned wish to discuss appropriate arrangements for restraining the arms race in that region.

"The General Assembly has requested the Committee to report to the thirty-fifth session on the state of the consideration of proposals and suggestions mentioned in paragraph 125 of the Final Document. This follow-up of the work of the special session will, I believe, enrich the exchange of views in the Committee on a number of substantive matters.

"The recommendations of the Disarmament Commission regarding the elements of a comprehensive programme are expected to be transmitted to this Committee, through the General Assembly. In view of what has been achieved and what remains to be done, I need hardly emphasize the significance of elaborating this programme. While we have a chart in which a wide range of areas for action has been defined, we need also to trace a path along that chart for movement towards the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. This entails the formidable but vital task of identifying the various stages in executing the international disarmament strategy. The task falls on this Committee. Success in it will mean a striking advance in the cause of disarmament; failure, on the other hand, could well endanger what the special session so painstakingly achieved.

"At the next session, the General Assembly will consider the declaration of the 1980s as the decade of disarmament. A second special session devoted to disarmament will be convened in 1982. I sincerely hope that, by then, we will look at the work of this Committee as having made significant contributions to the disarmament effort. The fact that the history of this effort has been as long and progress in it as uneven and sporadic as the arms race has been rapid and incessant should not cause a sense of futility. If anything, it should reinforce our quest for coherence, stimulate a methodical approach and encourage a concentration on what is achievable. I wish the Committee success in its endeavours."

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): Ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of you all, I should like to thank the Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva for having communicated to us the message of the Secretary-General. We are aware of all that Mr. Kurt Waldheim, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, has already done, and is continuing to do, to ensure that our Organization manifests itself wherever a danger to world peace arises. His personal efforts have helped to make the Organization the instrument to which more and more countries turn in seeking to settle their disputes. It can be said that today, perhaps even more than in recent years, when so many threats to peace exist and new clouds are gathering over certain regions of the world, the mission of the United Nations, the mission of the Committee on Disarmament to guarantee peace and security are more relevant than ever, in the context of the responsibilities which they continue to shoulder. May I ask Mr. Cottafavi to be good enough to convey to the Secretary-General the thanks of the Committee for this important contribution to our work. I take this opportunity to ask him to express to the Secretary-General our appreciation for the co-operation received from his Secretariat in organizing our meetings, and for the two letters which he has addressed to us and which we have had reproduced as documents of the Committee; I am sure that they will prove most useful. I now have the pleasure to inform you that, as Chairman of the Committee, I have received another message wishing us fruitful negotiations. It is from the Holy See, and reads as follows:

"At the time when the Committee on Disarmament, of which you are Chairman, is meeting in Geneva, the Holy Father, who follows with the closest attention and encourages all efforts to promote peace and disarmament, expresses his most fervent hopes for the complete success of the work in hand. May the deliberations in this multilateral negotiating forum, which reflects the wishes of the recent special session of the United Nations General Assembly, mark a new stage on the way to disarmament and produce tangible measures for the progressive, effective and controlled reduction of armaments, eliminating the threat which the stockpiling of arms imposes on mankind and making it possible to devote to the development of peoples the immense resources absorbed by military expenditures. In this hope, which corresponds to the expectations of the whole family of mankind, the Holy Father prays that the participants will receive the blessing of Almighty God.

Signed: Cardinal Jean Villot, Secretary of State."

(The Chairman)

Ladies and gentlemen, in this noble message each of us no doubt finds echoed his own concerns and his own hopes. We also find in it encouragement to continue efforts to promote the dialogue of harmony and peace. I think I am interpreting the feelings of the Committee in saluting the tireless efforts made by the Holy See to bring the hearts and minds of human communities closer together and thus establish the basis for more harmonious and brotherly relations between men and societies. Before closing this first meeting, I should remind you that we will assemble here again at 3 p.m. for the afternoon meeting.

Ladies and gentlemen, I think I can declare this meeting closed and thank you once again for your attention and your kind co-operation.

The meeting is adjourned.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.

FINAL RECORD OF THE SECOND MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 24 January 1979, at 3.00 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. BOUTEFLIKA

(Algeria)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria:

Mr. A. BOUTEFLIKA

Mr. R. BOUDJAKDJI

Mr. A. BENKALI

Mr. A. FASLA

Mr. A. BENSMAIL

Mr. N. KERROUM

Argentina:

Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS

Mr. F. JIMENEZ DAVILA

Mr. A.N. MOLteni

Australia:

Mr. A. SHARP PEACOCK

Mr. L.D. THOMSON

Mr. A.J. BEHM

Ms. M.S. WICKES

Belgium:

Mr. H. SIMONET

Mr. J.A.R. SCHOUMAKER

Mr. P. NOTERDAEME

Mr. P. BERG

Mr. G. VAN DUYSE

Brazil:

Mr. G.A. MACIEL

Mr. L.P. LINDENBERG SETTE

Mr. A. CELSO DE OURO PRETO

Mr. C.A. SIMAS MAGALHAES

Bulgaria:

Mr. P. VOUTOV

Mr. I. PETROV

Mr. I. SOTIROV

Burma:

U SAW HLAING

U THEIN AUNG

U THAUNG HTUN

Canada:

Mr. R. HARRY JAY
Mr. J.T. SIMARD
Mr. G.A.H. PEARSON

Cuba:

Mr. P. TORRAS
Mr. L. SOLA VILA
Mr. F. ORTIZ RODRIGUEZ
Mrs. V. BOROWDOSKY JACKIEWICH
Mr. C. PAZOS BECEIRO
Mr. R. VALIENTE
Mr. R. LOPEZ GARCIA

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. M. RUZEK
Mr. V. TYLNER
Mr. J. JIRUSEK

Egypt:

Mr. O. EL-SHAFEI
Mr. F. EL-IBRASHI
Mr. M. EL-BARADEI

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. TERREFE

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. S. KAHN
Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. G. PFEIFFER
Mr. H. SCHNEPPEN
Mr. J. POHLMANN
Mr. H. MULLER

Hungary:

Mr. M. DOMOKOS
Mr. C. GYORFFY
Mr. A. LAKATOS

France:

Mr. J. FRANCOIS-PONCET
Mr. P-C. TAITTINGER
Mr. F. DE LA GORCE
Mr. Y. PAGNIES
Mr. J. RIGAUD
Mr. J. BLOT
Mr. J-L. GERGORIN
Mr. F. BEAUCHATAUD
Mr. M.S. HESSEL
Mr. J. FEVRE
Mr. L. DELAMARE
Mr. BRESSOT

India:

Mr. C.R. GHAREKHAN
Mr. S.T. DEVARE
Mr. S. SABHARWAL

Indonesia:

Mr. A. SANI
Mr. A. KAMIL
Mr. M. SIDIK
Mr. I. DAMANIK

Iran:

Mr. M. FARTASH
Mr. D. CHILATY
Mr. D. AMERI

Italy:

Mr. N. DI BERNARDO
Mr. F. FERRETTI
Mr. M. MORENO
Mr. C. FRATESCHI
Mr. G. VALDEVIT

Japan:

Mr. M. OGISO
Mr. T. NONOYAMA
Mr. Y. KIKUCHI
Mr. T. IWANAMI
Mr. Y. NAKAMURA

Kenya:

Mr. K. MWAMZANDI
Mr. C. GATERE MAINA
Mr. G.N. MUNIU

Mexico:

Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES
Miss A. CABRERA
Miss L.M. GARCIA

Mongolia:

Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
Mr. L. BAYART

Morocco:

Mr. A. SKALLI
Mr. M. CHRAIBI

Netherlands:

Mr. R.H. FEIN
Mr. A.J. MEERBURG

Nigeria:

Mr. O. ADENIJI
Mr. K. AHMED
Mr. T.O. OLUMOKO
Mr. R.A. FATUNASE

Pakistan:

Mr. J.K.A. MARKER
Mr. I.A. AKHUND
Mr. M. AKRAM

Peru:

Mr. A. DE SOTO
Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO

Poland:

Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. S. KONIK
Mr. M. KRUCZYK

Romania:

Mr. I. RADULESCU
Mr. C. ENE
Mr. G. TINCA

Sri Lanka:

Mr. A.C.S. HAMEED
Mr. I.B. FONSEKA
Miss M.L. NAGANATHAN
Mr. R.P.E. JAYASINGHE
Mr. A.C.A.M. NUHUMAN

Sweden:

Mr. H. BLIX
Mrs. I. THORSSON
Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. J. PRAWITZ
Mr. J. LUNDIN

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. Yu. K. NAZARKIN
Mr. A.M. VAVILOV
Mr. E.D. ZAITSEV
Mr. V.A. VERTOGRADOV
Mr. Yu. V. KOSTENKO
Mr. M.G. ANTIUKHIN

United Kingdom:

Lord GORONWY-ROBERTS
Mr. N.H. MARSHALL
Mr. C.L.G. MALLABY
Mr. C.K. CURWEN
Mr. P.M.W. FRANCIS

United States of America:

Mr. A. FISHER
Mr. C. FLOWEREE
Mr. A. AKALOVSKY
Mr. R. HAGENGRUBER
Ms. B. MURRAY
Mr. M.L. SANCHES
Mr. A. YARMOLINSKY

Venezuela:

Mr. R.C. CASTILLO
Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT
Mr. H. ARTEAGA
Miss D. SZOKOLOCZI
Mrs. R. LISBOA DE NECER

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. PESIC
Mr. M. VRHUNEC
Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC
Mr. D. DJOKIC

Zaire:

Mr. B. BUKAYI
Mr. M. ESUK

Director-General of the
United Nations Office at Geneva:

Mr. L. COTTAFVI

Assistant Secretary-General
for Disarmament:

Mr. R. BJORNERSTEDT

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): I am pleased to express to you my delegation's sincerest and warmest congratulations on being elected to preside over our deliberations at this first session of the Committee on Disarmament, which was established by the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament.

Your worthy appointment above all constitutes proof of the international community's high opinion of your outstanding personal qualities and the distinguished course which you have pursued in meetings of the United Nations. Undoubtedly, however, it also constitutes a tribute to your country, Algeria, which has played such a brilliant part in the history of the non-aligned countries, and an acknowledgement of the decisive contribution which these countries made to the convening of the tenth special session of the Assembly through the declaration adopted by the Fifth Conference of Heads of State and Government in August 1976 at Colombo, the hospitable capital of Sri Lanka.

The Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Mexico, Santiago Roel, although prevented by unpostponable official duties from attending this session in person, wished to address at least a message to the Committee on Disarmament, and I shall now read out the text of this message as a preface to the statement of the delegation of Mexico:

"To afford assurance that all men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want' was one of the basic objectives of the Declaration by United Nations signed on 1 January 1942.

"The attainment of this objective, for which so many countries fought so bravely in the Second World War, is as urgent now as it was then. Unfortunately, it appears to be even further away today than it was 37 years ago. The world's economic resources have, indeed, multiplied, but its wasteful expenditure on the acquisition of increasingly lethal arsenals has grown at the same pace, if not faster, and the gulf separating the rich countries from the poor has grown wider every day. As the General Assembly of the United Nations aptly stated, 'the hundreds of billions of dollars spent annually on the manufacture or improvement of weapons are a sombre and dramatic contrast to the want and poverty in which two thirds of the world's population live'.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

"The Committee on Disarmament, which is today starting its labours with the membership and organization agreed upon at the recent special session of the Assembly devoted to disarmament, is thus confronted with an enormous and inescapable task, namely, to help to eliminate the threat to the very survival of mankind posed by the existence of nuclear weapons and the continuing arms race, and to ensure that disarmament becomes an effective instrument for improving the economic and social conditions of the developing countries, starting with adequate food for their peoples. To use the words of the President of Mexico, José López Portillo, the Committee must endeavour to help not only to prevent war but also to achieve peace.

"In bringing this noble and arduous undertaking to a successful conclusion, the Committee on Disarmament will always be able to rely on the wholehearted contribution of the Mexican Government and people".

The Committee on Disarmament is starting its sessions under auspices which my delegation would not hesitate to describe as promising. In our opinion, it would be pointless to try to elucidate the question whether it is a new body or an old body that has undergone far-reaching reforms. Suffice it to bear in mind something to which there can be no objection and which we would venture to describe as axiomatic, namely, that the Committee on Disarmament is, in many fundamental respects, essentially different from its immediate predecessor, the CCD or Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, and from its more distant ancestor, the 18-nation Committee on Disarmament.

The principal characteristics of the Committee, which is intended to be the "single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum" available to the General Assembly of the United Nations, are set forth in paragraph 120 of the Final Document on which a consensus was reached precisely at the first special session of the Assembly devoted to disarmament. From among these characteristics I shall confine myself to emphasizing the following: a system has been established under which the chairmanship of the Committee will be rotated among all its members on a monthly basis; the Committee will prepare and adopt its own rules of procedure and its own agenda; States which are not members of

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

the Committee may participate in its deliberations when they are interested in matters that are the subject of negotiation in the Committee; its meetings will be open to the public unless, exceptionally, otherwise decided; and, last but not least, it will be open to all the nuclear-weapon States.

We welcomed these reforms with particular satisfaction since the delegation of Mexico has earnestly striven for almost 10 years -- as is evidenced by the countless statements and working papers reproduced in the copious documentation of the 18-nation Committee on Disarmament, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and the First Committee of the General Assembly -- to improve the organization and procedures of the multilateral body for negotiations on disarmament and, in particular, to promote the adoption of a system of general rotation of the chairmanship, similar to the system that has now entered into force, which conforms to the principle of the sovereign equality of States and replaces what we have on several occasions referred to as the "unusual institution" of permanent co-chairmanship. We are convinced that the reforms I have mentioned will enable the Committee on Disarmament to function more efficiently.

Moreover, it is also fitting to recall that the special session, in order widely and prudently, to counterbalance its reforming activity and to enable the greatest possible benefit to be derived from the experience and knowledge accumulated over more than 15 years of negotiations on disarmament in Geneva, adopted the decision which its President defined at the closing meeting of the session when he announced that agreement had been reached on the formula described in paragraph 120 concerning the membership of the Committee. The decision was that all the members of the CCD would automatically become members of the Committee on Disarmament whose work we are beginning today.

Since, in addition to the members with which we have worked for so many years, our Committee now comprises nine new members -- France, Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Cuba, Indonesia, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Venezuela, I think that this is the appropriate moment to tell them all how deeply pleased we are that they should add their efforts to this disarmament undertaking, an undertaking which is perhaps one of the most frustrating but also, undoubtedly, one of the most noble and elevated to which man can devote himself. It is, I think, also the moment to express the sincere hope that China will very soon occupy the place that legitimately belongs to it.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Apart from this new structure and these basic provisions relating to the organization of the Committee, there are other elements which will also undoubtedly have a favourable influence on the disarmament negotiations. One such element is the fact that, as the fruit of the five weeks of work by the tenth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations -- work which was presided over in a masterly manner by Mr. Lazar Mojsov, Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia, and which, in turn, represented the culmination of five arduous sessions of the Preparatory Committee, which, it is only right to recall, was presided over with outstanding skill by the distinguished representative of Argentina, Ambassador Carlos Ortiz de Rozas, who also presided over the Ad Hoc Committee of the tenth special session, the Assembly succeeded in preparing and adopting by consensus a Final Document -- just one, in order to avoid dispersion, as Mexico had had the privilege of suggesting at the outset -- which, in its four sections -- Introduction, Declaration, Programme of Action, and Machinery, defines a series of principles, objectives, priorities, measures and procedures for channelling and promoting the efforts of all countries in such a way as to remove the threat of a nuclear war, to put an end to the arms race and to prepare 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".

Never before had the United Nations succeeded in adopting, and still less by consensus -- including France and China, such a comprehensive document which emphatically proclaimed a series of conclusions or provisions -- whose accuracy or compulsory nature, depending on the case, it will in future be impossible to call in question -- such as those defined in the emphatic statements that the increase in weapons, especially nuclear weapons, far from helping to strengthen international security, on the contrary weakens it; that the existing nuclear arsenals and the

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

continuing arms race pose a threat to the very survival of mankind; that there is a close relationship between disarmament and development, and that any resources that may be released as a result of the implementation of disarmament measures should be used to bridge the economic gap between developed and developing countries; that in accordance with the Charter, the United Nations has a central role and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament and that therefore Member States must keep the United Nations duly informed of all steps, whether unilateral, bilateral, regional or multilateral, taken outside its aegis.

We believe that a beneficial influence will also be exerted by the fact that the machinery for disarmament deliberations has been strengthened as a result of the decision that the First Committee of the General Assembly should deal in the future only with questions of disarmament and related international security questions, and that there will be a Disarmament Commission composed of all the States Members of the United Nations which will meet for a period of four weeks between sessions of the General Assembly.

The foregoing must not, however, cause us to overlook the situation with which we are currently confronted. This situation has been masterfully described in words which, since they were approved by consensus after prolonged and thorough debate, I feel obliged to quote exactly as they appear in paragraph 4 of the Final Document of the session of the Assembly devoted to disarmament. The paragraph reads as follows:

"The Disarmament Decade solemnly declared in 1969 by the United Nations is coming to an end. Unfortunately, the objectives established on that occasion by the General Assembly appear to be as far away today as they were then, or even further because the arms race is not diminishing but increasing and outstrips by far the efforts to curb it. While it is true that some limited agreements have been reached, 'effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament' continue to elude man's grasp. Yet the implementation of such measures is urgently required.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

There has not been any real progress either that might lead to the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Furthermore, it has not been possible to free any amount, however modest, of the enormous resources, both material and human, which are wasted on the unproductive and spiralling arms race and which should be made available for the purpose of economic and social development, especially since such a race 'places a great burden on both the developing and the developed countries'."

These are the deplorable conditions which are afflicting the world and which we must do everything possible to remedy. To this end, two principal categories of measures should be adopted.

The first of these categories covers measures of a predominantly procedural nature aimed at ensuring that the Committee on Disarmament is as effective as possible. Measures in this category fall totally within our responsibility since, as is stated in paragraph 113 of the Final Document of the General Assembly, "the international machinery should be utilized more effectively and also improved to enable implementation of the Programme of Action and help the United Nations to fulfil its role in the field of disarmament".

This means that at the session of the Committee on which we are embarking maximum efforts will have to be made to prepare and adopt rules of procedure and a programme or agenda appropriate for the achievement of these objectives.

This is not the time to enter into details concerning either of these two subjects. I should merely like to make a few general observations about them.

With reference to the agenda we feel that the system followed in the CCD will have to be radically altered so that, under such general headings as it may be deemed appropriate to maintain permanently, there are included each year specific measures to which the Committee considers it advisable to devote priority attention at the different sessions.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

In our opinion, it will also have to be borne closely in mind that, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 50 of the Final Document, the achievement of nuclear disarmament, which merits the highest priority, "will require urgent negotiation of agreements at appropriate stages and with adequate measures of verification satisfactory to the States concerned", for the results which are specified in the Document and should culminate in "a comprehensive, phased programme with agreed time-frames, whenever feasible, for progressive and balanced reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, leading to their ultimate and complete elimination at the earliest possible time". It seems to us that such negotiations will require that, after a reasonable period of time, talks such as the so-called SALT talks which have been held outside the CCD should henceforth be held within this multilateral negotiating body which is the Committee on Disarmament. If it is feared that the membership of the Committee is too large and that this fact would protract the negotiations, consideration might be given to the adoption of a procedure similar to that used by the Disarmament Commission between 1954 and 1957, namely, the establishment of a sub-committee consisting solely of the nuclear Powers, on the understanding that it would act as a subsidiary organ of the Committee, which it would keep duly informed of the progress of the negotiations.

One question on which it is impossible to remain silent when examining, even as briefly as I am doing, the subject of nuclear disarmament is the urgent need for the Committee on Disarmament to have, at an early date, a preliminary draft treaty on the total cessation of nuclear-weapon testing, an objective which the United Nations has been pursuing for more than a quarter of a century now and concerning which the General Assembly has adopted such pressing and categorical resolutions. We are confident that the three nuclear-weapon States which have been dealing with this question for quite a long time already will take proper note of the grave responsibility incumbent on them in this matter.

Without prejudice to the highest priority which should be accorded to nuclear weapons, the Committee's agenda should also include consideration of those items which it is found advisable to study in relation to the other types of weapons

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

expressly listed in paragraph 45 of the Final Document, namely, other weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons and conventional weapons, to which the Document devotes no less than six paragraphs, in which, for the first time in its history, the United Nations adopted a well-balanced series of substantive decisions of obvious importance on the matter.

As far as the rules of procedure are concerned, it seems to us essential that they should include provisions -- adopted, naturally, by consensus -- which would prevent the Committee on Disarmament from being paralysed -- as unfortunately the CCD so frequently was -- whenever the nuclear-weapon Powers do not succeed in submitting to it a joint text for the preparation of a treaty or convention on nuclear disarmament measures. We are convinced that there is no reason why it should be an essential requirement for the nuclear Powers to transmit to the multilateral negotiating body an absolutely complete text of a preliminary draft treaty or convention which they have been negotiating among themselves. On the contrary, we believe that there would be far from negligible advantages if the body in question were to take note of all those parts of the preliminary draft which had already been completed, on the understanding that it would take note of the missing parts as they in turn were completed. In this way, the nuclear Powers would benefit from the viewpoints of the other members of the Committee and, in particular, of the members of the Group of 21 which, by reason of their impartiality, might serve to provide the element of conciliation or compromise that sometimes eludes the nuclear-weapon States, which are too engrossed in the interests of their respective military alliances.

Apart from measures of the type which I have just outlined and which, in our opinion and as I have already said, will be for each and every one of us as representatives of the members of the Committee to endeavour to put into practice at this session, it will be necessary to bear in mind that "the decisive factor for achieving real measures of disarmament is the 'political will' of States" and that, to quote from the Final Document again "In the task of achieving the goals of nuclear disarmament, all the nuclear-weapon States, in particular those among them which possess the most important nuclear arsenals, bear a special responsibility".

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

This is the second category of measures to which I referred earlier. It is here -- in the will to demonstrate by deeds that we wish to discharge the responsibilities, whether special or not, deriving from the provisions of the Final Document -- that lies the key to the fate of both the negotiations and the multilateral deliberations on disarmament.

My delegation is convinced that, as we stated in a text which we submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-third session and which has become General Assembly resolution 33/71 F, having been adopted by consensus, the provisions of the Final Document constitute a consistent and articulated whole which provides a solid basis to set in motion an international disarmament strategy that makes it possible at the same time:

(a) To carry out what is the most acute and urgent task of the present day, namely, the removal of the threat of a world war, which would inevitably be a nuclear war,

(b) To channel the negotiations among States towards the final goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, on the understanding that such negotiations shall be conducted concurrently with negotiations on partial measures of disarmament,

(c) To strengthen international peace and security and to promote the economic and social advancement of all peoples, thus facilitating the achievement of the new international economic order.

This is why it seems to us most fitting that the special session should have proclaimed in its Final Document -- to which, incidentally, we have made such frequent references in this statement because we consider that it should be accorded a value similar to that of Constitutions in domestic law -- that the "Pressing need now is to translate '... its provisions ...' into practical terms ... and to proceed along the road of binding and effective international agreements in the field of disarmament".

As it said at the closing plenary meeting of the General Assembly on disarmament, my delegation is convinced that, for any objective observer who, without ceasing to be an idealist, has a clear idea of the realities of the world in which we live and of the limitations which they entail, this special session may be regarded as a success because it achieved everything that could reasonably be expected in the immediate future.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The long-term results and history's verdict on the session will however, depend on what peoples and the Governments representing them in the United Nations and in bodies such as the one in which we are gathered do to prevent what was agreed upon in New York in June 1978 from remaining a dead letter, as unfortunately has happened so often in other similar cases.

For this reason, we regard as very apt the statement made by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim, in the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization, in which he included, inter alia, ideas such as those which I am now about to quote in closing this statement and which essentially coincide with the ideas expressed by the President of Mexico to which the Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country referred in the message to the Committee which I have already read out:

"The success of the special session should not be a reason for complacency. It marks not the end but rather the beginning of a new phase of the efforts of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. We have an international disarmament strategy. We must now implement it with the utmost dedication and energy. By the time the next special session of the General Assembly on disarmament is held, we should be able to show to the world that the race for survival has gained an irreversible lead over the arms race."

Mr. FRANCOIS-PONCET (France) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, in the matter of disarmament, one must be mistrustful of words. What counts are ideas and acts. Our meeting today is important in that it is the expression of an idea, and perhaps the beginning of an act. That is why France wishes to be present.

This meeting, in the conditions in which it is taking place, appears to the French Government to be laden with significance.

First of all, turning to you, Mr. Chairman, let me say that France is happy to see that Algeria, which you represent with the authority and competence that everyone acknowledges, has been called upon to preside over this meeting. The presence of your country in this forum and in that seat reflects a profound change in the international approach to the problem of disarmament, a change that has been called for by many countries which, like France, consider that disarmament should not be the preserve of a few Powers, but the affair of all.

(Mr. François-Poncet, France)

The second significant fact is that this meeting is being held at Geneva, the capital of disarmament and the city of the United Nations. The history of this city is inseparable from that of a long line of men of goodwill who for 50 years have been working for peace and disarmament. The results of the efforts are disappointing, it is true; but the noble objectives of the pioneers and visionaries of disarmament should at least continue to inspire our action, even if the harsh lessons of recent history teach us realism. It is significant also that this meeting is being held under the auspices of the United Nations. It is, indeed, the direct consequence of the decisions taken at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, decisions which mark a profound change in the approach to the problem.

And finally, also significant, in any case in the eyes of France, is the participation of my country in this meeting, a participation which marks its re-entry into an essential debate from which it had stood aside only with regret and always retaining the hope, which has been fulfilled today, that when conditions were appropriate it would be able to resume the active role which it had long played.

Never has there been so much talk of disarmament. And never has man had in his hands so great an arsenal of weapons. The history of disarmament is the history of a contradiction between two feelings: immense hope in the face of the task to be accomplished; immense frustration at the scantiness of the results obtained. How, in such circumstances, can one avoid becoming resigned to the attitude of States which, by ever more costly and hazardous methods, seek the means of ensuring their security? And yet -- and this is the conviction of France as it was expressed last spring from the rostrum of the United Nations -- it is possible to break the vicious circle of sterile discussions which result in the last analysis in a proliferation of arms and distrust.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, this is the first time I have had occasion to express myself publicly, on the international scene, on this formidable problem. Will you allow me for a brief moment to describe the personal feeling that I have? As politicians and diplomats we wield, with the sangfroid of specialists, terms that are terrible because they express a reality that is equally terrible. Behind each one of the words we shall use in this debate, there is death or life,

(Mr. François-Poncet, France)

war or peace. The balance of military forces is not merely a mathematical equation, it is a reality that weighs heavy on our flesh-and-blood existence. And words of hope are just as weighty as those of fear, for they also have implications for the future of the human race. It would be just as dangerous for the future of peace to discourage hope as to condone resignation. If prudence is essential in our discussions, it is not in order to lessen our conviction, but better to measure our responsibility to the peoples who expect much of us.

It is in this light that France sees its contribution to the debate.

Mr. Chairman, France does not claim that it is proposing a complete plan of disarmament. It has, with regard to this problem, defined an approach which it believes to be original, and which is based on a number of guiding principles from which it has deduced some concrete proposals for discussion in various instances: in the United Nations, here, or in the regional framework. I would now like to mention those guiding principles and those concrete proposals here, before taking up the problems of methods appropriate for this Committee.

In order to have any chance of making progress, it is essential to start from a realistic conception. The hope which inspires us would remain a blind hope if it were not guided by lucidity.

Is there any need for me to mention the fundamental principles which govern relations between States, and to stress that these principles are constantly being violated in day-to-day reality? Here a sovereign State is invaded; these territories are victims of de facto annexation; elsewhere States resort to violence and not to arbitration for settling frontier disputes; certain subversive activities are encouraged from abroad. The use of violence or the resort to intimidation are widespread attitudes.

In this situation, there are two temptations: the first is to freeze the existing international balances through the perpetuation of blocs reflecting hegemonies; the second is to believe that general and complete disarmament is possible in the world as it is.

Those two courses, which are opposite in respect of the principles underlying them, seem to be equally disastrous with regard to their consequences.

(Mr. Francois-Poncet, France)

It is not by appropriating zones of influence and by aligning small and medium-sized nations with the largest countries that war-like intentions will be eliminated.

No more is it by advocating universal renunciation of national defence capacities and by allowing this unrealistic and unverifiable objective to serve as an alibi for those who hope to derive many benefits from the status quo that disarmament can be made a reality.

There is only one course which is consistent both with the exigencies of the debate in which life and death are at stake, and with the pragmatism required to deal with a changing and dangerous reality: this course is to start from the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations, from which the right of States and peoples to security is derived. In the opinion of France, this right to security comprises three elements:

1. Strict observance of the international guarantees of security, starting with those in the Charter of the United Nations;
2. The right for each State to organize its defence in such a manner that it can deter a potential aggressor;
3. The obligation for each State not to arm itself beyond a level which others regard as a threat.

From this right to security as so defined --which is one of the basic elements of a need that is felt by all the peoples of the earth, namely the need for self-affirmation --there arises the first objective which should be set for any disarmament plan, the attainment by each country of the minimum level of armament compatible with its security.

Also, if there is to be any hope of attaining such an objective, four essential conditions must be met at the action level.

The first condition is universality, which means that disarmament is the affair of everyone and must be achieved with the assistance and under the control of all. With the assistance of all, since disarmament cannot be reduced to the idea which the powerful may have of the security of the weak. Under the control of all, since there can be no progress in disarmament without an improvement in confidence.

(Mr. Francois-Poncet, France)

Next, diversity, since the geography of threats must be matched by a geography of security which takes account of regional differences. In this respect, one fundamental distinction results from the existence of a vast region of the world in which nuclear deterrence constitutes a major element in the existing balance. And it must be admitted that the nuclear phenomenon, to the extent that it has been mastered by the logic of stable and mutual deterrence, has made it possible to ward off the risk of war in this zone for more than 30 years.

That is why France recommends that the global approach which must be yours in this Committee should be complemented by a regional approach to disarmament.

Third, solidarity, since if, for the poorest nations, there can be no right to security without the right to development, it is only by putting an end to the scandal of the arms race that it will become possible to devote substantial additional resources to the task of reducing inequalities between peoples.

And lastly, pragmatism, since it is by analysing the dangers as they are perceived by States that one may hope to arrive at effective measures and at the consensus necessary for their application. The essential factors of instability must be determined, and efforts must be made to alleviate the intolerable burden of threats by gradually eliminating them. It is through this dialectic of security and disarmament that the world in general, and each region in particular, will arrive at less distressing conditions of life.

France does not of course reject the ultimate objective of real, general and controlled disarmament; however, it does not regard it as a present possibility, but as the end point of mankind's long march towards total solidarity.

From this over-all conception, of which I have just described the main elements, France has worked out a number of lines of action and concrete proposals, some of which are global in nature, and some regional. I wish to stress that they are not exhaustive; France reserves the right to supplement them, just as it is, of course, willing to examine with care and objectivity those of other countries.

(Mr. François-Poncet, France)

France is desirous that, at the appropriate moment, it should be you who take up these proposals of a global nature since you, ladies and gentlemen, are the first expression of the new conception of disarmament.

When the French Government observed a year ago that the United Nations was the natural framework for the debates of the international community, it requested that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should be replaced by a forum of discussion which, by its composition and procedures, would represent a genuine innovation.

That was a prerequisite for any serious attempt to get out of the impasse in which disarmament negotiations had become bogged down. And so the tenth special session, having decided on the reform of the negotiating and deliberative machinery, established new principles governing the creation of your Committee.

The Committee, benefiting from its relationship with the United Nations, reflects the diversity of the world in its composition and respects regional balances. The abandonment of the co-chairmanship and the adoption of the rule of consensus are truly the expression of the principle of the equality of States with regard to the right to security.

In proposing also the establishment of an International Institute for Research on Disarmament, France wished that all States should have an objective instrument of reflection and expert investigation.

The Institute would be an independent instrument of research attached to the United Nations, and its work would supplement, on a longer-term and more scientific basis, the very useful and highly appreciated efforts already made by the Secretariat of the United Nations.

I am happy to note that the thirty-third session of the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General of the United Nations to study the modalities for the establishment of such an Institute.

There is no disarmament without control and, in the course of your work, you must constantly be faced by this obvious fact. New technologies -- particularly space technologies -- are, as you know, opening up an increasingly wide range of possibilities. This is why France has proposed that an international satellite monitoring agency should be set up under the auspices of the United Nations.

(Mr. Francois-Poncet, France)

The thirty-third session of the General Assembly showed its interest in this proposal by deciding without opposition that a three-fold investigation should be undertaken: inquiries by the Secretary-General among Member States, a meeting of a group of qualified government experts and a report by the Secretary-General to the thirty-fourth session. In the course of this procedure, in which it will participate, France will supplement its proposals and, in doing so, will endeavour to answer the questions which they have raised in certain quarters.

In order to emphasize the relationships between disarmament and development, which are now being demonstrated by the work of a qualified group of experts, my country put forward the proposal to establish an international disarmament fund for development. The General Assembly has expressed the wish that our proposal should be referred to that group for its consideration. All sections of the international community must realize, without further delay, that development and security are the two indissociable foundations of a new international economic order.

The work of your Committee will naturally be concerned with the global aspects of disarmament, but should not disregard the efforts which are being made at the regional level in the self-same search for greater security.

In regions that are not covered by the nuclear deterrent, it is in the interest of all that they should protect themselves from the dissemination of atomic weapons. The French Government, which is particularly aware of this need, intends to contribute to a constructive policy of non-proliferation based on non-discrimination. But it is of course for the States concerned themselves to renounce nuclear weapons, a decision which can come only from an affirmation of their own will. President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing emphasized in New York the role which the creation of nuclear-free zones could play in this respect. A joint declaration by all the countries in a given region of their intention not to acquire this type of weapon would make it possible to strengthen a situation that is necessarily unstable at the present time. France, for its part, is naturally willing to draw the inferences from such a gesture, and this is what it is preparing to do in the case of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

Moreover, it cannot fail to indicate its interest in initiatives freely taken by the countries of a region with a view to strengthening their mutual confidence or entering into agreements on the limitation of the level of conventional weapons.

(Mr. François-Poncet, France)

In the vast expanse of the northern hemisphere covered by the nuclear deterrent, disarmament should deal as a matter of priority with two major factors of instability: the excessive size of the strategic arsenals of the super-Powers in relation to their need for mutual deterrents, and the unbalanced accumulation of conventional weapons in Europe.

The two major nuclear Powers should therefore make urgent and systematic efforts to reduce their arsenals to a level commensurate with the actual requirements of deterrence. As long as the existence of such a superabundant nuclear destruction capability leaves open the possibility of the virtually total annihilation of mankind, disarmament will remain an academic notion.

Accordingly, though France supports the two major Powers when they make progress in their bilateral strategic arms limitation negotiations, it must point out that the objective of this difficult enterprise should be a substantial reduction in their arsenals and the freezing of their technological competition without impairing the security of the two partners and their allies as a result.

It goes without saying that the problem arises in an entirely different manner for the medium-sized nuclear Powers such as France, since the disproportion between their forces -- which are limited to the defence of their vital interests alone -- and the strategic arsenals of the super-powers is quite obvious.

The accumulation of conventional armaments leads France to propose the convening of a disarmament conference in Europe.

Europe is a geographical and historical reality. It is also a region that is clearly delimited from the military standpoint, and it is the site of the most formidable concentration of conventional weapons that the world has ever known. This accumulation, which is already detrimental to détente, is bound to have serious effects on détente if it continues and accelerates.

This is why we have invited all States with forces on the continent to discuss together, on a footing of equality and aside from the confrontation of blocs, ways and means of achieving genuine disarmament.

(Mr. François-Fancet, France)

The main object would be to put an end to over-armament with conventional weapons and to the imbalances this involves. However, in order to establish the climate of confidence without which States would not agree to embark on the process of reduction, the first stage of the conference should be devoted to the elaboration of a series of measures designed on the one hand to co-ordinate, and on the other hand to improve and equalize the publication of data -- i.e., mutual knowledge of military potentials, structures and activities. Efforts should also be made at this stage to limit and control manoeuvres and movements that might conceal a surprise attack.

A comparison of the theories on the use of forces and of the strategies of the different participants would make for better mutual understanding, and would also lead to reflection on what might be the optimum level of security for European armies -- a level which would allow nations to keep the means necessary for their individual and collective self-defence, but would not provide them with the means for launching an aggression.

It would be for the European disarmament conference, in the second phase of its work, to find objective criteria, acceptable to all, on which to base such research. If all armies in Europe were to conform to a strictly defensive type of military structure, after gradual reductions and re-equipment, a new era of peace and confidence would begin for Europe.

Some will ask whether for this purpose it is necessary to create a new negotiating forum, when the CSCE and the MBFR talks already exist. We believe it is essential to do so, since the measures of confidence which we are proposing differ from those of Helsinki by their scope, their mandatory nature, the verifications to which they would be subject and their geographic range of application. Moreover, as they would also be connected with the subsequent adoption of specific provisions for the reduction of military equipment, they would be situated altogether outside the framework of the Final Act.

With regard to the MBFR talks, everyone is aware of our objections to negotiations on the creation, in the middle of Europe, of a zone in which countries would be permanently subject to certain specific obligations under the control of the two major Powers, a system which would, moreover, have the effect of redeploying armaments rather than reducing them.

(Mr. Francois-Poncet, France)

Nevertheless, our intention -- and I wish to make this quite clear here -- is certainly not to interfere with these negotiations, and we see no reason why the two exercises should not be conducted simultaneously.

We have also been asked why we limited the subject of this conference to conventional disarmament.

First, because it is not appropriate to place on the same footing, and discuss together in the same negotiations, weapons which are completely different in their nature, significance and use.

Secondly, because -- since the bulk of the nuclear weapons belong to two great Powers and form part of a general balance which extends far beyond the confines of Europe -- responsibility for nuclear disarmament rests with those two Powers.

We are nevertheless aware of the complementarity of the two forms of disarmament, since the existence of the nuclear deterrent in Europe is indissociable from the threat posed there by conventional weapons. Whether any progress is made with general disarmament will depend on the extent to which the European disarmament conference achieves satisfactory results.

Ladies and Gentlemen, you are thus the first manifestation of a new concept of disarmament.

I am sure that you will conduct your work with the open-mindedness and the rigour which the requirements of the coming decades demand. To achieve this, your Committee will have to remain true to its founding principles; and, being itself an innovation, it will have to ensure that its work and methods reflect this renewal.

It is gratifying that all the nuclear Powers have been invited to resume their seats on the Committee and that the voice of great China can make itself heard here whenever it deems it desirable.

Nevertheless it is still true that, through the United Nations General Assembly, its First Committee and the newly-instituted Disarmament Commission, the disarmament endeavour will above all be inspired by the principle of universality.. How then could you, as the main negotiating body depart from this rule, whose most normal form of expression is the search for a consensus?

(Mr. Francois-Poncet, France)

If your Committee were to depart from the principle of the universal right to security in order to revert to commitments that are essentially bipolar, France would be driven back again to its former reservations. And if it were to confine itself to abstract discussions, it would not live up to the expectations of the peoples.

What we seek is a disarmament effort that is serious, practical and effective. To achieve this, it is essential to base our work on a realistic vision of the international situation, of the East-West relations which determine the strategic balance, and of the North-South relations, which are characterized by the aspiration for harmony between two regions of the world that are divided by the inequalities of their development.

There will be no disarmament without a deepening of détente. Between East and West, confrontation is gradually giving way to the search for a balance. But this balance between the blocs cannot permanently and satisfactorily be a balance of terror and mistrust. We must take new and ambitious steps along the road that was opened at Helsinki, and go beyond an excessively narrow and limited concept of détente. In a word, Europe, which has been divided and paralysed by the cold war, must open itself to nations and to people. France, for its part, thinks that this is possible, and believes it has shown that it can be done with full respect for national independence and fidelity to alliances.

At the same time, however, we must realize that the advancement of détente is not in itself enough to create the conditions for genuine disarmament. Transformation of North-South relations is equally important for the success of our enterprise, because the gap between developed countries and those which aspire to development is a source of frustration which might well result in a challenging of the balances that are alleged to have been established between the rich of the East and the rich of the West in their own interests. France considers it important therefore to institute a constructive dialogue between North and South based on mutual trust. But, in the East-West and the North-South dialogue alike, it is essential to convince people of their solidarity, and to help them discover the fundamental unity of their aims, despite their rivalries and even their armed conflicts.

(Mr. François-Poncet, France)

The new and promising body whose creation we acclaim today -- the United Nations Committee on Disarmament -- can make a contribution precisely to the attainment of these objectives.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I would like to thank Mr. Jean François-Poncet for the substantial contribution by France, and to tell him how greatly we appreciated the remarks he made with respect to Algeria and to myself. I now call upon the third speaker on my list, the Honourable Hameed, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka, to take the floor.

Mr. HAMEED (Sri Lanka): Mr. Chairman, may I at the commencement of my remarks congratulate you on your assumption of duties as Chairman of this first meeting of the Committee on Disarmament. We regard it as a tribute to your country and to you personally, Mr. Chairman, that this first meeting of the Committee should be presided over by Algeria. Your country has made significant contributions to the cause of mediation and peace in the forums of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, the League of Arab States and not least of all within our non-aligned movement in which your country was a distinguished member even before your independence.

In the last days of the year just over, the international community joined the Algerian people to mourn the untimely passing of President Boumedienne. He was an architect of your liberation and under his leadership and guidance Algeria has made a lasting impact in the Councils of the world. I am confident that you will guide our deliberations in the spirit and with the wisdom which your country has inherited from your great leader.

I have yet another duty to perform and it is to thank those members of this Committee who supported our nomination to its membership. We are aware that among the criteria adopted for membership of the Committee on Disarmament is that of being a militarily significant State -- a qualification which Sri Lanka can hardly claim to satisfy. That we were included among the eight new members of the Committee is, we believe, a tacit acknowledgement of the contribution which the militarily less significant can make to disarmament -- a contribution which in my country's case derives from the policies and positions which the Government of Sri Lanka under the leadership of my President, His Excellency J.R. Jayewardene, has chosen to follow.

(Mr. Hameed, Sri Lanka)

This Committee is meeting today as a consequence of the United Nations special session on disarmament held in May and June last year. Mr. Chairman, as a fellow-member of the non-aligned movement, you would know that the special session was the result of the sustained efforts of the non-aligned group which as far back as 1961 first called for the convening of a special session devoted to disarmament. That objective was realized in 1978 following the resolution which my country's delegation, in our capacity of Chairman of the non-aligned movement, was privileged to propose at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly on behalf of the non-aligned community.

The Final Document of the special session which dealt with the machinery of disarmament established the United Nations Disarmament Commission to function as the deliberative body and this Committee on Disarmament to constitute the negotiating body. The Disarmament Commission was inspired and fashioned so as to give all States an opportunity and a role in this vital task of disarmament. In the context of our time this was as far as we could go to reach a consensus in order to democratize the institutions of disarmament. Those of us who participated in the special session will recall the protracted exchanges that took place on the role that the United Nations should play in the sphere of disarmament. The emphasis given by the non-aligned to the United Nations was because it is the most representative body. And through the Disarmament Commission we shall strive to implement that democratization, to give meaning to the letter and spirit of the Final Document of the special session.

Mr. Chairman, you will also recall the no less arduous negotiations that preceded the reform of the negotiating body -- this Committee on Disarmament. While we in the non-aligned believed that little or no progress of consequence had taken place in disarmament negotiations, there were those who believed otherwise and accordingly were averse to any major reform of the negotiating body. What we are today in this Committee is a reflection of what had been agreed upon and was accepted as the most realistic compromise, rather than what we could justifiably claim was the will of an overwhelming majority. We nevertheless view this Committee as a better representation of that overwhelming majority whose aspirations to realize the goal of disarmament we shall continue to urge within this Committee.

(Mr. Hameed, Sri Lanka)

I would like to take this opportunity to elaborate my Government's views on how we see our role in this Committee. As one of the new members of the Committee, we shall listen and learn as we contribute. While not discounting the advances made in the negotiating body in the past, we regard this Committee as a significant new beginning aimed at giving the disarmament process a new and decisive impetus. The increase in its membership, the adoption of its own rules of procedure, the appointment of its Secretary, the rotation of its Chairmanship, the adoption of its own agenda, the provision for the participation of States not members of the Committee -- these we regard not as mere tokens but as tangible evidence of the Committee's new role and the expectations of the international community from its members.

I would make just one comment on the decision-making process of consensus which we know was cardinal to the coming into being of this Committee. Consensus is the only possible criterion for decision-making in the context of today. In our efforts to reach this consensus we should not be oblivious of the concern for security and -- I say this without seeking to dramatize the issue -- the very existence of the vast majority of the human family. When it was decided in our Final Document that this Committee's plenary meetings were to be open to the public, we believe that it was intended as more than a gesture and that this public, representing the ordinary citizens of our countries, will be the real arbiters of the worth of this Committee.

It was not my intention, Mr. Chairman, to take this Committee's time in recapitulating the views and positions which have been stated during the special session and in the First Committee of the General Assembly. But a brief reference to some of these issues is difficult to avoid. As distinguished delegates would know, when I spoke of the threat to the very existence of the human family, it was the threat of nuclear war that I had in mind. Nuclear disarmament, therefore, is the imperative need and we gave this the highest priority in the Final Document. We are not so naive as to expect instant results. Nevertheless what does discourage us is the appallingly slow pace of negotiations on even what might be called the distant prelude to nuclear disarmament. The SALT II agreements which

(Mr. Hameed, Sri Lanka)

we had hoped for as a happy augury for the special session have not yet been concluded -- though we are told that they are imminent. The draft of a comprehensive test-ban treaty is still with the three nuclear-weapon States with no indication of its coming before this Committee. In the past, we understand, draft agreements of this nature were placed before this Committee in the expectation that its members would have little to say and therefore the drafts would receive prompt acceptance. That, Mr. Chairman, is an attitude which we hope will not be prevalent in this new Committee. If our membership is for the purpose of being onlookers waiting to endorse agreements, our participation in this Committee would be reduced to a farce.

I would like to make a passing but relevant observation at this stage. We readily recognize that disarmament and, even more, nuclear disarmament is an infinitely complex exercise involving technical competence that my own country hardly claims to possess. However, as a representative of an elected political leadership, I am obliged to ask whether, even in those States which have the technical competence, are not the issues presented in coherent non-technical terms to the political leadership who must in the last analysis take the necessary decisions and explain them to their people? A similar presentation can take place in this Committee and I would venture to think that it is well within the capacity of all our members to evaluate the issues and fulfil our role as active and constructive participants in the work of this Committee. My Government will give its best efforts in this direction.

Earlier in my remarks I made a reference to the democratization of the disarmament process which was one objective of the special session. I revert to this only to draw attention to the proposals which were brought before the special session by individual States. The Final Document lists these proposals and among them is one made by my President, His Excellency J.R. Jayewardene, for a World Disarmament Authority. It is not my intention to amplify that proposal before this Committee. We did so at the special session. The General Assembly at its thirty-third session adopted by consensus a resolution we sponsored to carry forward the proposals in paragraph 125 of the Final Document. While we

(Mr. Hameed, Sri Lanka)

heard some doubts expressed about the need to have these proposals even studied, we regard the adoption of that resolution by consensus as at least a vindication of what is stated in the Final Document: that all States have the duty to contribute to efforts in the field of disarmament and all States have the right to participate in disarmament negotiations.

My remarks would be incomplete without a reference to what we see as a recurring phenomenon obstructing even the present slow process of disarmament negotiations. What I have in mind is the tendency among the major military alliances to view international political changes as having a direct bearing on their security. The invariable response or, one might even say, the instinctive reaction to such changes is the slowing down or even freezing of on-going negotiations. The recourse to this form of linkage has tended to be increasingly frequent. The sequel often takes the form not just of an interruption or freezing of negotiations but of a call for new increases in arms expenditure. To recount the theories and remedies and the well-known "isms" that bring this about would be a recital of history both ancient and modern for which this Committee is no forum. But it would be sufficient to recall just the events of the last 30 years for evidence that armaments have neither ensured durable security nor durable allies. In our own time we have been witness to events which were not just unlikely but would have been dismissed as impossible a decade or two ago. I make this remark not to pronounce judgement on the events themselves but to emphasize the futility of security based on an accumulation of armaments. The device of linkage may allow a breathing spell but it postpones the essential choice which is either a fresh acceleration of the arms race or what we must now try to realize -- a halt and a reversal of this process.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, the picture is not wholly one of gloom. Within the major alliances we see signs of acceptance of the truth that armaments alone are no guarantee of security. If this trend gathers momentum we may yet see an abandoning of what has been for some an article of faith: that the nuclear deterrent has been the proven instrument that has kept the peace. Perhaps it has kept the peace,

(Mr. Hameed, Sri Lanka)

Mr. Chairman, in one area where we are told tensions are greatest and therefore any serious conflict will lead to a major disaster for the whole world. We have long heard the exhortation that peace is indivisible but looking at our own regions of Asia and Africa where armed conflicts of varying magnitudes have continued unceasingly one wonders whether the cost of peace in Europe and the West is being paid for elsewhere.

These last remarks may be regarded as a facile over-simplification. But I had more than just armed confrontations in mind. The heavier and more damaging toll of the arms race is the inflation that ravages our economies and like any epidemic knows no frontiers. Even those regions in which a tenuous peace prevails have to pay the price, and we in the Third World are much less able to bear that burden. I may have diverged from the purposes of our Committee by introducing this issue but it is not without relevance. Earlier in my remarks I referred to Sri Lanka's membership in this Committee being a tacit acknowledgement of the contribution that militarily less significant States can make to disarmament. There is another way in which we can make a contribution and that is as one of those countries variously described as developing, as least developed and most seriously affected and we are not alone in this respect in this Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I have in the course of my remarks sought to outline our approach to some of the important issues before this Committee. Assembled as we are in this Council Chamber we can scarcely forget the long efforts of those who laboured before us, within these same walls, to bring about the disarmament which is also our goal. Their experience makes us even more aware that our work is the continuation of a long process of seeking to establish the climate of confidence and co-operation that would allow for real progress towards the limitation of armaments without risk to national security. We know that we shall have to be content with limited successes and also accept disappointments. Yet we have no alternative but to persist in our efforts. May I conclude by assuring you, Mr. Chairman, of my delegation's fullest co-operation in the work of this Committee.

Mr. PEACOCK (Australia): Arms control and disarmament are the gravest problems facing the world today. Solutions are imperative. I know that we share a joint belief that solutions are possible, and this is the reason that the Committee on Disarmament is meeting for the first time today. I need not remind you that there has in the past been a lack of substantial progress in reaching effective arms control and disarmament measures. The special session, however, marked a turning point, because it was there that Governments demonstrated a willingness to confront directly the problems of conventional and nuclear arms build up. We must maintain this impetus.

Two elements are basic to any solution to the arms race. They are, first, the eradication of the causes of fear and, second, the encouragement of international stability. These will inevitably lead to a growth in international confidence. No single country can introduce confidence-building measures independently. Australia, like other middle Powers, is in no position to decide global issues of war and peace. Collectively, however, we can do much to foster an international climate more conducive to arms control and disarmament. It is within the framework of multilateral negotiations on arms control and disarmament measures that individual countries, bringing their own particular perspectives to bear, may be able to make original contributions. We would greatly welcome the participation of the People's Republic of China which, as a nuclear-weapon State, has a particularly valuable contribution to make.

Australia welcomes the opportunity to participate in this Committee -- an opportunity which affords closer involvement in the elaboration of practical measures to restrict the growth in armaments, both nuclear and conventional.

Practical measures directed to the avoidance of nuclear conflict must have a high priority for this Committee. The strong opposition of successive Australian Governments to the escalation of the nuclear arms race and to the spread of nuclear weapons is well known. We are committed to the continuing negotiation of measures to limit the production, distribution and use of these weapons. The problems involved are complex and difficult, and we recognize that there are no easy or quick solutions. In particular, the reduction of nuclear arsenals must ensure a stable strategic balance and thus the maintenance of international confidence.

At the same time, we need to remember that progress in the control of nuclear arms must always be related to similar progress in restricting conventional

(Mr. Peacock, Australia)

armaments. Given present levels of conventional arms, nuclear weapons remain an essential element in preserving the stability of the strategic balance and therefore the structure of international security.

Australia believes that the starting point for further progress in nuclear arms control should be the establishment of an international environment which will remove the motivation to possess nuclear weapons, deter their acquisition and provide non-nuclear-weapon States with security against nuclear attack. Our efforts need to embrace:

- substantial limitations and subsequent reductions in existing nuclear arsenals;
- the complete cessation of nuclear weapons testing in all environments;
- the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons to countries not yet possessing them;
- measures to ensure that the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes does not contribute to the proliferation of nuclear weapons;
- the cessation of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons purposes;
- satisfactory security assurances for non-nuclear weapon States; and
- confidence-building measures which will limit the danger of nuclear war through miscalculation or the failure of communication.

There has already been some progress in a number of these areas. Unless, however, we pursue the process of nuclear arms control on a broad front, covering both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the problem, there is a danger that progress in one area may be retarded by lack of momentum in another.

Of the matters facing this Committee, the elaboration of a treaty prohibiting nuclear-weapon testing in all environments is of primary importance and deserves the earliest attention. The United Nations General Assembly expressed in December its sincere hope that the negotiating Powers would present a CTB agreement to the Committee by the time it began its deliberations. It is to be regretted that this has not been possible. The negotiating Powers should be urged to do their utmost to ensure that a CTB text is presented to the Committee during this first session.

Even before the agreement is presented here, Australia believes the Committee could begin addressing the technical and operational aspects of an international seismic detection network, the study of which was initiated by the Committee's

(Mr. Peacock, Australia)

predecessor. A full experimental exercise of the proposed network should proceed without delay. This is essential if there is to be any possibility that an international verification system is to be operational by the time the Committee has completed its work in the drafting of a multilateral CTB treaty.

A widely accepted CTB treaty will be a significant milestone in arms control and disarmament efforts. It will be a barrier to both the spread of nuclear weapons and the expansion of existing nuclear arsenals. It will contribute to a greater level of confidence among States in all regions of the world. It will also provide the opportunity for building further upon international verification procedures of the kind incorporated in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Looking beyond the CTB, as part of the effort to enhance further the restraints on both the vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons, the Committee could profitably turn its attention to the proposal for an agreement halting the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons purposes. Such an agreement would be a further barrier to the spread of nuclear weapons to additional countries by preventing the development of untested nuclear weapons. It would also place a limit on the quantity of fissionable material available to the nuclear-weapon States for weapons production and thus be an effective measure towards scaling down the nuclear arms race.

Australia does not underestimate the difficulties of implementing and verifying an international agreement of this kind. We acknowledge that it would involve the development of an adequate system of full-scope safeguards accepted by both nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States. Australia's own activities in the safeguards field are well known. They need no elaboration here except to say that a rigorous, comprehensive and universally applicable system of safeguards would make the non-proliferation régime even more effective. We believe that an agreement halting the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons purposes would be a substantial achievement.

I turn now to the question of measures to restrain the growth in conventional arsenals. The present high level of conventional arms expenditure is a symptom of the underlying tensions and lack of confidence which persist between States. It is conventional arms which have inflicted the suffering and destruction experienced in many parts of the world since World War II. It is also conventional

(Mr. Peacock, Australia)

arms which are currently absorbing such a large proportion of national budgets. If significant reductions in military expenditures could be achieved in a manner which provided countries with undiminished security at a lower level of armament, this would do much to help reduce international tensions and to assist the release of resources, both nationally and internationally, for economic and social development.

The regulation of conventional armaments and military budgets, however, raises a multitude of issues which countries perceive as directly affecting their legitimate security interests. Such regulation would need to include the negotiation of agreements for placing restrictions on the production, transfer, acquisition and use of conventional weapons. This is an area of great complexity affecting all States. It is, nevertheless, incumbent upon this Committee to take a fresh look at conventional arms control and to seek approaches which are practical, achievable and contribute to security at lower levels of armament.

The control of chemical weapons represents an aspect of conventional arms control where practical measures are immediately possible. The question of a chemical warfare convention has been under consideration in the Committee's predecessor for some years. Together with the comprehensive test-ban treaty, this is an immediate task for the Committee. It is a complex issue and one which will take up a considerable amount of the Committee's time. Nevertheless, all nations represented here which are parties to the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention have undertaken in the terms of article IX of that Convention to reach early agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and for the destruction of present stocks. We are also enjoined by the Biological Weapons Convention to negotiate appropriate measures concerning equipment and means of delivery specifically designed for the production or use of chemical agents for weapons purposes. Australia regards this as an urgent matter. Chemical weapons remain the principal category of weapons of mass destruction still to be subject to a régime of control. A chemical weapons convention would be a logical extension to the Biological Weapons Convention and the Geneva Protocol of 1925.

A chemical weapons convention ought to be comprehensive in its framework and cover specified chemical agents. Its application would need to be gradual but we

(Mr. Peacock, Australia)

I believe there would be merit in spelling out the time-frame in the convention. Nevertheless, such a convention will only be as good as the verification procedures written into it. It is essential, I believe, that these should involve an exchange of information about chemical weapons stocks and manufacture of substances, consultations and, above all, on-site inspection to certify not only the destruction of stocks, but also that proscribed chemicals are not being manufactured by units producing similar chemical substances.

The Committee's predecessor achieved a good deal in this area. Further substantial progress, however, must await the joint initiative promised in 1976 by the United States and the Soviet Union. It would be helpful if those countries were to conclude their negotiations as soon as possible, so that we may have the negotiating text of a chemical weapons convention in this Committee this year.

This Committee on Disarmament assumes today its place as the principal multilateral negotiating body on arms control and disarmament issues. There remains an important and in some cases essential role for bilateral or regional negotiations on disarmament questions. This Committee, however, which has a more representative membership than its predecessor, should have a central role in the achievement of the objectives of arms control and disarmament set down by the special session of the United Nations General Assembly on Disarmament in its Final Document and of progress towards the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The Committee will need to adopt a rigorous work programme. While taking advantage of the experience of its predecessor, it might look beyond the established and yet-to-be completed arms control agenda and seek out new initiatives and solutions.

We must seize every opportunity to stem and if possible reverse the steadily mounting worldwide build-up and costs of ever more lethal arms, both conventional and nuclear. Albert Einstein's words remain true.

"We must never relax our efforts to arouse in the people of the world, and especially in their Governments, an awareness of the unprecedented disaster which they are absolutely certain to bring on themselves unless there is a fundamental change in their attitudes towards one another as well as in their concept of the future. The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything except our way of thinking."

Mr. BLIX (Sweden): In 1962 I participated in the start of the work of the ENDC. The approach to the disarmament work was bolder then than now. General and complete disarmament, which continues to be the final goal, was then seen as the immediate object of negotiation. Other and more specific tasks were grouped together under the headline of "collateral" measures.

It was not long, however, before the formidable difficulties in tackling the problem of general and complete disarmament led ENDC to focus on specific areas. The "collateral" measures became the main object of negotiations. To our disappointment, even the drastically lowered ambitions have proved immensely difficult to fulfil. Some results have been registered, but it is sad to note that items which were before us in 1962 are still before us -- unresolved. This is notably true of a complete test ban. It would be discouraging, indeed, if that issue were not solved in the course of this year.

I need not elaborate on the grave consequences of these failures, on the direct military and political risks connected with the bulging stocks of arms, on the staggering waste of scarce resources badly needed to satisfy human needs. But I would like to dwell, for a moment, on the reasons for the failures. Let me say, at the outset, that I do not think they are found in a lack of will to attain results. Nor do I think that the military-industrial complexes are a decisive obstacle, although their vested interests no doubt play a role. By far the most important factor, I think, is the lack of confidence between blocs and States. For this problem there are, I fear, only long term remedies. Deepening of détente does not flow from declarations alone. Confidence comes from consistent conduct by States, especially the big military Powers. From respect for agreements, pledges and international norms. From responsible action in all fields of frictions. From unilateral restraint to avoid prompting responses. From a readiness to turn to negotiations. In the long run better behaviour all around will produce a climate of confidence. In such a climate much can be attained that is impossible in an atmosphere of distrust.

(Mr. Blix, Sweden)

We cannot, however, content ourselves with hopes for the future. We must seek disarmament even in the climate such as it is today. And we know that just as confidence can facilitate disarmament, so can disarmament measures promote confidence.

It is natural that we look at the various fora in which disarmament is negotiated. It is striking that different parts of one and the same process -- the disarmament process -- are considered in different fora by different methods and according to different time schedules. A serious consequence is that the coverage is incomplete. It is particularly serious that the qualitative arms race largely escapes the terms of reference of some negotiations.

On this occasion the Swedish Government wishes to express its hopes for a successful work in the Committee. We welcome the presence of the new members. With their assistance we must jointly work to create the credibility of this body as our negotiating instrument.

Both the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the subsequent thirty-third session of the General Assembly have requested the CD to negotiate a number of specific disarmament measures. I should, however, underline that in addition to these requests the CD must in principle be allowed, even obliged, to discuss the disarmament problem comprehensively. Indeed, as I recalled at the outset, the first task of negotiation was general and complete disarmament. Thus, in our view the CD must in principle always be able to initiate or resume negotiations in areas where the CCD was involved or in other areas where it appears justified for generally agreed reasons. My Government hopes that the rule of consensus will be applied so as to admit such a procedure whenever practical results can thereby be hoped for.

I should like to dwell for a moment on some further comments on this new body. Last year's special session of the General Assembly marked the beginning of a new phase of the efforts of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. A number of countries became more actively involved in the disarmament efforts and an extensive plan of action was worked out in consensus at the session. An important object of the deliberations where concrete results were reached was

(Mr. Blix, Sweden)

the new negotiating body that would be the main instrument to implement the plan of action. The multilateral negotiations now make a new start with an enlarged membership and with new rules of procedure which we hope will make the body a more efficient tool for disarmament efforts.

The organizational change reflects also the responsibility which we all have to contribute to substantial results. Indeed, the risks to which the arms race exposes so many countries give them all a right and a duty to voice their concern, irrespectively of military strength. The growing interdependence between nations and regions restricts the possibilities of States to act without affecting other countries. This is dangerously true in the arms race situation, where any miscalculated action can ignite much worse things than powder kegs.

The global interdependence which subjects us to the dangers of sparks anywhere and gives us all a legitimate interest in the disarmament talks has also made the East-West imprint less dominant. The perspective is broadened. One new dimension is the relationship between disarmament and development, which will be studied as decided by the special session. Indeed, the Group of Governmental Experts is at present working on this matter in another room of this very building. It is the hope of the Swedish Government that the work will lead to concrete recommendations which will benefit the developing countries, as envisaged in the Nordic proposal and in the decision of the General Assembly.

The legitimate concern that all States have in the disarmament process does not negate the special responsibility of the leading military Powers. The General Assembly at its special session on disarmament unequivocally placed it upon them. Indeed, they are the ones who have the most to disarm. Today the outlays for military purposes of the two military alliances constitute around 70 per cent of the world total annual expenditures for such purposes. The United States and the Soviet Union alone stand for 60 per cent. Various international estimates indicate that, in the case of the United States, around 6 per cent of the gross national product go to military purposes and 0.22 per cent to foreign assistance. In the case of the Soviet Union,

(Mr. Blix, Sweden)

11-13 per cent of the GNP are estimated to go to military purposes, while the percentage of GNP devoted to foreign assistance is estimated to be much lower than that of the United States. At the same time the developing countries' share of world military outlays has increased from 6 to around 14 per cent in ten years.

The CD inaugurates its work in a complex situation of arms build-up. Some of the most worrisome problems relate to the qualitative military build-up. They are gradually changing the prospects and character of disarmament work. New weapons, which are more difficult to detect, challenge the possibilities of verification and could narrow the margins of confidence in disarmament agreements. The development of new models and new types of nuclear weapons and launchers, as well as their deployment in sensitive regions, is deeply worrying. Other problems relate more specifically to the ongoing upgrading of the conventional capabilities of both military blocs. Further on, the risks of an extension of the arms race to the outer space seem acute, despite the fact that the clearly stated aim of the Outer Space Treaty of 1967 is that outer space remains a domain of peaceful development. And the arms race in the oceans is taking new and tension building dimensions. The problems are thus piling up. What is done?

For a considerable time the international community has been following the attempts by the leading military Powers and blocs to agree bilaterally and regionally on reductions of their respective nuclear and conventional capabilities. SALT, the Vienna talks and the Soviet-United States discussions on the issue of conventional arms sales are some prominent examples. These attempts, which have so far led to little progress, focus to a considerable degree on quantitative aspects. However, qualitative aspects relating to new weapons technology are often decisive for the final results.

Nuclear disarmament is the highest priority on the international agenda. The SALT negotiations occupy a key role in the détente efforts. Even if a SALT II treaty will not entail substantial reductions of arsenals and qualitative restraints, we have no doubt that it will be of great significance.

(Mr. Blix, Sweden)

It is vital that the negotiating process continues in respect of the strategic arsenals both in order to create confidence and to reach more decisive results. That is why my Government stresses that a SALT II treaty must be followed speedily by a substantial SALT III agreement. Progress in this field is of undisputed importance in its own right. It has also a direct influence on the attempts to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons.

A comprehensive ban on all nuclear-weapon tests has been the highest priority item on the agenda of the CCD for a long time. The Swedish Government is deeply disappointed that it was not possible for the three negotiating nuclear-weapon States to conclude their negotiations so as to make it possible for the CCD even to initiate negotiations on a treaty. Only a few weeks ago the United Nations General Assembly again made urgent appeals to the three States to expedite their negotiations. In two different resolutions, which were both adopted by very large majorities, the General Assembly called upon the three States to submit the draft of such a treaty to the CD at the beginning of this first session. The Swedish Government has over the years made frequent appeals in the same direction, recently with increased emphasis. We know that many other States have made similar efforts. It has many times been stressed from the Swedish side that a CTBT constitutes no disarmament measure. It would, however, be highly instrumental in the efforts to prevent further qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons. It would thus contribute substantially to the curbing of the nuclear arms race, hopefully initiating its reversal. It would create confidence that the present nuclear arms race may not be slipping completely out of control. A CTBT would also be of a great importance for the efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation. If it is confirmed that further postponement cannot be avoided in the trilateral negotiations I suggest that the three Powers give the members of the Committee a full account of the remaining difficulties.

In my view international attention will be increasingly focused in the coming years on three different aspects of the present arms race and disarmament efforts.

(Mr. Blix, Sweden)

The first aspect is the planning, testing, production and deployment of new weapons.

The second aspect is the ongoing negotiations concerning weapons and weapons systems already deployed or close to deployment.

The third aspect regards the possible inclusion in negotiations of weapons and weapons systems which have so far not been included.

As regards the first aspect, the gravity of the present situation makes it natural to expect the leading military Powers to make efforts to reorient their military research and development to projects which lend themselves more easily to arms control and disarmament. A natural element of such an effort could be to introduce administrative practices whereby the possible effects on the arms race and disarmament efforts are analysed, whenever important weapon decisions are made -- that is when projects are defined, researchers enlisted, production decisions are taken and deployment measures envisaged.

The CD could be useful in the same context by calling attention to the dangers of early military applications of scientific advances. Whenever scientific discoveries of indisputable relevance occur and there is reasonable ground for fears that they will be used for military purposes, it seems natural that this Committee should be able to discuss the issue.

Let me then make a few general remarks in relation to the second aspect, the assessment of ongoing negotiations. The CD should, in my view, have an overview of their progress or lack of progress. It should be especially attentive to a continued build-up of military capacities.

The mutual concessions which the leading military Powers must make globally or in sensitive regions, in order to reach substantial negotiated results, might have to be of different types and might have to be made in different fora. The strategic and geographic positions, political systems and alliance patterns of the two leading Powers and the military blocs differ considerably. So do often the solutions they choose to their specific defence planning problems. Although I have been stressing the qualitative side of armaments, it is evident

(Mr. Blix, Sweden)

that quantitative factors in respect of military forces necessarily build and sustain tension as well as qualitative factors. The operational capacity of military forces is a combination of both. In this context I wish to stress the importance of making renewed efforts to reach results in the Vienna talks on force reductions in Central Europe. Such results could considerably improve the security situation in Europe. We trust that any agreement takes due account also of the legitimate security interests of those European countries, which have not been involved in the negotiations.

The matter of verification of arms control agreements has been a stumbling block in disarmament negotiations for many years. This is true also of the ongoing negotiations. It is now widely recognized and accepted, however, that a 100 per cent assurance against covert violation of disarmament agreements is neither possible nor necessary. What is necessary and possible is adequate verification -- that is, a control system which makes the risks of discovery high enough to make it politically too risky to attempt any violations. We are convinced that, for instance, the seismic verification of a test ban can be made efficient enough to deter from clandestine violations of a CTB agreement. The CCD, and from now on the CD, Ad hoc Group of Seismic Experts, has already made considerable progress. Its goal is the designing of a suitable network of seismic monitoring stations for the surveillance of a CTBT. A key role in such a network would be played by seismic data centres. I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate the offer made by the Swedish Government a year ago to establish, finance and operate a seismic data centre in Sweden. I would like to add in this context that in the course of this year Sweden intends to demonstrate the main functions to be performed by such a centre.

The third aspect mentioned earlier concerns the inclusion in actual negotiations of weapons which have so far not been directly dealt with in bilateral or multilateral fora. In this context the Swedish Government has insistently focused attention on the large sectors of nuclear weapons which fall outside SALT. These are weapons which are being rapidly modernized with

(Mr. Blix, Sweden)

different consequences for doctrines and force dispositions. They constitute, together with strategic weapons, a growing threat to détente and involve risks of conflict by accident in situations of crisis.

It was against this background that last summer the Swedish Government formulated some suggestions in the CCD regarding nuclear weapons intended for use in Europe. We reverted to the subject at the thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly. This is also why we made our views unmistakably clear on the neutron weapon, which apparently could be made operational by both super-Powers. One of the characteristics of the neutron weapon, which we strongly object to, is that it could lower the nuclear threshold. I wish, however, to underline that it is not only disarmament and general security policy considerations which have led my Government to formulate its reaction to the neutron weapon so explicitly and emphatically. Our reaction is also based on the humanitarian principles which protect life above objects.

The debate and the reactions provoked by the neutron weapon must not obscure the shockingly inhumane character of all nuclear weapons and their inherent purpose of mass destruction, as well as the accrued risks which the continued build-up of these weapons imply. The Swedish Government has formally put questions to the nuclear Powers of the CCD as to their future plans regarding specifically those nuclear weapons which fall outside SALT. The weapons concerned are medium and intermediate range nuclear ballistic missiles, including e.g. the SS-20, as well as tactical nuclear weapons, including the so-called mini-nukes and the neutron weapon. We welcome the fact that the United Kingdom has already presented its replies to the questions. We insist on the issue because of the particular risks which these weapons would present in a military conflict and because of the obstacles they present to détente in Europe. I express my hope that the United States and the Soviet Union will indicate their positions in respect to the same questions.

Among issues which merit increased attention is the continued arms race in the oceans and its consequences as regards the sea bed. The first Review Conference of the Sea-Bed Treaty left a legacy to the CCD to look closer

(Mr. Blix, Sweden)

at relevant technological developments which have taken place after the conclusion of the treaty. The CD has inherited the responsibility to fulfil this task. We therefore foresee its inclusion on the agenda of CD's future activities.

The entire issue of naval capacities and operations and the possibilities of restrictions in this domain have so far drawn very little active attention. Up to now only some sectors and aspects have been discussed and led to practical action. For instance, the number of submarine-based ballistic missiles have been restricted in SALT I. Further on the two leading military Powers made an agreement in 1972 on the prevention of incidents on and over the high seas. Confidence-building measures related to naval manoeuvres were discussed at the CSCE, but did not lead to any agreement.

As an integral part of the massive military resources of the leading Powers, naval forces must, of course, be included in any over-all assessment of the arms race situation and its implications for various negotiations.

Another important weapons sector which should be taken note of in the negotiating process comprises certain conventional weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects. I should like to call your attention to the United Nations conference which will take place here in Geneva on this subject in September and which will be preceded by a Preparatory Conference in March-April. This conference will present a unique opportunity to come to grips, for humanitarian reasons, with certain excessive and indiscriminate side effects of modern technology in the conventional weapons field. The main issues are quite clear. First, the conference must, in our view, agree on a ban or far-reaching restrictions on the use of incendiary weapons. No conventional weapons have been so widely condemned for their cruel effects and potential indiscriminateness as the incendiaries, particularly napalm and other flame weapons. The call which has gone out inter alia from the Heads of State of Non-aligned Countries should be heeded. We urge all States, and particularly the great Powers, to make a maximum effort to reach a far-reaching ban on the use of incendiaries.

(Mr. Blix, Sweden)

Secondly, we must take action to ensure that the new generation of the world's probably most common weapon -- the automatic rifle -- will not be so designed -- weapon and projectile -- that there is an escalation of injury as compared with the traditional 7.62 mm rifle. There is no doubt any longer that it is perfectly possible to design a high-velocity, small-calibre weapon which does not increase the wounding effects beyond presently used calibres. Manufacturers and Governments bear a heavy responsibility to see to it that present developments and designs, as well as pending procurements, will not run counter to the legitimate humanitarian concern that there be no excessively injurious rifles commissioned for national armies and defence alliances.

In other conventional weapons areas, such as those of mines and booby-traps, there seem to be good prospects for international agreement in 1979. It will be impossible, however, to qualify the projected conference as successful, unless there are tangible and workable results also in the incendiaries and small calibre weapons field.

I urge all Governments, particularly those of the great Powers and their allies, to undertake to negotiate in good faith agreements in the areas I have mentioned. The disarmament gains, properly speaking, will be limited. But the humanitarian gains would be great, indeed.

Different aspects of the arms race which I have touched upon invite a more systematic consideration of the issue of confidence-building measures. In a situation where a genuine process of disarmament is still to be embarked upon, the concept of confidence-building measures constitutes an indispensable approach in efforts to sustain and deepen détente, while in no way working as a substitute for real disarmament. We generally talk about confidence-building measures in the CSCE context. The next follow-up of the CSCE in Madrid 1980 is an important occasion to pursue further results in the confidence-building measures issue. At the same time it is clear that such measures may be very general or very specific in their character and functions. They can precede disarmament agreements and pave the way for them by enhancing détente. They can form part of them and make them more complete. They may even become the main substance of an agreement, if the initial disarmament purpose cannot be immediately achieved.

(Mr. Blix, Sweden)

The United Nations special session on disarmament and the thirty-third session of the General Assembly have seen the presentation of several initiatives which focus attention on this issue. At the same time they underline the importance of exploring regional solutions to arms race problems. Such regional approaches, which can take the characteristics of each situation into account has the full support of my Government. Latin American experiences and initiatives are widely known and of great interest in this regard. The Belgian proposal for a comprehensive study of all the aspects of regional disarmament has also rightly attracted substantial support in the General Assembly. I would also like to note that one of the French proposals at the special session focuses on regional confidence-building measures.

The CSCE led to some specific agreements on confidence-building measures regarding prior notification of military manoeuvres and exchange of observers. The Swedish Government has already indicated its view that further progress on this road is both needed and possible. One of several possibilities could be restrictions regarding such military manoeuvres and movements which could easily create concern or give rise to speculations.

I would argue that a broad outlook should inspire confidence-building efforts in the various fora, including the CD. Restrictions on movements of the most threatening concentrations of military forces appear increasingly logical. I am now thinking of the European scene. Such restrictions could counterbalance the gradually increased capacity of military forces in this region of the world. In principle such restrictions may concern troops or armaments or both. Conventional, chemical, nuclear or others. It has to be kept in mind, however, that the tension-building effects of weapons do not depend exclusively on the actual deployment of troops or their movements. Again a European illustration is the presence, quantity, and continuous upgrading and deployment in sensitive regions of short-range and medium-range nuclear weapons. Confidence can only be built by clear evidence of restraints in deployment of these weapons and by successful efforts to integrate them in a concrete negotiating process leading to comprehensive disarmament measures.

(Mr. Blix, Sweden)

Another example of the importance of restraint has regard to chemical weapons. These weapons represent a potential threat. Their tension-building effect is accentuated by the fact that they can be rapidly assembled. Here we are faced with a military capacity which can be prepared in advance and made operative at relatively short notice.

Worried voices can be heard in the international debate. They make us aware of the possibility that chemical weapons have already been deployed. The legal threshold against the use of chemical weapons, represented by the ban contained in the Geneva Protocol of 1925, must not be undermined. The temptation to use these terrible weapons would be much less significant if different steps of practical preparation for their possible use are not taken. Inhibitions should be strengthened and not undermined. It is imperative to heed the annual resolutions by the United Nations General Assembly urging the CD to give the question of chemical weapons high priority. The CD, therefore, inherits a heavy responsibility to complete at last the work on a CW convention. Even in the absence of such a convention there should be restraints in the planning, organizing and training for a chemical warfare capability. Restrictions on training should in our view also be included in a convention. Such restrictions would have to take account, of course, of the necessity that preparations for protective purposes be allowed under a CW convention.

Let me conclude where I started and underline the role of confidence-building measures as an integral part of the disarmament work. They are equally vital in the short-term and in the long-term perspective. Concrete disarmament measures must be pursued -- and may be achieved -- even in a climate of considerable distrust. But results are more likely to emerge -- and to endure in a climate of confidence. Our task in this Committee is to spare no efforts in carrying on the work performed by the CCD. This should be done both by measures which build confidence and by finally concluding tangible disarmament agreements. The important legacy left to us by the special session in its programme of action should inspire and direct these efforts.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Mr. Chairman, the Soviet delegation associates itself with the congratulations and good wishes which have already been extended to you.

An honourable and responsible task has fallen to you, Mr. Chairman, the task of starting the work of the enlarged Committee on Disarmament. We extend our greetings to the Foreign Ministers who have come for the opening of the session, as well as to all other distinguished representatives. We wish all of them success in solving the complicated problems facing the Committee on Disarmament.

We attach great importance to the fact that for the first time France is taking part in the work of the multilateral negotiating body on disarmament. We are gratified that Cuba, Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Indonesia, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Venezuela have become members of the Committee.

A message of greetings to the Committee on Disarmament has been sent by L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. May I read out the text of this message.

"To the Committee on Disarmament, Geneva

"As the enlarged Committee on Disarmament begins its work I extend greetings to all of its participants and wish them success in solving the complex problems before this, the main forum for multilateral negotiations on ending the arms race and achieving disarmament.

"The time has come for States and peoples, and for statesmen, who bear responsibility for the lives and well-being of their countries, to realize fully the real meaning of the alternative with which mankind is now confronted: either the arms race will be stopped and reversed -- and then peaceful principles will, at last assert themselves irrevocably in inter-State relations -- or the course of events will again lead to dangerous balancing on the brink of war, with all the attendant adverse consequences for the relaxation of tension, for normalization of inter-State relations and for the solution of world economic problems. There can be only one choice here: the efforts to bring about a decisive turn in the struggle to stop the arms race must be doubled, trebled, increased ten-fold.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

"A major role in this great undertaking belongs to the Committee on Disarmament. Its agenda includes such fundamental questions as nuclear disarmament measures; complete and general cessation of nuclear weapon tests; prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons; prohibition of the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction, including neutron weapons; reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments; reduction of military budgets. It would be no exaggeration to say that the future of all peoples and the future course of world history largely depend on the solution of these questions.

"Over the years of its activities the Committee on Disarmament has had much experience of thorough and comprehensive consideration of extremely complex problems, as well as of the preparation and negotiation of multilateral agreements, which have limited the arms race in certain areas. This experience must be put to good use.

"This year the Committee on Disarmament is beginning its work on a more representative basis: it includes States, nuclear and non-nuclear, in different continents, in different regions of the world, members of military alliances and non-aligned countries. This broadens opportunities for a comparison of views on concrete questions to be considered by the Committee, for bringing out constructive ideas, for selecting proposals conducive to progress in the matter of stopping the arms race. These opportunities must also be used fully.

"The Soviet Union intends to do everything it can to make the work of the Committee on Disarmament a success. The series of proposals for stopping the arms race, which we submitted at last year's United Nations General Assembly special session devoted to disarmament, and then at the thirty-third regular session of the General Assembly, is known to all. In the Moscow Declaration of 23 November 1978, the Soviet Union, together with other socialist member countries of the Warsaw Treaty, once more appealed for quicker progress in solving the principal problems of disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament. We have worked and will continue to work most actively and with a sense of purpose in this direction.

"In conveying to the Committee on Disarmament my good wishes for success, I express the hope that 1979 will see its activities produce the practical results which are awaited by all nations of the world and on which people in all parts of the globe are pinning their hopes for a more durable and lasting peace.

L. BREZHNEV."

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Mr. Chairman, what is needed now as never before is decisive progress in the direction of curtailing the arms race, releasing the vast material resources which are spent on it and converting them to peaceful creative purposes. For achieving this, there are favourable prerequisites. We see them above all in the fact that, as was manifested at the special session devoted to disarmament and at the thirty-third regular session of the United Nations General Assembly, the overwhelming majority of States attach primary importance to the solution of the problem of disarmament.

Unfortunately, however, one has to take into consideration the fact that there is also another tendency -- a tendency to continue building up armaments on far-fetched and artificial pretexts.

In conditions in which these opposing tendencies are confronting one another, purposeful efforts by all States, large and small, and their creative and constructive co-operation in the field of disarmament acquire special significance. The Committee on Disarmament is called upon to play an important role in this matter. Whether the world will be able to break loose from the arms race which has engulfed it, or will slide further down the armaments accumulation slope, will depend largely on this.

We would like to remind you that the Soviet Union, unswervingly following the course of peace and putting into practice the programme for the struggle for peace and international co-operation, and for the freedom and independence of peoples put forward by the Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth Congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, has made an extensive series of proposals in the field of disarmament. They were formulated and substantiated in the document entitled "Practical measures for ending the arms race: proposals of the Soviet Union", submitted by the USSR to the special session of the United Nations General Assembly. Some of these proposals were developed at the thirty-third session of the Assembly.

We are gratified that these proposals and initiatives, which cover practically all the main aspects of the problem of disarmament, have met with extensive international support and have been reflected in United Nations decisions. Together with the constructive ideas and proposals of other States aimed at the adoption of effective measures in the field of military détente, they form the necessary basis for solving an extremely important task of international politics in the present-day conditions -- the task of bringing about a speedy and decisive breakthrough in solving disarmament questions.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have also made important proposals on disarmament questions at the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, and at the Belgrade Conference on Co-operation and Security in Europe. A meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty has recently been held in Moscow. In the Declaration adopted at this meeting, the participants confirmed that there is no type of weapon which they would not be ready to limit or reduce on the basis of strict observance of the principle of not impairing the security of any country.

What, in our view, is the content of the forthcoming work of the Committee on Disarmament?

It is generally recognized that task number one in the field of disarmament is the task of taking all necessary measures to limit the nuclear arms race and achieve nuclear disarmament. It is precisely for this reason that priority consideration of nuclear disarmament measures has been and still is the guiding principle in the work of the Committee on Disarmament. Now, when already four out of the five nuclear Powers are directly taking part in the work of the Committee on Disarmament, this area of its activities acquires even greater practical importance.

Given the readiness of all nuclear Powers members of the Committee to solve questions of nuclear disarmament, the consideration of these questions in the Committee can henceforth be more comprehensive and substantial -- though it should not, of course, be forgotten that decisions taken in this area, be it in the Committee on Disarmament or in another forum, can be of real value only when all nuclear Powers without exception participate in the decision making. We would like to hope that the time will come when the leaders of the People's Republic of China will abandon their negativist position on questions of disarmament and, in a constructive spirit, will take part in business-like negotiations.

The solution of the cardinal problem of nuclear disarmament is far from being easy, it requires especially great efforts and persistence. However, this problem can be solved, and we cannot evade it. There is no other reasonable

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

alternative. Guided by these considerations, the Soviet Union has recently made a proposal for the practical preparation of negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing stockpiles of such weapons until they have been completely destroyed.

The special session of the United Nations observed that "the achievement of nuclear disarmament will require urgent negotiation" (paragraph 50 of the Final Document). In one of its resolutions, the thirty-third session of the General Assembly also pointed to the need for "an early initiation of urgent negotiations on the halting of the nuclear arms race". We believe that the time has come to get down to business.

At present it is necessary, first of all, to hold consultations concerning the practical initiation of negotiations of this kind, for which purpose the Committee on Disarmament, as we see it, is an appropriate body. In the course of such preparatory consultations, it would be necessary to solve questions connected with the organizational aspect of the negotiations, and to consider alternative methods of preparing for them and conducting them. We believe that consultations of this kind should be held already during the current session of the Committee on Disarmament, with a view to starting substantive negotiations already in 1979.

Clearly, the subject of the negotiations should be specifically outlined. The subject of negotiations, we believe, should be the cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons, covering the cessation of the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons; the cessation of the production of their components, including fissionable materials for military purposes and means of delivery; the gradual reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their elimination.

Naturally, the implementation of measures in the field of nuclear disarmament should go hand in hand with the adoption of international political and legal measures for strengthening the security of all States.

The Soviet delegation has some other considerations on this question which it intends to submit to the Committee on Disarmament in the form of a special document at a later stage. We believe that, in the agenda which we are to elaborate, nuclear disarmament should occupy the main place.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Obviously, consideration of the question of the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States should be an important item in the work of the Committee on Disarmament. As is known, the thirty-third session of the General Assembly recommended the Committee on Disarmament to consider all proposals and suggestions concerning effective political and legal measures at the international level to give the non-nuclear-weapon States guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The work of the Committee on Disarmament in this area could, from the very beginning, be of a concrete nature. When making its proposal at the United Nations General Assembly, the Soviet Union simultaneously submitted a draft international convention on the subject. The Soviet delegation suggests that provision should be made in the time-table of the current session of the Committee on Disarmament for the discussion of this question.

One of the important tasks of the Committee on Disarmament, is still the elaboration of measures for the prohibition of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. On one particular aspect of this question -- the prohibition of radiological weapons -- bilateral negotiations will be resumed in the near future. However, we would like to emphasize once more that the prohibition of one or another new variety of weapon of mass destruction, as each variety is identified, is not in itself enough. It does not provide any guarantees against the continuation of the never-ending chase after super-weapons, against the spending of an ever-increasing proportion of intellectual and financial resources for these unproductive and dangerous purposes, or against the maintenance of distrust between States which is engendered by this kind of competition. The objective should be to put an end altogether to any projects in this area; and, to achieve this, it is necessary to conclude a comprehensive agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. In this connexion, the Soviet delegation would like to draw the attention of the Committee on Disarmament

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

to the request made by the thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly that the Committee should actively continue negotiations, with the assistance of qualified experts, with a view to agreeing on the text of such an agreement.

In March 1978, the socialist States submitted for the consideration of the Committee on Disarmament a draft convention on the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of nuclear neutron weapons. We believe that consideration of this draft should be continued.

Other questions of great importance are still the problem of a general and complete cessation of nuclear-weapon tests, and the problem of the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons. They require a solution without delay, and the efforts of the Soviet Union in the relevant negotiations are directed precisely towards this goal.

The Soviet delegation has dwelt only on the questions which it considers to be most important, and for the solution of which the Committee on Disarmament will have to work in the immediate future. The scope of the work to be accomplished in the Committee is very broad. In these conditions it is important to ensure that the procedure of the Committee, which it is to adopt, will help to increase its capacity for work and its effectiveness. The basis for these rules was agreed upon at the special session devoted to disarmament. We believe that questions of procedure should not be overestimated and should not take too much of the Committee's time; they should be solved as soon as possible so that the Committee can successfully start the consideration of questions of substance.

The Soviet Union is ready to do everything in its power to ensure that the Committee on Disarmament fulfils its purpose, justifies the hopes which the international community places on it and actively contributes -- by elaborating appropriate measures -- to the limitation and elimination of the material basis of war. I may assure you that any constructive proposals in this direction will meet with the most positive response from the Soviet delegation. Other delegations may count on active co-operation from our side.

Lord GORONWY-ROBERTS (United Kingdom): I am particularly glad to be present at the first meeting of the Committee on Disarmament.

I salute my colleagues from the old Committee whose faces I recognize around this table. I offer warm greetings to the new participants who are appearing here for the first time, including the distinguished representative of France, whose country made such a constructive contribution to discussion of disarmament in 1978. I hope it will not be long before the People's Republic of China takes its seat in this Committee.

For my Government, the opening of the Committee on Disarmament is an important occasion. It is appropriate that the Committee is starting its work at the beginning of a year in which we all hope to see major successes in arms control. We hope that this international negotiating body will be invigorated by the reforms which were agreed at the time of the special session and endorsed by almost every Government in the world. Britain was glad to play a central role in the negotiation of those reforms. We should now concentrate on substance and not seek prematurely to change our charter yet again. It is vital that this Committee should grasp the opportunities, and capitalize on the spirit of consensus which emerged from the special session. Above all, we must show the political will to reconcile national interests with the cause of international peace and security on which the future of the world depends.

National security is a complex matter. Those who seek to preserve it only by means of armed defence are naive and unambitious. My Government takes the view that a fundamental objective of foreign policy is to build greater security by developing co-operation and understanding between States. Our aim is to lower mutual suspicion and remove or at least reduce potential causes of conflict. Carefully prepared and balanced agreements to control and reduce arms and forces can contribute significantly to the strengthening of national and international security, and also offer the possibility of directing resources to social and economic purposes. But arms control enhances security only if it is credible -- if the States concerned are confident that the treaties are being observed. Hence the overriding importance of verification. The British Prime Minister at the special session pledged my country to accept the necessary measures to verify our compliance with arms control agreements.

(Lord Goronwy-Roberts, United Kingdom)

The distinctive feature of this Committee is that it is a place intended for negotiation of agreements. It is not a forum for statements of general aspiration or a place for Governments to launch appeals for others to abandon arms which they themselves do not possess or need. It should be a body where Governments work out legally-binding commitments on specific measures of arms control and disarmament. The Committee should consciously build up the expertise required for detailed negotiation on technical matters. My Government will spare no effort to contribute to the process of informed negotiation.

One task of this Committee will be to work on a comprehensive negotiating programme for disarmament, building on the programme of action agreed at the special session. We need to agree on the disarmament subjects to be considered here and the order in which they should be tackled. I am aware that the United Nations Disarmament Commission will be considering elements in a comprehensive programme when it meets in May. But I see no conflict between discussions in the deliberative body of the whole United Nations membership, where the views of all can be directly expressed, and work by experts in this smaller committee where the actual negotiations take place. I see this as a useful task in preparing the path towards general and complete disarmament, which remains our ultimate goal.

There may be some who call for instant general and complete disarmament. But the final document of the special session recognizes that progress towards this objective must take place in the context of undiminished security for all the nations concerned. I know how frustration and impatience can build up at the apparently slow pace of disarmament: but hastily and poorly conceived measures would be destabilizing and it must be recognized that formidable problems exist in many areas. The right answer is to press ahead as fast as we can without dangerous side-effects. We must reach agreement on important matters and move on to more important ones, placing the bricks one by one in the edifice of peace.

I will discuss now some of the measures on the way to general and complete disarmament on which this Committee will have a role to play.

(Lord Goronwy-Roberts, United Kingdom)

A comprehensive test-ban treaty is one of the most important items on the international agenda. This Committee has inherited notable expertise: the Ad Hoc Committee of Scientific Experts has done valuable work on a system for the international exchange of seismic data, which will be an important feature among the measures of verification in a comprehensive test-ban treaty. I believe the Ad Hoc Committee will continue to play a key role, especially in the trial and establishment of the seismic exchange.

My Government is making strenuous efforts to achieve success in our negotiations here in Geneva with the Soviet Union and the United States. Good progress has been made. Tripartite agreement in principle has been reached on most of the major issues, and we hope quickly to resolve the outstanding ones. Our aim is a multilateral treaty banning nuclear tests in any environment, and containing verification provisions which would give maximum confidence that parties were complying with their obligations. It is agreed that peaceful nuclear explosions should be covered in a protocol integral to the treaty.

Such a treaty would curb the development of new types of nuclear weapons. We hope that by demonstrating in this way that the nuclear Powers are prepared to accept self-restraint, we can attract the adherence of non-nuclear weapon States, aligned, neutral and non-aligned. The treaty which we envisage would be entirely non-discriminatory in its effect. The widest possible international adherence to it would further the objective, endorsed at the special session, of curbing vertical and horizontal proliferation. It would be a landmark in arms control.

Another priority task is the negotiation of a ban on the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons. The draft convention which my Government tabled here in 1976 served as a focus of discussion in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Important steps have since been taken towards overcoming two of the main problems of chemical disarmament -- the scope of the intended ban and means of defining the agents to be prohibited. But verification remains the key, since even a small chemical factory would be capable of producing weapons of high toxicity. We welcome the agreement of the Soviet Union and the United States that verification should be based on a combination of national and international arrangements. We hope that their discussions will continue intensively so that the Committee on Disarmament can soon negotiate a treaty.

(Lord Geronwy-Roberts, United Kingdom)

It would meanwhile be valuable to gain practical experience of ways of ensuring that production of chemical weapons had ceased and was not taking place clandestinely. Following the lead given by the Federal Republic of Germany last year, my Government now invites relevant experts from the member States of this Committee to make a visit from 14 to 16 March to certain establishments in the United Kingdom. The group of experts would visit a commercial plant currently producing phosphorus compounds. We would demonstrate there a type of inspection which we believe would be efficient in ensuring that chemical weapons were not being produced, and at the same time would not prejudice commercial secrets. The group would also visit the site of a former pilot plant for producing chemical warfare agents, now in process of demolition, in line with Britain's renunciation of offensive chemical weapons. The purpose of this visit would be to show how an inspection can verify destruction of production facilities for chemical weapons agents. The British delegation will shortly be in touch with members of the Committee about the details of the visit.

In 1976 the United States proposed that a convention should be negotiated banning the use of radiological weapons -- the only one of the categories of weapons of mass destruction identified by the United Nations which was not already under negotiation. These are weapons which would rely for their effect on the deliberate, widespread and indiscriminate dispersal of highly radioactive materials. United States/Soviet talks have made good progress. A ban on such weapons would be a sensible measure and my Government hopes that the subject can soon be discussed in this Committee.

This Committee will also be continuing the consideration of ways to prevent the development of new weapons of mass destruction based on new scientific principles. I feel sure that many countries share my view that the best approach is to keep the question under careful review, and to consider the desirability of formulating separate agreements on the prohibition of any specific new weapons which may be identified. Arms control treaties must be precise if they are to be effective. Vagueness invites evasion.

(Lord Goronwy-Roberts, United Kingdom)

In the nuclear field this Committee will be called upon to examine the Canadian idea for a verifiable cut-off in the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes. My Government voted for the resolution at the 1978 General Assembly. I think we all recognize that such a measure would require stringent inspection to ensure that States were not producing or diverting fissionable materials for nuclear weapons.

The Committee is also to consider ways of strengthening the security of non-nuclear weapon States from nuclear attack. Before the United Nations special session the United Kingdom stressed the advantages of the nuclear-weapon States giving appropriate negative security assurances. My Government gave such an assurance, in solemn and formal terms, at the special session. We are glad that other nuclear-weapon States have also made statements on this subject. But the various assurances are so different in character that it would be immensely difficult to fuse them into a common form of negative security assurance in an international convention. Nor do I see how a Convention would strengthen the assurance my country has given. Nevertheless we shall continue to play our part in the search for appropriate international arrangements which would help to increase the confidence of non-nuclear weapon States in their security from nuclear attack.

I should now like to turn briefly to one or two arms control issues which will be mainly dealt with outside this Committee. Two of the most notable treaties negotiated by our predecessors were the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968 and the Biological Weapons Convention of 1972. As a depositary power for both, the United Kingdom launched at the 1978 General Assembly resolutions setting arrangements in hand for next year's review conferences.

We shall need to look carefully at developments in the last few years concerning the effectiveness of these treaties. In the case of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, there is a balance of obligations between nuclear and non-nuclear Powers. It is clear from the progress in the SALT and comprehensive test ban negotiations that the nuclear-weapon States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty are keen to curb vertical proliferation. And the growth of peaceful nuclear technology throughout the world in the last decade is self-evident proof that the benefits of nuclear energy are being made widely

(Lord Goronwy-Roberts, United Kingdom)

available, with the invaluable assistance of the International Atomic Energy Agency. There is no evidence that the acceptance of Agency safeguards has hindered any country's civil nuclear development: indeed a country which opens its nuclear industry to international inspection will be assured of the greatest possible co-operation from the countries which supply nuclear equipment, materials and technology. The International Atomic Energy Agency's dual role of encouragement of nuclear industries through technical assistance and control of nuclear proliferation through safeguards promotes a balance of advantages for all.

How to improve the transfer of technology without increasing the proliferation dangers is the subject of the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation, the findings of which are expected to be published in February 1980. They will form part of the background to what we hope will be a comprehensive discussion of the whole field of non-proliferation at the Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. I believe the equipment and services which are needed for a successful civil nuclear industry can be made generally available under internationally acceptable arrangements.

The Biological Weapons Convention was a genuine disarmament measure, requiring the destruction of all stocks of biological weapons. The United Kingdom played an active part in its negotiation. Some concern has been expressed about developments in genetic engineering in recent years which might permit laboratory culture of new organisms dangerous to mankind and incalculable in their effects. This would be a perversion of scientific knowledge with potentially appalling consequences. My Government suggests that the Review Conference should examine such developments so that the world may be assured that none is being used for military purposes.

I turn now to the budgetary approach to arms control. The arms race is a worldwide phenomenon. At least 38 countries have military expenditure exceeding \$1 billion a year. The burden is particularly hard on the developing countries. Their military expenditure amounted to \$56.3 billion in 1976, almost three times the amount they received in development assistance, despite the continued efforts of many donors to increase their aid.

(Lord Goronwy-Roberts, United Kingdom)

There has recently been progress towards negotiations on military budgets. The adoption at the United Nations General Assembly of the Swedish and Mexican resolution initiating a pilot test of the reporting instrument devised by the Secretary-General's group of experts is a useful step forward in the search for a reliable data base on military expenditure. It is, of course, disappointing that a very few States felt obliged to abstain on this resolution on the very doubtful ground that it is not necessary to measure and compare military budgets before negotiating to reduce them. I think most of us would agree that a standard form of reporting military expenditure is the only practical basis for universal, balanced and verifiable reductions. That is an attractive aim for many reasons, not least because it would have an impact over the whole spectrum of military activities.

In the search for measures of nuclear disarmament it is easy to lose sight of the stark fact that conventional weapons, in greater numbers and of increasing sophistication, are in daily use in one place or another, killing and maiming thousands of people. My Government has consistently argued for international discussion on ways to halt the build-up of conventional weapons, regionally and throughout the world. At the same time we recognize the right of States under the Charter of the United Nations to acquire arms to protect their territorial integrity. Arms control in this field should not discriminate against States which do not manufacture arms. Suppliers and recipients should participate in negotiations, starting perhaps on a regional basis.

We have also followed with great interest the talks between the two major arms suppliers -- the United States and the Soviet Union. The recent initiative by Mexico and other Latin American and Caribbean States to limit the supply of arms in their area is encouraging. I hope the regional countries will agree on a common approach to a restraint régime covering a range of armaments of different kinds. I can say now that Britain will be willing to consider favourably the question of participation in discussions resulting from this initiative.

We hope also that progress will now be made in restricting conventional weapons regarded as causing unnecessary suffering or as being indiscriminate in their effects. We hope that the United Nations Conference this year will conclude

(Lord Goronwy-Roberts, United Kingdom)

conventions on all matters where there is a sufficiently broad measure of agreement. We should particularly like to see action on our proposal for a convention on the use of landmines and bobby-traps, and on the Swiss proposal banning the use of weapons whose primary wounding effect is caused by fragments not detectable by x-ray. We hope that there will be agreement on a convention restricting the use of incendiary weapons, particularly napalm.

Looking back over 1978, I cannot say that we achieved all the progress which was expected in arms control and disarmament. The special session reached consensus on a programme of action and the reform of disarmament machinery: the stimulus which it gave to the disarmament discussions produced a record number of resolutions in the General Assembly. But it is concrete action that the world expects from this Committee. We must make 1979 the year of achievement, starting I hope with a second Strategic Arms Limitation Agreement between the super-Powers. We must achieve among other things a comprehensive test-ban treaty, concrete progress in the negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions in Central Europe and also constraints on "inhumane" weapons. My Government dedicates itself to pursue these tasks with determination and in a spirit of co-operation.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Mr. George M. Seignious II, had intended to represent the United States on this the opening day of the initial session of the Committee on Disarmament. Regrettably, this has not been possible. Mr. Seignious has asked, however, that I read you the following message from him:

"I have asked Ambassador Fisher to extend to you my most sincere wishes for the success of the Committee on Disarmament as you begin your work in which all mankind has a stake. I deeply regret that the need to remain in Washington to testify before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as part of the process of seeking Senate confirmation of my appointment has made it impossible to be with you today as I had hoped and planned. It would have been an auspicious occasion for me to make my first speech, as Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, delivered in an international forum. I look forward to the opportunity of paying a visit to the Committee in the not-too-distant future.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

"Your concerns are the concerns shared by Governments everywhere. The ultimate goal which we all share, it seems to me, is like the objective described in the legislative act that established the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency within the United States Government. 'To seek a world which is free from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of armaments.' That goal should serve as a beacon to inspire all of us, no matter how difficult our task may seem at times."

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

CD/PV.3
25 January 1979
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE THIRD MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 25 January 1979, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman

Mr. R. Boudjakdji

(Algeria)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria:

Mr. R. BOUDJAKDJI
Mr. A. FASLA
Mr. A. BENSMAIL
Mr. N. KERROUHI

Argentina:

Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS
Mr. F. JIMENEZ DAVILA
Mr. A.F. MOLteni

Australia:

Mr. L.D. THOMSON
Mr. A.J. BEHM
Ms. H.S. WICKES

Belgium:

Mr. Henri SIMONET
Mr. J.A. RAOUL SCHOUAeker
Mr. G. SOKAY
Mr. P. NOTERDAEMIE
Mr. P. BERG
Mr. G. VAN DUYSE

Brazil:

Mr. G.A. MACIEL
Mr. L.P. LINDEMBERG SETTE

Bulgaria:

Mr. P. VOUCOV
Mr. I. PETROV
Mr. I. SCIROV

Burma:

U SAW HLAING
U THEIN AUNG
U THAUNG HTUN

Canada:

Mr. G.A.H. PEARSON
Mr. R. HARRY JAY
Mr. J.T. SILLARD

Cuba:

Mr. P. TORRAS
Mr. L. SOLA VILLA
Mr. F. ORLIZ RODRIGUEZ
Mrs. V. BROWDSKY JACKIEWICH
Mr. C. PAZOS DECEIRO
Mr. R. VALENTE
Mr. R. LOPEZ GARCIA

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. V. TYLNER

Egypt:

Mr. O. EL-SHAFFI
Mr. F. EL-IBRAHIM
Mr. M. EL-BARADEI

Ethiopia:

Mr. G. ALJULA

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. S. KAHN
Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. G. PFLEIFFER
Mr. H. SCHNEPPEN
Mr. J. POHLMANN
Mr. H. MULLER

Hungary:

Mr. M. DOMOKOS
Mr. A. LAKATOS

France:

Mr. F. DE LA GORCE
Mr. F. BEAUCHATAUD
Mr. J. FEVRE
Mr. J-C. PARAVY

India:

Mr. C.R. GHAREKIALI
Mr. S.T. DEVARE

Indonesia:

Mr. A. SANTI
Mr. A. KAMIL

Iran:
Mr. M. FARTASH
Mr. D. CHILATY
Mr. D. AMERI

Italy:
Mr. L. RADI
Mr. N. DI BERNARDO
Mr. F. FERRETTI
Mr. M. ALESSI
Mr. H. MORENO
Mr. A. VINCI GIACCHI
Mr. C. FRATESCHI
Mr. G. VALDEVIT
Mr. F. DE LUCA

Japan:
Mr. M. OGISO
Mr. T. NONOYAMA
Mr. Y. KIKUCHI
Mr. T. IWANAMI
Mr. Y. NAKAMURA

Kenya:
Mr. K. MWAMZANDI
Mr. C. GATERE MAINA
Mr. G.H. MUNIU

Mexico:
Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES
Miss A. CABRERA
Miss L.M. GARCIA

Mongolia:
Mr. L. BAYART

Morocco:
Mr. M. CHRAIBI

Netherlands:
Mr. R. FEIJ
Mr. A.J. MEERBURG

Nigeria:
Mr. O. ADENIJI
Mr. K. AHMED
Mr. T.O. OLUMOKO
Mr. R.A. FATUNASE

Pakistan:

Mr. J.K.A. MARKER

Mr. E.L. AKHUND

Mr. H. AKFIM

Peru:

Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO

Poland:

Mr. B. SUJKA

Mr. H. PAC

Mr. S. KOJIK

Mr. M. KRUCZYK

Romania:

Mr. I. RADULESCU

Mr. C. ENE

Mr. V. TUDOR

Sri Lanka:

Mr. A.C.S. HAMEED

Miss M.L. NAGANATHAN

Sweden:

Mrs. I. THORSSON

Mr. C. LIDGARD

Mr. L. NORBERG

Mr. J. PRAWITZ

Mr. J. LUNDIN

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Mr. V.L. ISRAELYAN

Mr. Yu. K. NAZARKIN

Mr. A.M. VAVILOV

Mr. E.D. ZAITSEV

Mr. V.A. VERTOGRADOV

Mr. Yu. V. KOSTENKO

Mr. M.G. ANTIUKHIN

United Kingdom:

Mr. N.H. MARSHALL

Mr. C.L.G. MALLABY

Mr. C.K. CURWEN

Mr. P.M.W. FRANCIS

United States of America:

Mr. A. FISHER
Mr. C. FLOWEREE
Mr. A. AKALOVSKY
Mr. R. HAGENGRUBER
Mr. B. MURRAY
Mr. M.L. SANCHES
Mr. A. YARMOLINSKY

Venezuela:

Mr. R.C. CASTILLO
Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT
Mr. H. ARTEAGA
Miss D. SZOKLOCZI
Mrs. R. LISBOA DE MECER

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. PESIC
Mr. M. VRHUNEC
Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC
Mr. D. DJOKIC

Zaire:

Mr. B. BUKAYI
Mr. M. ESUK

Director-General of the
United Nations Office at Geneva:

Mr. L. COTTAFANI

Assistant Secretary-General
for Disarmament

Mr. R. BJORNSTEDT

Mr. PESIC (Yugoslavia) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, allow me to greet this assembly on behalf of the Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and to express its satisfaction at the participation in the work of the new Committee on Disarmament of the representatives of Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Cuba, France, Indonesia, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Venezuela. The establishment of such a Committee represents, in our opinion, a concrete expression of certain important results emerging from the tenth special session, devoted to disarmament. One of the objectives of that session was to enable all the nuclear Powers and all other States to contribute to the solution of the problems of disarmament, and to be included among the factors making for the building of new international relations, through the reorganization and stimulation of the existing machinery of negotiation or the establishment of new bodies. We are convinced that the process of democratization which we began at the special session, and the increase in the number of countries directly engaged in the disarmament negotiations, pave the way to the opening of the disarmament process and the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in this area of vital importance for the whole world.

We attach particular importance to the decision taken by the French Government to join in the efforts of other nuclear Powers in seeking solutions to one of the gravest and most complex problems facing the international community, that is, disarmament. We believe that a similar decision by the Government of the People's Republic of China, should that Government decide to take it, would meet with the widest approval from the international community.

We have always supported every initiative aimed at starting and accelerating the process of disarmament and in this context, at enlisting the efforts of every country and the various bodies concerned with that problem. That is one of the reasons why we attach great importance to the opening of the work of the Committee on Disarmament. This is also an occasion for us to set forth some of our views on disarmament problems in the light of the special session on disarmament which Mr. Kurt Waldheim, Secretary-General of the United Nations, justly described as the most important event of 1978, and in the light also of the thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly.

The special session on disarmament gave a new impulse and outlined bases for the action to be taken by the whole international community to inaugurate a new phase in the efforts to start a genuine process of disarmament. The discussions at the special session showed that we are living in an era of dynamic change in the world, where no one can any longer stay resigned to the existing state of affairs. More specifically, it was the occasion for an increasingly clear manifestation of

(Mr. Pesic, Yugoslavia)

aspirations to the establishment of democratic international relations, based on equality of rights, and to a situation of genuine and equal security for every country, in which massive efforts, organized to the maximum, are made, especially by the non-aligned countries, to ensure world-wide détente, to establish the new international economic order and to eliminate the policy and relationships of domination. The States Members of the United Nations are agreed in considering that the existence of nuclear weapons and the pursuit of the breakneck arms race threaten the survival of mankind. They have also found that lasting international peace and security cannot be built on the basis of a piling up of armaments and the strengthening of military blocs, or maintained from a precarious balance of means of dissuasion or from doctrines of strategic superiority, but demand a rapid and substantial reduction in armaments and armed forces and the adoption of effective measures to eliminate tensions and settle conflict by peaceful means. The special session also expressed in its Final Document the conclusion that there is a close relation between spending on armaments and economic and social development. It also affirmed that there is a melancholy and spectacular contrast between the hundreds of billions of dollars devoted every year to the manufacture or improvement of weapons and the deprivation and poverty in which two-thirds of the world's population live. The session further observed that the armaments race has extremely harmful economic and social consequences, and that its pursuit is clearly incompatible with the establishment of the new international economic order based on justice, equity and co-operation. The checking of the armaments race and a genuine process of disarmament were declared to be essential tasks of the highest urgency.

These processes should unfold in a balanced way through the assumption, and observance, of mutually acceptable reciprocal engagements between the nuclear Powers themselves and between those Powers and the non-nuclear-weapon countries.

It was also considered that to take up this historic challenge would be in the political and economic interests of all the countries and peoples of the world.

Where do we now stand in these matters, and what lessons may be drawn, after the relatively short space of time which has elapsed since the special session? The fruitful discussions on disarmament which took place at the thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly have given us some indications in this regard. To us it seems that those discussions have a two-fold aspect: they have shown on the one hand that the concern caused by the intensification of armaments and the stagnation of negotiations on their limitation has in no way diminished, and that meanwhile Member countries attach increasing importance to efforts to implement the decisions taken by the special session. That interest also appears from the

(Mr. Pesic, Yugoslavia)

continuing support for a series of initiatives introduced at the special session, the introduction of further initiatives, and from the preparations for various activities in the field of disarmament to be undertaken this year and next. Unfortunately, all this confirms at the same time that the process of negotiation is lagging far behind the armaments race, which is spiralling upwards at an ever more dangerous rate and spreading to more and more countries. All this also confirms that the process of disarmament will be held back and put off until the countries which have the greatest responsibility for the armaments race show greater political will and determination.

The Committee on Disarmament is beginning its work at the very moment when negative trends suggest that the armaments race is not only continuing but receiving further impetus. The military blocs and the great Powers are its protagonists. Contrary to the recommendations of the tenth special session, the two blocs have unfortunately made plans for further armament programmes entailing a steep increase in military expenditure. The military arsenal is thus increasing rapidly both qualitatively and quantitatively. Such a development, which we can observe all the time, has negative implications for international relations and faces humanity with further dangers to peace.

Despite the statements on the approaching conclusion of SALT II, not the slightest progress has been achieved for a long time past in the disarmament negotiations. The real interests of peace and security in the world, and international public opinion in its broadest dimension, demand that this situation should be changed without delay.

We have, rightly, agreed to give priority to nuclear disarmament. Though we do not wish to underestimate the efforts made up to now in that field, the result has clearly been the establishment of a nuclear equilibrium rather than nuclear disarmament. Freedom to develop and accumulate such weapons has remained intact, while a nuclear disaster has become an even more serious threat to mankind. In this context, Yugoslavia and the other non-aligned countries feel that it would be in the general interest to conclude SALT II as soon as possible and to embark without delay, in conformity with the General Assembly's recommendation, on the negotiations for SALT III, and to reach agreement on a drastic reduction of the nuclear arsenal.

I would like also to stress the great importance we attach to the conclusion of a treaty prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests (CTBT), to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and to the provision of unconditional guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon countries against nuclear attack. We consider that such

(Mr. Pesic, Yugoslavia)

agreements would create a climate of confidence, with the necessary conditions for an effective reduction in nuclear armaments, while on the other hand, failure to adopt such measures, or their postponement, would have unfavourable effects on the process of disarmament as a whole and reduce the value of the results obtained. Our opinion is that the non-proliferation Treaty will not achieve its full purpose or its full value until genuine progress is made in nuclear disarmament.

The race in conventional armaments and the reinforcement of conventional armies is accelerating at a frenzied tempo. There is no doubt that this affects the economically less-developed countries most seriously, in general the non-aligned ones, which are constantly exposed to the risk of aggression, neo-colonial pressures, overbidding by the blocs and different forms of domination. The decisive elimination of such elements in international relations would establish the necessary conditions for the adoption of satisfactory measures in the case of conventional disarmament also.

It is against this background that we consider the question of dismantling military bases and the withdrawal of armed forces from foreign territories, and the question of measures of confidence. The non-aligned countries defined their joint position on this most important subject at the tenth special session, and in our view due attention must be given to the approaching disarmament negotiations. There can be no doubt that the first steps towards conventional disarmament should be taken by the countries which are the most powerful, from the military standpoint, in the world, and first of all by the military blocs and their principal members.

We attach great importance to the efforts to begin serious discussions and reach an agreement on the prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction, since such weapons are similar in their effects to nuclear weapons and may even surpass them. The prohibition should apply to all weapons of mass destruction, for the principle must be to put an end to the qualitative proliferation of armaments. Every new weapon of this kind clearly begins a new cycle in the armaments race and constitutes yet a further threat to international peace and security.

I would like also to stress on this occasion that we attach particular importance to the reduction of the armed forces and armaments of the military blocs. The special session rightly devoted a special paragraph to Europe, which is the region with the highest concentration of armed forces in the world, and pointed out the need to reduce such forces to a military balance at a lower level, while fully respecting the interests of States not members of any bloc, as regards their security and independence. On the basis of this recommendation by the special session,

(Mr. Pesic, Yugoslavia)

we must express our concern at the fact that the discussions which have been taking place in Vienna for several years on the regional reduction of armed forces and armaments have not yet produced any results and have not gone beyond the stage of identification of the subject of the discussions. In this light, we consider that our attention and support should be given to some recent initiatives on regional disarmament measures aimed at putting into practice the recommendations concerning Europe in the Final Document of the special session, and to the consequent action which should be taken to follow up the relevant decisions of CSCE. In so urging, we have in mind that such measures would supplement the efforts directed towards bilateral, regional and global disarmament. We also think that all necessary steps should be taken to make the Mediterranean a zone of international peace, security and international co-operation.

The present situation in the sphere of disarmament is unsatisfactory, and we all know it. Although the efforts so far made have not been without result, the results are insufficient, as was generally agreed at the General Assembly's special session on disarmament. We must all of us, and the great nuclear Powers in particular, continue to make the effort to speed up, in the various ways and through the machinery established by the special session, the negotiating process there begun.

The special session and the General Assembly have assigned important tasks to the Committee on Disarmament. It will have from the very beginning of its activities to concern itself with various questions of organization, including the preparation of its rules of procedure, for this is essential to the smooth progress of its work. The question of procedure is of fundamental importance, since the day-to-day performance and character of the Committee's work will largely depend on those rules. Procedure is also important on account of the close relationship which exists, according to the Final Document of the special session, between the Committee on Disarmament, the Disarmament Commission and the First Committee of the United Nations on the one hand, and the General Assembly on the other, the Assembly having a central role and bearing the chief responsibility for disarmament, in accordance with the Charter.

We believe that the Committee on Disarmament should become a negotiating body in the real meaning of the words. It must participate directly and on a basis of equality, and democratically, in all the phases of negotiation concerning the disarmament matters with which it is to deal. Only so can the Committee win the confidence of the international community and become an effective negotiating body in the field of disarmament.

(Mr. Posic, Yugoslavia)

The Committee on Disarmament has inherited several important unsolved disarmament problems from the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), such as the prohibition of chemical weapons, and the consideration of the prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction and systems of such weapons. Some of those problems have been under consideration for many years, and we would like to think that the agreements on the total prohibition of chemical weapons and their testing will soon be a reality. The tenth special session added to those urgent tasks an important new one, the preparation of a global disarmament programme, and to that task also we should harness ourselves as soon as possible.

Since this is the beginning of the work of the Committee on Disarmament, we would like in particular to stress the need for preserving the dynamic approach achieved at the special session of the General Assembly by ensuring the continuity of the negotiating process and speeding-up its tempo; for maintaining the closest links with the United Nations and for strengthening its role in the disarmament process; for ensuring observance of the priorities upon which agreement was reached at the special session and in the General Assembly; and for ensuring the participation in the negotiating process of all the interested Member countries of the United Nations.

The world expects that decisive steps will be taken following the tenth special session for the implementation of its decisions. There can be no doubt that the first steps towards effective disarmament, and any new agreement, could not but have a vital effect in bringing about a positive transformation of international political relations, and that the settlement of international key problems and crises would greatly contribute to disarmament. We therefore consider it essential to maintain, without a break, parallel efforts towards the settlement of key problems in international relations and towards disarmament. Effective measures in either field could greatly contribute to strengthening détente, security and confidence. Disarmament has become an imperative need of our time and the most urgent task facing the international community. As we said in the Final Document of the special session, we are confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament, or face annihilation. In the absence of effective measures for disarmament, without effective measures to stop the arms race, all the concrete results obtained in international relations would be at risk. This Committee, too, can play an important role in this regard. Yugoslavia for its part will spare no effort to make its contribution towards that objective.

Mr. RADI (Italy) (translated from Italian): Over the past few years no problem has attracted so much international attention as that of disarmament.

From both the political and psychological angles, the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament was an unprecedented event whose implications and significance can escape nobody.

Through the responsible participation, at high level, of 149 States, including the five nuclear-weapon States, the special session solemnly reaffirmed the universal character of the desire for peace, stressing that despite attendant difficulties and moments of discouragement, the will of Governments is strong to meet this challenge through the achievement of effective agreements aimed at building a world freed from the threat of armaments and based on mutual understanding, justice and security.

In the nuclear era, with world society moving towards patterns of ever-increasing interdependence, the objective of reducing and eliminating armaments is a compulsory and irreversible choice of the international community. It must be brought about by gradual steps under effective international control, until the final goal of general and complete disarmament be attained, safeguarding, however, at each stage the strategic balance of forces on both the world-wide and regional level.

At the special session, the participants unanimously pointed out the political, economic and social risks that would result from an ever-spiralling uncontrolled arms race. They were equally unanimous in proclaiming that the strengthening of détente, the consolidation of peace, the conquest of more widespread and better balanced well-being largely depend on a progressive reduction of the stocks of lethal weapons, the burden of which has become intolerable. In particular, we should remember that substantial progress towards disarmament is the first prerequisite for seeking a solution of the problem of the harmonious development of all regions of our world. In our search for lasting peace, we would be deluding ourselves if we were to focus only on the balanced and progressive reduction of forces, without taking into proper account the legitimate demands for social and economic development of the peoples of less favoured countries. The absence of a timely solution of the problems of development threatens once more to create the illusion that one can seek to solve outstanding questions by the use of force.

(Mr. Radi, Italy)

Through deep discussion and profound thought on the whole range of disarmament issues, the proceedings in New York have succeeded in fixing the main lines of action along which the future negotiations should develop, with greater imagination and a more dynamic driving force. In this context, the special session was an example of responsibility and awareness, from which we must now draw the appropriate conclusions by taking responsible initiatives at the negotiating level.

Today the Committee on Disarmament starts its first session with a new membership and with new terms of reference emanating from the Members of the United Nations as a whole.

I would like first of all to take this opportunity of greeting the representatives of the countries which have shared with Italy the privilege of participating in the Geneva disarmament negotiations since the days of the Committee of Eighteen, and later, in the various stages of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. I would also recall in particular the two Co-Chairmen of the CCD -- the United States and the Soviet Union -- to whom the Italian delegation wishes to pay a tribute for the significant contribution they have given in that capacity to the Geneva Conference. Finally, I would like to welcome the representatives of the countries sitting at this negotiating table for the first time: France, who will assuredly give to our negotiations the contribution to be expected from her special responsibilities as a nuclear-weapon State; and then Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Cuba, Indonesia, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Venezuela, all countries with which Italy maintains relations of friendship, co-operation and confidence. We hope that China will soon occupy the seat which has been reserved to her among us, as a nuclear-weapon State.

The disarmament negotiations, because of their complexity and importance, require a forum particularly well qualified and imply the continuous and active participation of all militarily significant States, beginning with the nuclear-weapon States. The recommendations adopted by the special session on the membership of this Committee have the merit of reconciling this essential necessity with that of a more active and balanced participation in the negotiations of countries which demonstrated particular interest in them.

It is the hope of the Italian Government that prospects of more coherent and more fruitful work may, in future, result from this new and better balanced participation in the negotiation of western, eastern and non-aligned countries.

(Mr. Radi, Italy)

Even more so since our Committee, thanks to its composition, appears to be the qualified forum to tackle globally the elaboration of specific measures universally acceptable.

The task awaiting us is an urgent one. It must be managed without delay and with firm determination:

In the Declaration and Programme of Action contained in its Final Document, the special session outlined the major options and priorities for our future work.

At its thirty-third session, recently concluded, the United Nations General Assembly further specified the objectives to be reached in the near future, adopting an unusually large number of resolutions, many of them -- most significantly -- by consensus.

It is now incumbent on the Committee on Disarmament, starting work with alacrity, to benefit from the recommendations and encouragement of the United Nations, by focusing its attention on specific measures to be given priority in keeping with the most anxious expectations.

In opening this new round of negotiations, the Committee on Disarmament should not overlook the legacy of lessons and experiences bequeathed by the CCD, thanks to which the most important multilateral agreements on armaments limitations were worked out, beginning with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

In pursuing its immediate goals, the Committee on Disarmament should not, however, abandon or neglect the wider and longer-term aim of complete and general disarmament, which the United Nations has expressly set as the ultimate goal of our efforts.

For many years Italy has been maintaining that progress in specific sectors of disarmament should form part of an organic framework, as constituent elements of a coherent and articulated whole to be achieved in successive and gradual stages. We have therefore noted with satisfaction that the special session recommended the Disarmament Commission to consider the elements of a comprehensive programme for disarmament to be submitted as recommendations to the General Assembly, and through it to the Committee on Disarmament. On this subject the Italian delegation has presented a detailed working paper, which we trust will be attentively studied along with contributions and suggestions from other delegations.

(Mr. Radi, Italy)

Passing to immediate tasks, I would like to stress here the highest priority that the international community continues to assign to the complete ban of nuclear tests.

This is an issue which the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has been debating, in its political, scientific and technical aspects, for years; it is essential that a responsible decision on this problem should be taken as soon as possible.

In the view of the Italian Government, the total banning of nuclear tests constitutes the indispensable and no-longer postponable complement to the Treaty on non-proliferation, which provides for reciprocal and interdependent rights and obligations for both non-nuclear- and nuclear-weapon States.

Italy is attentively following the development of the tripartite negotiations between the United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union which have recently made noteworthy progress. To succeed in overcoming the existing difficulties and to reach an early agreement, further resolute steps on the part of the negotiators are required.

The elements of the agreement which will result from the tripartite talks -- and which must inter alia take into account the need for adequate verification procedures -- will have to be submitted, at an appropriate stage, to the careful consideration of the Committee on Disarmament, where the final text of a widely acceptable treaty will have to be drafted.

My Government continues to pay particular attention to the problem of the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons as well as of their destruction. The great urgency of this problem has once again been reaffirmed in a resolution of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, introduced by a large number of countries -- including Italy -- and adopted by consensus.

Today's tendency to see the dangers of armed conflict mainly in terms of a nuclear holocaust leads us sometimes to forget that the chemical weapon also is a weapon of mass destruction and among the most deadly.

It is frequently not realized that chemical weapons, too, have benefited from notable technological development, which has enormously enhanced their destructive potential, the possibilities of their employment and their danger.

(Mr. Radi, Italy)

Nor can we ignore that some States hold at present massive stocks of these weapons, already extensively tested; and many other States also possess the basic agents and the necessary technical know-how to equip themselves, in the short term, with substantial stocks of chemical weapons.

The problem of chemical warfare has been debated at length in its different aspects -- including the particularly delicate one of verification -- both in the United Nations and in the CCD, to which various draft conventions have been submitted.

Already in 1974, the United States and the Soviet Union agreed to consider a joint initiative at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament "with respect to the conclusion, as a first step, of an international convention dealing with the most dangerous, lethal means of chemical warfare". The Italian Government is aware of the difficulties of the search for effective agreement acceptable to all. It is confidently following the bilateral discussions between the United States and the Soviet Union, and hopes that through them the desired solutions may be reached without delay.

These bilateral negotiations do not, however, exonerate the Committee on Disarmament from pursuing a tenacious and imaginative exploration of all the possibilities of reaching the total and verified elimination of all chemical weapons. Indeed, we all share the objective of, and responsibility for, chemical disarmament; it is in this direction that the Italian delegation will continue to operate in a spirit of co-operation and constructive purpose.

In recent years, science has made extraordinary conquests which, according to how and why they are utilized, can become instruments for economic, social and civil improvement or vehicles of death and destruction.

In addition to what we could call "the sword of Damocles of nuclear war" there looms on the horizon the menacing advent of new types of weapons equally and perhaps even more deadly.

Though preserving the necessity for scientific and technological progress, the task of all lovers of peace and security is to make every effort so that consequences beyond all imagination and measureless risks do not originate from achievements of the human intellect.

(Mr. Radi, Italy)

Faced with this danger, the Committee on Disarmament has a double duty to fulfil: firstly, to prevent the emergence of new generations of weapons of mass destruction based on new scientific principles, by keeping the problem under constant review and by the acquisition of all the data as far as possible; secondly, to draw up the legal instruments for banning particular types of new weapons as soon as they may be identified.

With these criteria in mind, and within the Committee on Disarmament, Italy is, from this moment, definitely in favour of considering the issue of the ban on radiological weapons which are currently the subject of bilateral consultations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Such a ban would undoubtedly represent a first realistic step which could be followed by others, as the need arises.

It is evident that the path to disarmament is still long and paved with many obstacles. However, from the start, it must be followed with firm intentions and having a global and precise evaluation of all the interests at stake.

In this respect we cannot avoid being worried by the increasing and ever more menacing magnitude of the accumulation and transfer of conventional weapons, especially in regions of the world where dangerous situations of tension exist.

The uncontrolled conventional-arms race, often involving expensive and highly sophisticated devices far exceeding comprehensible defence needs, not only contributes to the worsening of alarming situations of suspicion and confrontation, but also deprives particularly needy countries of precious resources, resources which could be used in more profitable directions, ranging from economic development to the strengthening of infrastructures, the war against hunger and endemic diseases and the elimination of illiteracy and of other social evils.

As for conventional weapons, public opinion expects timely and far-sighted decisions which must proceed parallel to the initiatives to be taken in the field of nuclear-weapons reduction.

Italy desires to confirm her readiness to co-operate with all interested countries -- suppliers as well as recipients -- in the search, on both regional and global levels, for solutions which would contribute to the erection of a barrier against the escalation of conventional weapons, while safeguarding the imperatives of security needs. On this subject I would like to recall the proposal for regional control of the transfer of conventional weapons presented by Italy already

(Mr. Radi, Italy)

in 1970 and at the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. This proposal is listed in the Final Document approved by the special session.

In our judgment, the subject of the control of the transfer of conventional weapons cannot remain outside the concern of the Committee on Disarmament, if this Committee wishes to fully attain its proper objectives.

In my statement I have sought to concentrate my main attention on the major topics most closely related to our Committee's agenda.

Moreover, we hope that rapid progress, also in other negotiations which Italy is following with particular interest, will accompany the renewal of the Geneva negotiations.

I am referring to the Soviet-American strategic arms limitation talks, which the Italian Government considers essential for the general cause of stability and peace. In the hope that the remaining difficulties standing in the way of a positive and rapid conclusion of SALT II may be soon overcome, Italy is already looking forward, with great interest, to the task with which SALT III could be entrusted, with the prospect of safeguarding security at ever-diminishing levels of armaments.

Italy's particular geopolitical position makes us, at the same time, especially attentive to developments in the MBFR negotiations in Vienna. We expect from them a valid contribution to the advent of a more stable balance in our continent. We are continuing to contribute to their positive outcome, within the limits of our position as a "special-status participant".

Extremely knotty issues are to be dealt with by the Vienna negotiations. They call for a frank appraisal of the objectives to be attained and for fully motivated decisions.

The great turning-point in the race for armaments, for which the nations of the whole world are longing, cannot be achieved all of a sudden, because it cannot be isolated from consideration of the international situation.

As is only too well-known, mistrust, suspicion and lack of mutual understanding are among the main causes of the armaments race. It is therefore necessary for disarmament measures to be seconded, preceded or accompanied, as appropriate, by parallel initiatives aimed at widening the area of dialogue, nourishing trust, promoting détente, anticipating and removing causes of friction. Only thus will every initiative in the field of disarmament become credible and fruitful.

(Mr. Radi, Italy)

However, the problem of disarmament cannot be isolated from that of verification. Indeed it would be neither correct nor realistic to promulgate disarmament measures without adequate, precise and formal guarantees that these measures will be universally implemented.

Italy is well aware of the difficulties -- technical, economic and political -- inherent in the verification of the disarmament agreements. Though the methods of control may vary according to the kind of measures to be controlled, it is evident by now that in most cases the national verification techniques need to be accompanied by forms of international co-operation, designed to ensure rapid, technically reliable and politically effective verification procedures.

It is in this spirit that, on various previous occasions, Italy has favoured the initiation of a study on the setting up of an international verification organ, designed to offer coherent and adequate solutions to this crucial problem from a technical as well as from a legal angle. In the same spirit, Italy has supported the French Government's initiative for the establishment of an International Satellite Agency, and is ready to co-operate in studies to be undertaken to this end.

Furthermore, it would be desirable for international verification to be accompanied by national controls exercised by public opinion in the different countries over the respective Governments, so that in practice, the latter will act in accordance with the engagements entered into.

The convening of the Committee on Disarmament opens a new phase in the history of the proceedings of the Geneva negotiating forum.

Our hope is that the new Committee will tackle this new phase resolutely and openmindedly, benefiting from the ideas and proposals of new participants, as well as from the lessons and experiences of the past. In this context it would be useful to examine, inter alia, at the proper time, the procedures and working methods followed in the past, so as to make the Committee's action more incisive and more adequate to its new tasks and to the needs of the moment.

Today, the thoughts and hopes of mankind are concentrated on our activities. From our work they expect rapid and effective progress on the road of disarmament and of a secure peace.

For her part, Italy will do everything in her power not to betray those expectations and to contribute to the common efforts within the Committee on Disarmament. She will act with the spirit of dedication, the sense of responsibility and the feeling of confidence demanded from all of us by the crucial and urgent nature of the tasks assigned to us.

Mr. MARKER (Pakistan): Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a pleasure for the Pakistan delegation, and for me personally, to congratulate you on assuming the chairmanship of this important Committee. As a distinguished representative of a brotherly country which has made a unique and unprecedented contribution to the cause of the peoples of the Third World for national liberation and economic independence, you are admirably suited to guide the deliberations of this Committee. For here we represent the interests and preoccupations of the majority of the United Nations Member States, which, like Algeria and Pakistan, fervently desire a halt to the arms race and the achievement of a stable structure of world peace and security.

Mr. Chairman, your opening address to this Committee has conveyed not only the sombre feelings with which the majority of nations today view the threat from the global armaments race, but also their urgent desire to halt and reverse this destructive process. The message from Secretary-General Waldheim, which has also sounded a timely warning about the dangers inherent in the ever escalating arms race, has, in addition, indicated the opportunities open to this Committee to achieve genuine progress towards the goal of general and complete disarmament.

The decision of the tenth special session of the General Assembly to create the Committee on Disarmament was an important milestone in the history of disarmament negotiations, and Pakistan considers it an honour to attend this inaugural session of the Committee. It is our fervent hope that its more representative character and democratic procedures will enable this Committee to make significant and tangible contributions towards the realization of the hitherto elusive goal of disarmament.

However, as was acknowledged at the special session, the prospects of disarmament are in large measure determined by the conditions of world peace and security, both at the global and regional levels. It is, therefore, with deep concern that we must note the increase in international tensions in many parts of the world. Instead of reducing armaments, most States, particularly the two most powerful nations, continue the acquisition and development of larger and more sophisticated military arsenals, so that, since the special session, the arms race has not been reversed, but has further escalated. Resort to the use

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

of force, to shape the course of international relations, has increased. External intervention and aggression against small and weak States has occurred with alarming frequency. Despite our declarations and resolutions, the Charter's vision of a system of universal collective security is today more elusive than ever. And the priority of eradicating poverty and pestilence, of creating a new, equitable, world economic order, has been relegated to the background.

The Final Document of the special session on disarmament declared itself against any attempts to create spheres of influence. The concept is a deplorable one, whether such spheres of influence are created through bilateral or multilateral military alliances or through the promotion of certain States as "regional influentials" or "predominant" Powers. Global stability cannot be maintained by a balance of mutual deterrance in strategic armaments alone; this must be matched by a corresponding equilibrium in various sensitive regions of the world. The climate for disarmament must be created not only at the global level but also in those areas where tensions and conflicts presently endanger the fabric of peace. The prospects for the success of the negotiations to be conducted within this Committee depend on the outcome of this process.

The tenth special session of the General Assembly was the first occasion on which the international community approved an integrated set of measures relating to various facets of disarmament. The prospects for the work of this Committee have been enhanced by the unanimous adoption at the special session of specific objectives, principles and priorities for disarmament negotiations, and a concrete programme of measures to be implemented in the near future. We share the hope expressed here yesterday that the impetus provided by the special session to the process of disarmament will be maintained and accelerated through the deliberations of this Committee.

Of all the decisions of the special session relating to the machinery for disarmament, the creation of the Committee on Disarmament is undoubtedly the most important. The function of this Committee is to negotiate specific disarmament measures--agreements, conventions or treaties-- in various areas of disarmament. This negotiating role of the Committee on Disarmament sets it apart from all other international fora on disarmament. Whatever the procedures of work we adopt, every effort must be made to preserve and enlarge this negotiating role of the Committee.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

While the role of the Committee on Disarmament is precise, the scope of its responsibilities is quite extensive. Under the provisions of the Final Document, and of the resolutions adopted at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, the Committee has been called upon, inter alia, to fulfil the following tasks:

- To elaborate a comprehensive programme on disarmament;
- To achieve a nuclear-test-ban treaty;
- To formulate a convention prohibiting chemical weapons;
- To conclude effective arrangements, including consideration of an international convention, to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons;
- To reach agreement on the banning of new weapons of mass destruction;
- To consider measures for the cessation of the production of fissionable materials.

Apart from these responsibilities, specifically assigned to the Committee, it is clear from the relevant provisions of the Final Document that the Committee on Disarmament is expected to associate itself with negotiations envisaged for nuclear disarmament, as well as for the limitation and reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons.

Our ultimate goal, remains the achievement of general and complete disarmament. We do not, of course, expect to attain this immediately, but the Committee must maintain a steady step-by-step process, and should at least aim to fulfil the majority of the tasks entrusted to the Committee in time for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Since the Committee cannot expect to simultaneously address all the issues before it, my delegation would suggest that we first take up for consideration those questions which have been outstanding for some time, or where early progress appears possible. In this context, the adoption at this session of an agenda and programme of work for the Committee assumes special importance. My delegation believes that while all the responsibilities of the Committee that I have mentioned should be recognized as forming part of its mandate, during the current year the Committee should concentrate on the three items which the General Assembly has asked it to consider.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

The first among these is the nuclear-test-ban treaty. This was to be completed in time for the special session last June. It is most unfortunate that the CCD was prevented from considering this priority issue due to the separate talks being conducted by three nuclear Powers. The international community desires urgent action on the nuclear-test-ban treaty; The General Assembly has asked this Committee in two separate resolutions to take up consideration of this treaty. The question is: when should the Committee begin examination of this subject? Should it await the outcome of the negotiations between the USSR, the United States and the United Kingdom, or take this up irrespective of these talks?

My delegation would suggest that the three Powers concerned be urged to transmit the draft CTB treaty to the Committee within the next two months. If they cannot reach agreement on the text even at the end of this period, we hope that they will at least inform this Committee of the status of the negotiations and the areas of agreement and disagreement. Thereafter, the responsibility for negotiating the test-ban treaty should be assumed directly by our Committee. In these negotiations, the drafts and proposals submitted by any State should receive full consideration on a basis of parity with the text which may be fully or partially evolved by the three nuclear Powers. My delegation would welcome the finalization of the CTB treaty in this Committee during the current year. Pakistan would support a text which effectively prevents the further sophistication and testing of nuclear weapons, in whatever guise or form.

The second subject on which this Committee has been requested to undertake negotiations "at the beginning of its 1979 session" is an agreement for "the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and for their destruction" It is most unfortunate that the joint initiative promised by the two super-Powers on this subject almost three years ago has not materialized. In the time that has elapsed, the potential for the development of chemical weapons has become more extensive. My delegation hopes, therefore, that in response to the recommendations of the General Assembly, the United States and the Soviet Union will submit their joint initiative to the Committee as soon as possible. We are aware that important problems are involved in a chemical-weapons ban, particularly with regard to verification. In our opinion, however, these problems are not insuperable, provided the political will exists among the major military and industrial Powers to give up this terrible option of warfare.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

Although the General Assembly has urged the submission of the joint initiative by the two major Powers, the absence of this should not prevent the Committee from opening the negotiations on a chemical-weapons-ban treaty. These could begin on the basis of the drafts presented to the CCD earlier, or any new proposal which may be submitted by a member State in this Committee. My delegation is prepared to actively contribute to the process of evolving a draft treaty on chemical weapons during the current year.

The third subject to which consideration is to be given this year is the conclusion of effective arrangements, including an international convention, to assure the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Apart from the recommendation in paragraph 59 of the special session's Final Document, the General Assembly, at its thirty-third session, adopted two resolutions on the subject addressed to the Committee on Disarmament. Both these resolutions-- one sponsored by the Soviet Union and the other by Pakistan -- call on the Committee to evolve "effective" measures or arrangements to assure the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, including consideration of an international convention. The Committee is to take up examination of the draft conventions presented by Pakistan and the Soviet Union, and the views expressed on this subject, as soon as possible, and to submit "a progress report" to the next session of the United Nations General Assembly. Without going into the priority to be accorded to various items, this topic has the advantage of having concrete texts available on which negotiations could be initiated forthwith.

As you have mentioned, Mr. Chairman, agreement on this question would enhance the climate of world peace and security. Such security assurances are of special significance to the non-nuclear States of the Third World. They are entirely helpless in the face of the nuclear threat which is posed not only by the nuclear Powers but also some other States, such as South Africa and Israel, which may be in the process of acquiring -- or have perhaps already acquired -- a nuclear weapons capability. Action must be taken to prevent this possibility, and Pakistan has taken several initiatives, including one for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, for this purpose. We shall persevere in

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

our efforts to evolve arrangements for the denuclearization of South Asia. Pakistan shares the hope expressed in the Secretary-General's message to this Committee that the precedent of the treaty of Tlatelolco "will be followed by further concerted action toward the establishment of other nuclear-weapon-free zones". But, in the meantime, the world can avert a nuclear free-for-all only by constructing effective political and legal barriers against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. This will provide the time needed to succeed in halting and reversing the nuclear-arms race and prohibiting completely the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Some of the nuclear-weapon States remain reluctant to commit themselves to an international convention to assure the non-nuclear States against the nuclear threat. Various reasons have been cited to justify this reluctance, but the two advanced most often are: first, that assurances against the use of nuclear weapons have already been extended to the non-nuclear-weapon States; and, second, that it is not possible to evolve a formula for a uniform obligation by all the nuclear-weapon States. Let me say, with all deference to the Governments concerned, that neither of these presumptions is quite valid.

There is general agreement that the assurances provided by three nuclear Powers under resolution 255 of the Security Council are restrictive and lacking in credibility. Nor do the unilateral declarations made by the major nuclear Powers at the special session on disarmament provide an effective assurance to non-nuclear-weapon States against the use, or threat of use, of nuclear weapons. Apart from the fact that these declarations are different from each other in form and content, their credibility is further diminished-- in some cases entirely eroded -- by the conditions and qualifications attached to them.

A unilateral declaration, unless sanctified in a legal instrument, does not create binding or irrevocable commitments. It is bound to provoke a sense of reservation, because it is merely a statement of governmental policy, and policies, like Governments, are apt to change. Those very States which argue that the declaration of their Head of State regarding non-use of nuclear weapons is as binding as a treaty, have themselves taken the view that declarations made by Heads of State or Government of other nations regarding non-proliferation do not constitute a legal commitment and, therefore, urge acceptance of the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

We are told that no uniform formulation can be evolved for security assurances because of the different security perceptions of the nuclear- and non-nuclear-weapon States. Unilateral declarations were made by the major nuclear Powers at the special session, but the conditions and qualifications in the declaration of one nuclear Power were negated by the conditions and qualifications in the declarations of the other. The net result is that these qualified unilateral declarations provide little practical assurance to the non-nuclear States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. A "common formula" is, therefore, indispensable to evolve credible security guarantees.

The debate which took place on this subject at the last session of the General Assembly has clarified the issues involved in formulating such a "formula". The fundamental difficulty in reaching a common formula is the existence of the military strategies of the rival political blocs, both of which envisage the use of nuclear weapons against the nuclear and non-nuclear members of the opposing bloc. Pakistan continues to believe that the formulation for "negative" security assurances approved by the General Assembly in resolution 31/189 C, and reaffirmed at its thirty-second session, provides the most viable basis for evolving a "uniform obligation" to be undertaken by the nuclear Powers. This formula is not only supported by nearly 100 Member States, it also equitably reflects the preoccupations of all countries. The Pakistan delegation would suggest that after a preliminary exchange of views on the draft convention submitted by my country on this subject, the Committee should set up an ad hoc working group to take up detailed examination of the various issues involved.

My delegation hopes that this Committee will proceed to discharge its responsibilities with determination and despatch. These responsibilities are unique; but it is necessary to bear in mind that the Committee on Disarmament is part of the larger structure of United Nations machinery on disarmament. Its work must take account not merely of bilateral and trilateral negotiations outside the United Nations but specially of the discussions and decisions of the Disarmament Commission and, of course, the General Assembly.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

The procedures of this body must also reflect its character as a United Nations organ. The Committee should naturally work by consensus; but consensus should not be interpreted as providing one, two or three members, however important they may be, with the power of veto in this Committee. Also, unlike the CCD, the negotiations within the Committee should proceed in a systematic manner with separate sessions or meetings assigned for the consideration of specific topics. It might be worth-while to consider the establishment of ad hoc working groups or negotiating parties to take up the consideration of particular items or parts of such items. The Committee may also wish to set deadlines for the conclusion of negotiations and discussions on specific points.

The States represented on this Committee reflect a balance of interests between the nuclear and non-nuclear States, between aligned and unaligned countries, between large and small Powers, developed and developing countries. This is not to say that all national interests are reflected in the membership of this Committee. It is for this reason that the Pakistan delegation attaches importance to providing all interested States Members of the United Nations with the opportunity of participating in, and contributing to, the work of the Committee on Disarmament.

Pakistan's most fervent desire is to avoid involvement in an arms race, whether global or regional. This desire is testified to by the recent decision of the Government of Pakistan to unilaterally reduce its defence budget for 1979 by five per cent. We can but hope that this example will be followed by other States in the region.

The Super Powers, who are also the possessors of super military capabilities, have obtained possession of the ability to obliterate the world. It is the most onerous responsibility that has ever been known to mankind, and our common interest demands that it be shared. Disarmament is the vital concern of everybody, and especially that of our Committee. For these reasons, among many others, the Pakistan delegation will extend to the Committee on Disarmament its fullest attention and co-operation.

Mr. CARPIO CASTILLO (Venezuela) (translated from Spanish): The delegation of Venezuela has significant reasons for feeling especially gratified at becoming a member of the Committee on Disarmament. It is certainly an honour for our country to assume the great responsibility entrusted to it on being appointed a member of this important body.

We come to the Committee on Disarmament with enthusiasm and resolve, eager to participate actively in its work and to help, together with the other distinguished delegations, in arriving at formulas for an understanding that will permit progress to be made in disarmament. We shall do so with the interest, spirit and diligence that have guided our earlier conduct in the various organs of the United Nations in which disarmament matters are discussed. This explains in part our presence in this multilateral negotiating forum, in which mankind places firm hopes for the promotion of international peace and security.

At the same time, we are conscious of the immense difficulties and complexities that have to be tackled here, of the formidable obstacles that have to be overcome in order to achieve the goals that have been mapped out, and of the magnitude and significance of our responsibility. Nevertheless, we are essentially optimistic. Above all things, we rely on flexibility and good sense, on open and peaceful dialogue, so as to act in keeping with the needs of an unprecedented crisis that seriously threatens the fate of mankind.

We are also encouraged by the course of steadfastness and perseverance pursued by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in one of the most pressing problems facing contemporary society. Under its auspices, agreement has been reached on a number of important measures which, together with others of similar or greater significance that might be agreed upon in future, would give powerful impetus to the cause of disarmament. For the Venezuelan delegation, this is an appropriate occasion to pay sincere homage to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament for the work carried out in so many years of intense activity, of unbending determination, in an area filled with pitfalls and vicissitudes.

In making an over-all review of the international outlook, it is easy to see that the efforts deployed in order to contain the arms build-up, despite the logic and the good sense that underlie them, have lagged behind the arms race, which is making quantitative and qualitative advances at an alarming pace.

(Mr. Carpio Castillo, Venezuela)

It is obvious that the problems caused by the overwhelming and unchecked build-up of arms, far from being resolved, are growing even more serious and are increasingly threatening the survival of the human race. Not only is the outlook in this irrational trend disturbing in strictly material terms --it also reveals a moral devastation, a crisis of ideals and lofty aims, which together represent an assault on the human condition. As Simón Alberto Consalvi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Venezuela, has said, "the arms race, in itself, is a grave sign of an ethical crisis and of renouncement of all the other intelligent alternatives open to mankind".

Fortunately, this situation, which might be a source of discouragement and frustration, has not undermined the general determination to persevere, to redouble and intensify efforts, in an attempt to achieve tangible results in the sphere of disarmament. The holding of the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament pointed to the start of a new stage in the crusade against the arms race and established the framework within which the negotiations on disarmament must continue. It bore eloquent witness to the unflinching attitude that guides the international community in the titanic struggle which has to be waged against the arms build-up.

In the course of the meetings of the special session of the General Assembly, it became apparent that it was necessary and desirable to treat the problem with greater vigour and dynamism, to undertake specific reforms and restructurings of the machinery for the discussion and negotiation of disarmament, so as to facilitate and favour a more appropriate consideration of matters of substance. The changes agreed upon by the Assembly were indispensable because of the increasingly urgent demands of disarmament-related questions, which have increased in number and complexity. Naturally, the basic problem is still the lack of a political decision by the military and nuclear Powers that makes it impossible to achieve major progress. In any event, the innovations in the machinery are intended to strengthen the instruments of negotiation and broaden their scope, to systematize and organize still more the joint efforts to secure more beneficial results. The inclusion of Venezuela and other countries in this multilateral negotiating body is completely in line with this attempt to revitalize and democratize the consideration of disarmament matters in the United Nations.

(Mr. Carpio Castillo, Venezuela)

Unquestionably, the democratic orientation with which the deliberations of the Committee are commencing is significant. Organizational and procedural democratization was clearly established in the Final Document of the special session of the Assembly, which specified, inter alia, that the chairmanship of the Committee should be rotated among all its members on a monthly basis; that interested States not members of the Committee should be permitted to submit proposals on disarmament measures and participate in the discussion of the subject-matter of such proposals; that non-member States should be invited to express their views when questions of particular concern to them were under discussion; and, what is more, that the plenary meetings of the Committee should be open to the public.

We attach singular importance to this last point, since it is connected with a matter that we have repeatedly raised. We have maintained that in order to give a new impetus to disarmament it is necessary to have all the peoples of the world participate in these efforts in the most active, consistent and organized fashion. After all, the adverse consequences of the arms race endanger the existence of peoples and impose economic and social sacrifices on them. Since the need has become apparent to mobilize international public opinion for repudiating and condemning the arms race, the peoples are entitled to receive the fullest and most accurate information on the risks and implications of this very serious contemporary phenomenon, so that they can duly play their role of moderation and persuasion.

The opening of the Committee's meetings to the public, where appropriate, is a step that can help to turn into reality the already widespread desire to inform and involve a non-specialized public; to guide leaders in all sectors of public and private life; to strengthen and foster the emergence of professional, political and religious movements of opinion. In short, this kind of initiative can help to forge a pacifist consciousness opposed to the arms race.

In recent years, the trade in arms has reached exceedingly high figures. Truly, no argument or pretext can justify the persistence of many developing countries in using disproportionate resources for the purchase of armaments, thus lessening their peoples' chances of achieving a proper standard of living. Nor are the people who, from other countries, promote the arms trade in different interests and without scruple free from blame or responsibility either. However, the

(Mr. Carpio Castillo, Venezuela)

growing seriousness of this problem can in no way obscure or diminish the attention called for by the proliferation of nuclear weapons, a vital question of maximum priority.

Although some 80 per cent of world-wide military expenditure is allocated to conventional arms and forces, the greatest threat to mankind lies in nuclear war. Some 15 years ago the nuclear arsenals were already enough to destroy our civilization. Today, as is known, the nuclear arsenals contain tens of thousands of highly sophisticated nuclear weapons with a total nuclear explosive power equivalent to one million times that possessed by the bomb which devastated Hiroshima. Moreover, the arms limitation agreements arrived at so far are easily outstripped by the changes that are taking place in other areas in the arms race. Advances of a qualitative kind in nuclear weapons are still being made with virtually no restrictions whatsoever, as is shown by the incessant nuclear tests, largely designed to perfect the efficiency of these weapons.

While action must be promoted to agree on measures to limit conventional weapons, at the bilateral, regional and world-wide level, the major efforts of the United Nations, through this Committee, must aim at removing from the horizon the spectre of a nuclear conflagration.

We have repeatedly expressed our concern that effective measures for nuclear disarmament and the prevention of a nuclear war are for us of the highest priority. Any measure for nuclear disarmament, and all of them are imperative, must therefore include a firm and voluntary commitment by the five nuclear Powers. Otherwise, the gaps in such agreements or measures would not only make them imperfect or deficient but would also open the door to unilateral action by a nuclear Power, and we do not even wish to picture the foreseeable consequences.

Hence, the special session of the Assembly placed great importance on the participation of all nuclear-weapon States in the Committee on Disarmament, and such participation was established in its membership.

We are exceedingly gratified that the distinguished delegation of France, representing a nuclear Power, has filled the place that lay vacant for a period of sixteen years. Similarly, we hope that the People's Republic of China will soon be taking part in the Committee's work.

(Mr. Carpio Castillo, Venezuela)

As can be seen from the special report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to the special session of the Assembly, a number of matters are under consideration, and some of them have been considered by the CCD for sixteen years without its having been possible to achieve concrete results.

One of the Committee's tasks at this first session will be to adopt its programme of work, in which connexion it will have to take account of the recommendations made by the General Assembly, including those of the thirty-third session, and proposals submitted by the members of the Committee.

Unquestionably, this task is not an easy one, since we are faced on the one hand with those matters under consideration which were left pending by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, and on the other, by the various resolutions conferring on the Committee mandates that are "a matter of priority", "of great priority" or "to be taken up urgently". Our opinion, which we have already expressed earlier, is that this Committee must negotiate, as a matter of the highest priority, effective measures for nuclear disarmament. In this respect, special attention must be given to the question of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control, agreement on a treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, and the preparation of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, the last-named topic in co-ordination with the Disarmament Commission, a deliberative body on which the special session of the Assembly conferred a specific mandate in this respect.

The other matters pending are still of an urgent character, such as the prohibition of chemical weapons and their total destruction, the prohibition of new weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, the prohibition of radiological weapons, the prohibition of neutron nuclear weapons and the elimination of the arms race on the sea-bed. In addition to these matters, resolutions of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly call for consideration of the preparation of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States, and the question of an adequately verified cessation and prohibition of production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes and other nuclear explosive devices.

In view of this extensive and heavy programme of work that awaits us, there is no doubt that the establishment of ad hoc working groups, where necessary, will help to speed up the work of the Committee and to negotiate more expeditiously, as the international community expects of us, the requisite effective measures for disarmament.

(Mr. Carpio Castillo, Venezuela)

There are many centres of anxiety, discord and distress that hinder the attainment of peace and well-being on our planet. In the times in which we are living, of increasing interdependence and complexity, it is impossible to disentangle or separate the common problems we are facing. The research carried out under the auspices of the United Nations has emphasized the close link that in fact exists between the two most important objectives of the international community: disarmament on the one hand, and development on the other. Development at an acceptable pace is difficult or impossible to reconcile with the continuation of the arms race, which consumes huge and diverse resources that could otherwise be used for the economic and social advancement of the peoples.

An outstanding feature of our times has been the joint and united action of the countries of the third world, aimed at laying the foundations of an international economic order of justice and equity. As a result of the struggles and the demands of the third world, the conviction has been formed that it is essential to secure substantial progress in the field of development in order to preserve international peace and security. In the final instance, neither peace nor security can be preserved in a world in which nations are separated by such great and growing economic disparities. Far from being achieved through the build-up of arms, genuine security can only be achieved through disarmament and co-operation in a world in which inequalities and inequities are tending to diminish.

The achievement of major advances in disarmament will be a decisive spur to endeavours in the area of development. Progress in disarmament, both in the wealthy and in the poor countries, would release internal material, financial and human resources that could be used for development purposes. If the atmosphere of fear, hostility and confrontation is reduced through progress towards disarmament, propitious conditions will emerge for eliminating some of the obstacles that hinder harmonious and just economic relations among all States.

Consequently, the responsibility of the Committee on Disarmament and the importance of its task are obvious. What can be achieved here will have an evident impact on other aspects of the international problems that also call for urgent solutions.

We firmly believe that the problems caused by the arms race, although difficult and complex, can and must be resolved with the firm will of all States. The future of all the peoples will largely depend on the results achieved, on

(Mr. Carpio Castillo, Venezuela)

the solutions found for these dilemmas and problems. In this undertaking, the United Nations, through this Committee, will continue to be the most appropriate forum to channel and concentrate efforts and actions and free mankind from the threat of its destruction.

In conclusion, we should like to state most emphatically that the delegation of Venezuela will lend its firmest support to all initiatives, measures and proposals making for a fruitful understanding to secure the important and vital objectives we have before us.

Mr. SIMONET (Belgium) (translated from French): May I first of all say how happy I am to be able to represent my country in this place on the occasion of the opening of the work of the new Committee on Disarmament. Belgium comes to it with the firm intention of acting dynamically to further the aims which are those of the world community in the field of disarmament.

We take this opportunity of welcoming the other member States of this negotiating body which is our Committee. We are particularly gratified to note the presence of States which have an important part to play in this Committee by reason of their nuclear power.

We hope to see China associate itself in turn and in the near future with our work, if we are to promote the achievement of our great objective, namely, general and complete disarmament.

The immensity and the complexity of this task are such that every willingness will be required to advance the cause of disarmament, the universality of which has been demonstrated by the Final Document of the tenth special session of the United Nations, devoted to disarmament.

Nevertheless, it appears to me, after the special session devoted to this problem last June, that the situation has hardly evolved in a favourable direction.

And yet the presence in New York of twenty-five Heads of State and fifty Ministers for Foreign Affairs for the work of the special session had given rise to the belief in an international political realization of the need for really tackling the thorny problem of disarmament.

I accept the importance of the consensus which was reached on the Final Document defining the aims to be attained and stating, in perhaps too general a fashion, the means of achieving them.

(Mr. Simonet, Belgium)

Despite the undoubted differences existing between the views of various countries, it may nevertheless be considered that there now exist, not an agreed model for general and complete disarmament, but at least recognized principles and a programme of action specifying priorities.

The contrast existing between the intentions proclaimed from the rostrum at international forums and the current practice of the right of the strongest is certainly a cause for discouragement, but it also gives us the measure of the immensity of the way still to be travelled. Progress along this long road will only be achieved if disarmament is viewed not merely as a whole, but also in its complexity.

This complexity is mainly due to the universally recognized link between security and disarmament. They cannot be dissociated without running the risk of destabilization, and this, though it might perhaps be regional at the outset, would affect the politico-strategic equilibrium of the world. Moreover, as security requirements vary greatly from one region to another, the paths leading to disarmament are therefore many and varied. For these reasons, Belgium has been defending the merits of a regional approach for a number of years. In our view, that should in no way exclude the global approach which has so far dominated thinking in matters of disarmament.

I should like to recall some principles which must, in the eyes of my country, guide the approach to negotiations in the field of disarmament. Global disarmament strategy, to which the document of the special session invites us, emphasizes the universality of disarmament. It must therefore be considered as part of the responsibility of all Powers, nuclear and non-nuclear alike.

On the other hand, there exists, as regards disarmament, a kind of interaction. While it is the concern of everyone, it implies by the nature of things the responsibility of each State, but it goes without saying that the circumstances vary from case to case. Because of this, nuclear States and countries not equipped with atomic weapons -- but which it has been agreed to call "militarily significant" -- obviously have special responsibility in their respective fields.

The very nature of the circumstances which I have just mentioned means that the security-disarmament link varies according to region. This leads to varying regional tensions and, consequently, to the possibility of a regional solution of which the States forming part of geographical entities that are homogeneous from the security and disarmament viewpoint must be aware.

(Mr. Simonet, Belgium)

Approaching the problem from another angle, we believe that there must be a parallelism between efforts for nuclear disarmament and efforts for conventional disarmament. Détente must have as a corollary at the military level a reduction in forces and equipment, whatever their nature.

If disarmament is one of the ways which should enable us in fine "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war", as we are called upon to do in the initial lines of the Charter of the United Nations, to which all our States have subscribed, it requires an attitude which must wish to see the disappearance of all the types of arms to be found in the arsenals of the world.

Lastly, an essential element in any disarmament policy implies the existence of a climate of confidence and of the acceptance by States of a certain openness as regards their military resources. It is therefore not possible to escape from a system of verification, of effective controls making certain that the commitments entered into are respected. To deny such evidence is to run the risk of seeing disarmament agreements transformed into instruments rather of mistrust than of confidence, and to incur destabilization risks that are diametrically opposed to the desired results.

For historical and geographical reasons which are beyond its control, my country is situated in that part of the world where the fact of nuclear development is a determining element in the political equilibrium, but where, too, the concentration of nuclear warheads is the most impressive.

Being aware of this problem and wishing to indicate its desire not to increase nuclear risks, my country was one of the first to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty.

Nevertheless, whatever may be the undoubted value of the principle, non-proliferation will have a chance of succeeding only in so far as the necessary balance is observed between, on the one hand, the unilateral commitment of some to give up an attribute of sovereignty by self-limitation and, on the other, the necessity for others gradually to reduce their nuclear military arsenal. That is why my country fervently wishes that the current tripartite negotiations on the total banning of nuclear tests, as well as the bipartite SALT talks, may be concluded in the shortest possible time.

(Mr. Simonet, Belgium)

While the monopoly which the nuclear States possess imposes upon them the obligation to reduce their "vertical" proliferation, it is essential also to stress the question of "horizontal" non-proliferation, on which there is interaction between nuclear and non-nuclear States.

It seems obvious to us that States which voluntarily undertake to give up both producing and equipping themselves with nuclear weapons have the right in exchange to be preserved from any risk to which the temptation to take advantage of the relative weakness to which they have agreed might give rise. This implies that those in possession of nuclear weapons should undertake by suitable formulae not to make use of them vis-à-vis such States.

Similarly, it does not seem superfluous to repeat that the conclusion of a treaty on the cessation of all nuclear tests would substantially increase the chances of strengthening the application of the non-proliferation principle, to which my country remains firmly attached.

While attending to the essential tasks awaiting us in the nuclear field, it is necessary at the same time to consider the problems encountered in the field of conventional disarmament. The complexity of those problems is also undeniable, and for various reasons.

In the first place, conventional conflicts have become so much more numerous as to increase the danger facing mankind.

Moreover, as from a certain level, a parallel and balanced reduction of conventional forces and armaments would be necessary to ensure a parallel balance in the substantial reduction there would be in the nuclear field.

For any nuclear reduction which did not lead to reductions in conventional armaments, or served, on the contrary, as a pretext for increasing them, would ultimately have no other effect than to bring about a further disequilibrium giving cause for concern.

It is especially important to stress the part which conventional disarmament may play in areas not covered by what is called nuclear dissuasion. Conventional reductions in those areas may constitute one of the steps leading to the process of general and complete disarmament, provided that the States concerned are assured that disarmament does not involve the alienation of their security and independence.

(Mr. Simonet, Belgium)

As I have had occasion to say in the United Nations, experience has proved that "there is no subject more difficult than that of disarmament. Negotiations always get off to a hesitant start. Once they are under way, progress is slow because of a fundamental distrust which the protagonists cannot overcome, regardless of the sincerity of their determination".

But the difficulties of the task must not make us give up the pursuit of our objective. The favourable developments which have occurred since the sixties in negotiations on certain aspects of disarmament should, indeed, encourage the international community to redouble its efforts.

Détente has made possible an improvement in the climate of international relations. There is no acceptable alternative to détente. While aware of the fragmentary and fragile character of the results obtained, we must welcome them and consider that they represent the first necessary steps along the long road to be travelled by men of goodwill.

If we can get over the mountain of our prejudices and perpetual fears, we may enter the twenty-first century without the threat of a terrible conflict hanging over our own or our children's heads.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): Before closing this meeting, I should like to express my sincerest thanks to all who have spoken for their substantial contribution to our Committee's work and for their renewed expressions of friendship towards my country, my Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Bouteflika, and his representatives in the Committee. It will be my duty and pleasure to transmit to Mr. Bouteflika the expression of those feelings of friendship and confidence.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

CD/PV.4
25 January 1979
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FOURTH MEETING
held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva
on Thursday, 25 January 1979, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman:

MR. R. BOUDJAJDJI

(Algeria)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. R. BOUDJAKDJI
Mr. A. FASIA
Mr. A. BENSMAIL
Mr. N. KERROUM

Argentina: Mr. D.C. ORTIZ de ROZAS
Mr. F. JIMENEZ DÁVILA
Mr. A.H. MOLTENI

Australia: Mr. L.D. THOMSON
Ms. M.S. WICKES

Belgium: Mr. J.A.R. SCHOUMAKER

Brazil: Mr. G.A. MACIEL
Mr. L.P. LINDENBERG SETTE

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. I. PETROV
Mr. I. SOTIROV

Burma: U SAW HLAING
U THEIN AUNG
U THAUNG HTUN

Canada: Mr. G.A.H. PEARSON
Mr. R. Harry JAY
Mr. J.T. SIMARD

Cuba: Mr. P. TORRAS
Mr. L. SOLA VILA
Mr. F.O. RODRÍGUEZ
Mrs. V.B. JACKLEWICH
Mr. C. PAZOS BECEIRO
Mr. R. VALIENTE
Mr. R.L. GARCIA

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. V. TYLNER
Mr. J. JIRŮSEK

Egypt:

Mr. O. EL-SHAFEI
Mr. F. EL-IBRASHI
Mr. M. EL-BARADEI

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. TERREFE
Mr. G. ALULA

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. S. KAHN
Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. G. PFEIFFER
Mr. H. SCHNEPPEN
Mr. J. PÖHLMANN
Mr. H. MÜLLER

Hungary:

Mr. H. DOMOKOS
Mr. A. LAKATOS

France:

Mr. F. de la GORCE
Mr. F. BEAUCHATAUD
Mr. J. FEVRE
Mr. J.C. PARAVY

India:

Mr. S.T. DEVARE

Indonesia:

Mr. A. SANI
Mr. A. KAMIL

Iran:

Mr. D. CHILATY
Mr. D. AMERI

Italy:

Mr. F. FERRETTI
Mr. M. ALESSI
Mr. M. MORENO
Mr. C. FRATESCHI

Japan:

Mr. M. OGISO
Mr. T. NONOYAMA
Mr. Y. KIKUCHI
Mr. T. IWANAMI
Mr. Y. NAKAMURA

Kenya:

Mr. C.G. MAINA
Mr. G.N. MUNIU

Mexico:

Mr. A. GARCÍA ROBLES
Miss A. CABRERA
Miss L.M. GARCIA

Mongolia:

Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
Mr. LUVSANDORJIIN BAYART

Morocco:Netherlands:

Mr. R.H. FEIN
Mr. A.J. MEERBURG

Nigeria:

Mr. O. ADENIJI
Mr. K. AHMED

Pakistan:

Mr. J.K.A. MARKER
Mr. H. AKRAM

Peru:

Mr. J.A. MONTERO

Poland:

Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. H. PAC
Mr. S. KONIK
Mr. H. KRUCZYK

Romania:

Mr. I. RADULESCU
Mr. C. ENE
Mr. V. TUDOR
Mr. T. MELESCANU
Mr. G. TINCA

Sri Lanka:

Mr. A.C.S. HAMEED
Miss M.L. NAGANATHAN

Sweden:

Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. L. NORBERG
Mr. J. PRAWITZ
Mr. J. LUNDIN

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. V.L. ISSRAELIAN
Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN
Mr. A.M. VAVILOV
Mr. E.D. ZAITSEV
Mr. V.A. VERTOGRADOV
Mr. Y.V. KOSTENKO
Mr. M.G. ANTIUKHIN

United Kingdom:

Mr. N.H. MARSHALL
Mr. C.L.G. MALLABY
Mr. C.K. CURWEN
Mr. P.M.W. FRANCIS

United States of America:

Mr. A. FISHER
Mr. C. FLOWERREE
Mr. A. AKALOVSKY
Mr. R. HAGENGRUBER
Ms. BLAIR L. MURRAY
Mr. H.L. SANCHES
Mr. A. YARMOLINSKY

Venezuela:

Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT

Mr. H. ARTEAGA

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. PEŠIĆ

Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIĆ

Mr. D. DJOKIĆ

Zaire:

Mr. B. BUKAYI

Mr. H. ESUK

Director-General of the
United Nations Office at Geneva:

Mr. L. COTTAFANI

Assistant Secretary-General:

Mr. R. BJÖRNERSTEDT

The CHAIRMAN (Translated from French): Before giving the floor to the first speaker, I should like to inform you that, at the request of the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Secretariat is distributing in the conference room, as document CD/3, the text of the message addressed yesterday by Mr. Leonid Brezhnev, the General-Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, to the Committee on Disarmament on the occasion of the inauguration of its work.

May I ask Ambassador Victor Issraelyan, the representative of the USSR to the Committee on Disarmament and a member of the Collegium of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, to convey our sincere thanks for the contents of the message which emphasizes the very special importance that the Soviet Union attaches to the work of our Committee.

Mr. TORRAS (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): In taking the floor for the first time in the discussions of the disarmament negotiating body -- the Committee on Disarmament -- I should like my first words to convey to you, Minister Abdelaziz Bouteflika, the fraternal greetings of our delegation on your election as Chairman of our meetings and to assure you of our firm decision to make our modest contribution to the achievement of the agreements required of us in our work.

We fully share in the grief felt by a sister republic, the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, at the loss of its beloved leader, President Houari Boumedienne, and should like to convey through you sincerest condolences from the Cuban Revolution and our firm decision to carry on together the consistent and worthy struggle for a better world, the struggle in which he was a distinguished combatant.

We also wish to express our gratitude to all those who have co-operated in some way in choosing our country to take a place in this august tribune and, in turn, congratulate the other countries that have also been selected for the first time to form part of the group of States responsible for negotiations on disarmament in this forum.

Our congratulations also go to the older members and our hope that, with the experience they have already acquired, they will contribute to the successful outcome of our labours; we are grateful to all delegations which have expressed satisfaction that our own country as well as other States have become members of this Committee.

(Mr. Torras, Cuba)

The new members and also those which have been engaged so far in the task of arriving at the adoption of international instruments as elements of general and complete disarmament, can, we repeat, unhesitatingly rely on the most determined support and the firm co-operation of the Cuban delegation.

The non-aligned and developing countries bear a special responsibility for the achievement of specific agreements on disarmament, whence their growing interest in taking part in the most important work being done with that aim in mind. This interest has justifiably claimed the attention of all States.

This responsibility is born of the fact that, in representing peoples bravely struggling to overcome underdevelopment and poverty and the vestiges of centuries of colonialist and neo-colonialist exploitation, they wish to contribute as much as they can to the achievement of agreements which will allow the astronomical resources devoted to arms production to be used to combat the backwardness, destitution and hunger that still afflict a large part of mankind. The fact that, according to estimates in the specialist press, the astronomical figure of more than \$300 billion is allocated to military expenditure and that, according to figures given in the North American press, the military budget of a single Power -- the United States -- will amount to \$136 billion by 1980, in itself explains the imperative need for the non-aligned and developing countries to do everything in their power to bring about agreements that will open the way to the desired goal of general and complete disarmament.

We consider that the proliferation of international organs and forums on disarmament, in general and in particular, is not desirable for the achievement of our objectives, since it places a heavy financial burden on our budgets and entails the appropriation of hundreds of thousands of dollars for their servicing, when our peoples expect the investment made in defraying the cost of these activities and their delegations to be translated into concrete and tangible results. In this respect it is important to remember that the tenth special session of the United Nations devoted to disarmament decided that there should be a single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum: the Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. Torras, Cuba)

Bearing in mind the general interest and aspirations of the international community, this means that our delegations must work in a constructive spirit and must tackle problems directly, avoiding pointless debate in order to focus attention on what must be our primary objective: the achievement of specific agreements, international instruments and treaties on disarmament which will solve the problems that hamper the attainment of general and complete disarmament.

At the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament as well as during the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations and of the First Committee of the General Assembly, we heard a number of opinions to the effect that the main obstacle in the way of agreements on disarmament is the lack of "political will" on the part of some States to set out on the path to achieving them. We consider that those who express such opinions are right in respect of some States that are well known for their deeds, but not in respect of the others.

For us, political will is expressed in a frank and open presentation of the nature of the problems which prevent or put obstacles in the way of finding the common denominator that will make for agreement on the international instruments under discussion and the decision to eliminate those problems; in this context, the responsibility of the nuclear-weapon Powers for making effective and concrete progress in the sphere of general and complete disarmament is undeniable.

In referring to political will, our delegation considers it a duty to pay tribute to the consistent position in favour of disarmament adopted by the Soviet Union since its very emergence as a State -- one that is a result of its own social system, which means that since it has no economic interests or colonies or investments to defend or safeguard, it has no need of war. As stated by Carlos Rafael Rodríguez, the Vice-President of the Council of State and Ministers of Cuba, who headed the Cuban delegation to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament, it is now more than half a century since the Soviet Union spoke of the urgency of bringing about general and complete disarmament. Since then, Soviet initiative has been a part of all international efforts aimed at disarmament.

(Mr. Torras, Cuba)

In the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, an important place is occupied by the Programme of Action which is to serve as the basis for future activities. The document itself establishes the priorities on which the attention of States seeking general and complete disarmament must be focused.

The basic element of disarmament priorities is to engage in activities which will prevent the unleashing of a nuclear conflict, the dimensions and the consequences of which are incalculable. It is worth remembering what Fidel Castro, our great leader, said in referring to these weapons in his report to the First Congress of our Communist Party:

"Never has the struggle for peace been more necessary, because neither have weapons ever before been of such destructive power, nor have the risks of human extermination been potentially greater".

For this reason the Committee on Disarmament must tackle, in all its scope and complexity, the need to secure international agreements and instruments which will enable mankind to live without fear of the nuclear holocaust. In this connexion, the negotiations taking place between the nuclear-weapon States on strategic arms limitation and the prohibition of nuclear tests cannot be ignored.

Nuclear disarmament, described by the special session of the Assembly as a measure of the highest priority, must be the central point in the work of this Committee, which has the task of bringing reality to the elimination of the threat posed by nuclear weapons. To this end, we have some significant proposals on which we must work immediately, without delay.

There are also proposals and specific resolutions on the prohibition of other types of weapons of mass destruction. In our opinion, such a prohibition must be made real and effective, without allowing for interpretations that suggest a need to identify such weapons -- for that would in fact imply their very existence.

In this same context, it has to be borne in mind that delays make for the emergence of further obstacles and difficulties, such as the criminal attempt, in the face of world-wide condemnation, to produce the neutron bomb, which is not

(Mr. Torras, Cuba)

only a new threat to the survival of mankind but also an obstacle to the negotiations on disarmament. It is worth pointing out that a proposal is already in existence: the draft treaty submitted by the socialist countries at the most recent session of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

The Committee must take note of these situations so as to identify problems realistically and facilitate progress towards achievement of the increasingly vital agreements for which we are responsible.

There are also General Assembly proposals and suggestions, which must be dealt with as a matter of priority, concerning chemical weapons, on whose prohibition this body has been working for several years.

We firmly believe that conditions are better now for the elimination of existing differences on the conclusion of a treaty banning chemical weapons and, in view of the urgency of the matter, we must strive for its adoption without any delay.

One of the tasks of the Committee on Disarmament is to analyse the so-called comprehensive programme of disarmament. Since the Committee cannot yet begin to deal with all the elements which should be included in this programme, it should not remain inactive or engage in general debates until the United Nations Disarmament Commission meets in May. The progress made by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in this matter must be taken into account, even though it may appear limited.

The Committee on Disarmament, with its more modern structure and with the participation of a greater number of countries, is expected to continue the work started and developed within the CCD over the years, and to begin work on drafts in which the bases have been laid for promoting adoption of appropriate international instruments in the field of disarmament.

It has to be borne in mind in this respect that, if the goal of general and complete disarmament is to be achieved, there must necessarily be partial disarmament agreements of a binding nature.

We also wish to refer to the need for all nuclear-weapon States to participate in our work. Only in this way will it be possible to guarantee the universality of the agreements resulting from our work and their mandatory

(Mr. Torras, Cuba)

implementation. And in this context we are gratified by the participation of France in this Committee -- a development which, in our view, is of major importance.

For the analysis of the comprehensive programme of disarmament, moreover, it will be necessary to bear in mind all the points made and set out in paragraph 125 of the Final Document of the special session devoted to disarmament concerning the existence of a large number of proposals, ideas and suggestions which do not appear in the Final Document because they failed to command the necessary consensus but which have the support of a large part of the international community.

Among these is the proposal for the dismantling of foreign military bases. This is of vital importance to Cuba because, as you know, the United States maintains a naval and air base in our country, against the express will of our Government and people, in gross disregard of our sovereignty. The elimination of military bases in foreign territory would be an effective step towards the strengthening of international security. Our delegation will work for this in the Committee.

In dealing with these questions, we cannot overlook the right of peoples and States to possess the weapons they require in the struggle for their national liberation, and for the defence of their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament established the priorities that exist on this subject, which we must bear in mind when we come to discuss specific proposals.

On the other hand, the General Assembly, at its thirty-third session, adopted various resolutions containing specific suggestions concerning the work of the Committee. These suggestions, coming as they did immediately after the special session, reflect, in the highest degree, the concern produced by the special session and take account of many of the ideas presented at that time.

We have before us various important documents which have already been partly discussed in the CCD, and it is to be hoped that we shall be able to deal with them from a new angle and a new perspective.

It is also to be hoped that we shall soon have before us a text on the prohibition of nuclear weapon tests which will greatly facilitate our task and permit the preparation of other related instruments.

(Mr. Torras, Cuba)

In recent times, the possibility of the neutron bomb, as a singularly inhumane weapon of mass extermination, has shown that it is increasingly urgent to conclude a treaty on prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons.

We have before us the priority task of preventing advances in science and technology from contributing to the emergence of weapons of this type. If we are not up to this task, nobody can predict what will happen in the future.

The last point to which my delegation would like to draw attention is also contained in the Final Document of the special session on disarmament. Since the Committee's decisions will be taken by consensus, the instruments resulting from our work will find broad acceptance and be sufficiently effective.

In disarmament questions, the taking of decisions by consensus is of fundamental importance, since if they are not taken in this way any agreement adopted could become a dead letter and be completely ineffective. This fact places a twofold responsibility on us, in that we shall have to reconcile all interests in a realistic and objective manner so that each task undertaken culminates in the success we all desire.

In view of the complex nature of disarmament problems and of their impact on the national sovereignty of each State, there can be no solution to them unless the parties to the negotiations reach firm agreements by means of consensus, possibly including the mandatory element that is required.

My delegation now affirms its commitment to work in this body towards the accomplishment of its mandate, with a view to offering the international community all the international instruments it is possible to produce so as to facilitate achievement of general and complete disarmament, which is our ultimate objective.

This supreme objective of ours in the matter of disarmament is consistent with Cuba's noble concept of peace, which is an essential requisite for creative work, whose glory was extolled by our President, Comrade Fidel Castro, in the speech he made at the solemn session of the National Assembly of Peoples' Power to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the victory of the Revolution. (I quote):

(Mr. Torras, Cuba)

"To develop a country and build socialism is much more difficult than to win a revolutionary war. The latter may take years, but the former is a task stretching over decades. Yet victories in work are much nobler than victories in war, which are always won at the price of blood. The glories of war, although just, may be forgotten and, for the revolutionary, they have no meaning except as a bitter instrument of liberty. The glories of work are eternal. Had mankind been just it would have erected more monuments to work than to feats of arms. But work has its own undying monument, namely, progress and human creation and their unknown heroes -- the selfless masses of the people; although to fight, win and die for a just cause is also the form in which expression must sometimes be given to the noble work of revolutionaries with which pages of unsurpassable selflessness and grandeur are written and the everlasting monument of progress constructed".

Cuba's idea of peace and the importance attached to it by our Revolution have been embodied in its fundamental law, the Constitution of the Republic, which was approved after thorough discussion by our people throughout the length and breadth of the country, and of which article 12 includes the following precise definition. (I quote):

"The Republic of Cuba:

"Shall work for an honourable and lasting peace based on respect for the independence and sovereignty of peoples and their right to self-determination:

"Shall base its international relations on the principles of equality of rights, the sovereignty and independence of States, and mutual interest":

With this provision reaffirmed in the external policy of the Cuban Revolution, we come to this Committee with optimism and in the conviction that it will make progress along the road towards turning the aspirations of peoples for general and complete disarmament into a reality.

Mr. PEARSON (Canada): Seventeen years ago, on 19 March 1962, the head of the Canadian delegation to the new 18-nation Committee on Disarmament addressed it for the first time. He made a special point of welcoming the eight new members and expressed the hope that their presence would "assist materially in the search for early agreement" and in avoiding the stalemates of the past. He went on to note other reasons which gave hope for early progress towards agreement: these included endorsement by the General Assembly of a set of basic principles on disarmament, expectation that the reallocation of some of the resources then devoted to expenditures on armaments to the raising of living standards would greatly improve these standards, awareness from past experience of the grave consequences of the failure of negotiations and, finally, fear of the growing power of modern weapons.

I do not repeat these hopes of 1962 in order to discourage the expectations of the eight new members in 1979. Canada sincerely welcomes these members and believes their presence will indeed be of positive benefit to our work. May I take note in particular, Mr. Chairman, of the distinguished record which your country and you yourself have established at the United Nations. I wish only to remind all of us, old as well as new, that the arguments in favour of disarmament are well known. We might well ask whether anything has happened in these past 17 years to justify a similar optimism today. Part of the answer may be found in the fact that, of eight areas of possible agreement which the Canadian delegation singled out in 1962, negotiations in five areas have actually led to agreement, partial or otherwise. But there has been failure in the most crucial areas of nuclear and conventional disarmament, and we are still waiting for the results of the negotiations on a comprehensive test ban and a ban of chemical weapons. Perhaps it is time for this Committee again to resume its efforts to reach agreement on chemical weapons in particular.

Negotiations on disarmament clearly cannot make substantial progress unless all the nuclear-weapon Powers participate. The United States and the USSR have special responsibilities, reflecting the dominance they have achieved in the development of strategic weapons, but there are limits beyond which they are unlikely to reach agreement if other major military Powers stand aside. We express the hope, therefore, that China will soon follow the example of France and take its seat at this table.

Of all the issues that have been examined or referred to this Committee, none has been assigned nor is likely to be given higher priority than those concerned with nuclear weapons. Paragraph 45 of the Final Document of the United Nations special session devoted to disarmament makes this abundantly clear.

(Mr. Pearson, Canada)

This priority is not new. The nuclear age is now older than most people alive. But as the years pass the contrast between ever-more sophisticated and efficient weapons and the failure of efforts to control or eliminate them becomes more obvious. Only the Non-Proliferation Treaty stands out as a really significant multilateral arms control measure in the nuclear field. Yet even here, the Final Document of the special session took six full paragraphs on this general subject to achieve the correct balance of views to which all nations could subscribe.

Nuclear issues are not the only ones, as the Final Document also recognizes. But if the nuclear-weapon Powers are able to control these weapons, the incentive for the non-nuclear-weapon States to forego any option to acquire such weapons will be greatly strengthened. To have a lasting and more positive effect upon world security, the concept of non-proliferation must be applied more even-handedly to both its horizontal and vertical dimensions. Unless there is movement in this important field, it will be difficult to breathe new life into the arms control and disarmament process.

In this perspective, Canada believes that negotiations in this Committee on nuclear questions must be directed primarily towards the goal of achieving a comprehensive test ban treaty. We welcomed the start of the discussions in 1977, as it marked the first concerted attempt by nuclear-weapon States to reach such an agreement since the signing of the Partial Test Ban Treaty in 1963. We realized that the achievement of a comprehensive test ban would not be rapid, since we agreed that measures of verification must be such that all States could be reasonably certain that others were living up to the terms of the agreement. Yet we are disappointed by the rate of progress of the negotiations. The establishment of a fully-tested world data exchange system to which all of us can contribute could be one of the most effective methods available to the international community for setting up a comprehensive test ban regime. Let us be clear, however, that problems of verification are a matter of judgement, not of technical perfection.

Seen another way, a test ban could be achieved by unilateral declarations to that effect by the nuclear-weapon States themselves. We do not prefer that approach for two reasons. First, we believe that, to have any lasting effect, a test ban should be of such duration that it begins and continues to have a negative impact on development of new weapons. Such an achievement, however, could be called into question if a ban does not go beyond simply moving nuclear testing into an intermittent time frame. Secondly, if future steps, such as the comprehensive test ban, are to be more even-handed in both the vertical and horizontal dimensions of non-proliferation, the non-nuclear-weapon States should have a substantive input into the final treaty, so that it has a good chance of becoming universal, and all contracting parties understand their obligations under it.

(Mr. Pearson, Canada)

A second measure to which we attach importance is a ban on the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes or other nuclear explosive devices. The General Assembly of the United Nations, at its thirty-third session, agreed by a large majority that this proposal had at last come of age. Previous formulations of the concept concentrated almost exclusively on the impact such a treaty or convention would have on the nuclear-weapon States. In our view, however, the General Assembly, in requesting this Committee to consider this proposal at an appropriate stage, was right to put it in the context of verifiable and universally binding controls to be implemented on a non-discriminatory basis.

Thus, my delegation views this proposal as another way in which to enhance the effectiveness of the non-proliferation regime. Indeed, a treaty equally applicable to nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States would, in conjunction with a Comprehensive Test Ban, progressively control the dynamics of nuclear competition, and could, if the nuclear-weapon States agreed, prevent the expansion of existing stockpiles for use in developing new nuclear weapons systems based on known technology. We would then have gone a long way toward bringing the nuclear arms race in both its vertical and horizontal dimensions to a halt.

We further believe that, to be realistic and effective, the nuclear-weapon States must first agree on ways in which such a treaty can be verified. To this end, resolution A/33/91 H identifies full-scope safeguards, on a non-discriminatory basis, as the essential mechanism by which adequate verification may be achieved. Canada, for its part, will continue to explore various aspects and methods of verification of such an agreement with a view to tabling, at an appropriate stage, the text of a draft treaty.

Canada looks forward to the conclusion of the second stage of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks and the beginning of what is now generally recognized as the next stage in a continuing process. The results of the present stage of the negotiations are of particular interest because they involve or look forward to two further measures for reducing nuclear arms: ceilings on strategic weapons systems which may eventually lead to a slowing in the growth of military spending on new strategic nuclear weapon systems and, in time, it is hoped, an agreement to stop flight-testing so as to restrain further development of new strategic delivery vehicles.

Still another way to strengthen the non-proliferation regime is exemplified by negative security guarantees. The Committee now has before it under this heading the unilateral assurances of the various nuclear-weapon States with respect to the conditions which they feel must pertain before they would preclude the use of their nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. These assurances are made in the context of rights and responsibilities with respect to self-defence under the Charter of the United Nations. We support such assurances because they constitute, in part,

(Mr. Pearson, Canada)

a recognition by the nuclear-weapon States that the Non-Proliferation Treaty is not entirely even-handed in its treatment of nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States, and that any step towards redressing this balance strengthens the Treaty by providing it with greater equity.

We are not entirely convinced that these essentially unenforceable and differing negative promises can be converted into a legally binding form; at the very least the nuclear-weapon States would have to agree on the form of guarantee that they are making. The format of a treaty does not lend itself to the sole purpose of recording unilateral promises, and the obligation not to use nuclear weapons would apply only to those who possess nuclear weapons. The search for a common formula will require on the part of the nuclear-weapon States the careful examination of any common elements of their individual assurances.

They can be assisted in this task by the Committee on Disarmament. Two resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its last session in effect request our Committee to consider the proposals which were submitted during the discussions on this issue and to report. We believe that this Committee could play a useful role in examining the possibility of achieving a common formula which could be acceptable to all nuclear-weapon States and which would satisfy the demands of non-nuclear-weapon States. If preliminary consideration of the question revealed that there were, in fact, elements of possible agreement on such a question, we could then envisage the establishment of a working group to pursue the subject.

Apart from assigning some of the foregoing specific nuclear issues to this negotiating body, the General Assembly at its thirty-third session called for the initiation of a wide-ranging list of disarmament and arms control studies recognizing, inter alia, that global efforts towards disarmament can usefully be supplemented by regional approaches. The results of these studies could prove useful to our own efforts. I wish to endorse the Secretary-General's emphasis on the importance of developing a comprehensive approach to studies on disarmament and the need to relate them to a strategy for disarmament and to negotiations towards the implementation of that strategy. It may well be that studies commissioned for a broader deliberative function will provide valuable background and even suggest directions for negotiations, but we should not hesitate in this body to initiate our own studies of the singular or recurrent problems associated with specific agreements.

One area where this point is already implicitly recognized is in the field of verification; specifically, the application of the science of seismology as it relates to the monitoring of a comprehensive test ban treaty. As the head of the Canadian delegation stated in 1962: "In the opinion of my delegation, the best way to achieve a realistic solution of the problem of verification is to avoid abstract debates on the word 'verification'. Instead, there should be careful examination of each measure of

(Mr. Pearson, Canada)

disarmament together with the specific verification procedures ... needed for that measure". The applicability of this suggested negotiating technique is just as valid today, and it is our intention later this year to table a paper summarizing various verification proposals for different disarmament and arms control measures, which we hope will assist this Committee in achieving its goals.

Similarly, any tendency to blur the lines between the negotiating function of this Committee and the deliberative function of the Disarmament Commission will only lead to confusion. Both bodies, while remaining distinctive, must play their part in a comprehensive strategy but the programme for such a strategy, in our view, could most conveniently be discussed in the Commission. It will be for this Committee to focus on the specific elements of any agreed strategy and find ways for bringing them into force.

Finally, it would be logical to assume that one of the first items on our agenda will be the settlement of procedures to aid us in our work. I believe that the timely and very useful suggestions put forward in the letter of 4 January 1979 from the Assistant Secretary-General for the Centre for Disarmament will be of assistance to us in this regard. Our best rule of thumb at this stage is to provide ourselves with a flexible mode of coming to grips with our workload and to avoid rigid structures which constrict our ability to respond to the particular requirements of each negotiation. With larger numbers of participants, a greater degree of informality might prove helpful. Furthermore, some formula whereby more concentrated expertise might be brought to bear on specific problems on an ad hoc basis, without in any way inhibiting the full participation of member States should they so wish, could well prove the most productive way of proceeding.

I have deliberately concentrated these remarks on nuclear weapons. The control and reduction of nuclear weapon systems is the greatest challenge we face, although my Government is strongly of the view that the control of conventional weapons cannot be ignored by this Committee. We would like to see negotiations on all issues of arms control and disarmament proceed as circumstances permit. It is tempting to believe, as the British statesman Lloyd George once remarked, that you cannot cross a chasm in two jumps. That is the all or nothing approach to disarmament. It is correct in the sense that international security cannot be assured by any one category of measures, whether they be arms control, disarmament, defence alliances, declarations of intent, codes of behaviour or international peace-keeping forces. But in a world which is rapidly acquiring the capacity for self-destruction, our immediate goal must be self-preservation, not perfect security. If we cannot cross the chasm in one jump, the alternative is to build a bridge. The Final Document of the special session is not a bad design for such a bridge, but it cannot be built quickly or all at once. Let us do what we can with the materials at hand, remembering what lies below.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): This occasion symbolizes the increasingly active role of the entire community of nations in the processes of arms control and disarmament, the success of which is so critical to the peace and security of all of us. I would like to join in welcoming the representatives of those Governments who were not at this table last year, and to say how much we look forward to working with you, and with all the others present here, in exploring our common interests and our common goals. The presence of so many distinguished statesmen and diplomats is witness to the high hopes the world places in this body.

What I propose to do this afternoon is to tell you why my Government is convinced that this forum is so essential to the pursuit of our common goals, and then to discuss the approach the United States is taking in pursuing those goals.

We all are becoming increasingly aware that the inhabitants of this small planet are more and more dependent on each other for the necessities of life: for our supply of foods and fibres, for our shrinking non-renewable energy resources, for a livable environment. In no other area, however, are we so entirely dependent on each other as in the avoidance of international conflict -- conflict that always holds the terrible danger of escalation into thermonuclear holocaust. Conflict anywhere in the world can threaten all of us, and heighten the potential for conflict among the nuclear-weapon Powers.

The Committee on Disarmament has a major role to play in helping to reduce the tensions that lead to conflict because it can articulate the interests of all Governments concerned, and it can help to incorporate them into the language of workable agreements. I want to stress this point in contrasting the role of the Committee on Disarmament with the role of the other major multilateral disarmament body, the United Nations Disarmament Commission, which was designed as a deliberative, rather than a negotiating body. Both bodies provide the opportunity for Governments to share with each other their views and concerns, to test their positions in vigorous multinational debate and to explore mutual values in an effort to narrow differences on divisive issues. But the negotiating body has also to be able to meet the challenge of finding ways to bridge differences so that effective agreements can be achieved.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

Our predecessor bodies have always functioned under the rule of consensus. We are committed to do likewise, and properly so. It may be useful at this time to reflect on the significance of the consensus principle. Clearly, in a multilateral negotiating forum, all participants are free to express their opinions, and any restraint on that freedom of expression can only serve to poison the atmosphere. But, by the same token, all participants must recognize two factors affecting decision making:

First, some participants will have a more vital interest in particular agreements than other participants will. The views and concerns of those specially interested participants must necessarily, in the real world, be given greater consideration.

Second, all participants must bear in mind that the views of the overwhelming majority on a particular question carry special weight, and should lead the minority members to consider their positions carefully.

The rules of ordered liberty are the essence of the principle of consensus on which the work of this body was founded.

Let me turn now to the views of the United States on the substantive issues that are our common concern.

Our objective should be to strengthen the security of all peoples and nations. No nation can be expected to support an agreement that puts its security at risk. I am sure, however, that you share my conviction that through the various mechanisms that are available to us, of which this negotiating forum is in the front rank, we can devise arms control and disarmament measures that contribute to the restraint of armaments and enhance the general security.

In this regard it is natural that the major, but by no means the exclusive, preoccupation of the United States has been with the problem of controlling nuclear armaments. My country shares the view that has often been expressed in international disarmament discussions and was spelled out in the Final Document of the United Nations General Assembly's special session devoted to disarmament, that among genuine measures of disarmament, effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war have the highest priority. The obligations of the nuclear-weapon Powers in the effort to halt and then reverse the growth of nuclear arsenals are clearly expressed in Article VI of the NPT. The United States is well

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

aware of these obligations and is exerting its best efforts to meet them, as I will outline for you in a moment. I take particular note of the fact that it was a predecessor of this forum -- the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee -- that was responsible for producing the text of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, including article VI.

As the nuclear-weapon States have special responsibilities with respect to nuclear weapons, so all States have responsibilities with respect to limits on non-nuclear weapons. Although these responsibilities bear more heavily, perhaps, on those States that are the principal suppliers of the non-nuclear weapons that make up 90 per cent of the world's arsenals, effective limitation is not possible without co-operation between suppliers and recipients. In this area, too, my country is fully aware of its obligations and is taking action to meet them.

Returning to the question of bringing nuclear arsenals under control, I am happy to be able to report that the United States and the Soviet Union are close to resolving the remaining issues that stand in the way of a SALT II agreement. This agreement will establish ceilings on all major categories of strategic nuclear delivery systems of the two sides. It will also initiate the process of reducing the overall number of such systems. In addition, important qualitative constraints will be imposed on the further development of the nuclear arsenals of the two participants.

Let me stress that this agreement not only builds -- and builds very considerably -- upon the first 1972 Agreements, but also commits both sides to a process which we firmly expect will yield further and more extensive agreements in the future. Indeed, in conjunction with this agreement, the two sides have stated their intention to pursue further negotiations aimed at securing significant additional reductions of their strategic arsenals and at imposing further qualitative constraints on these arsenals. Moreover, we are aware of the military significance of current and potential modernized long-range theatre nuclear systems, and are examining their potential relevance and susceptibility to arms control.

Some may regret that the SALT II agreement is not even more far-reaching in its impact. Let me emphasize the importance of viewing SALT II as just one step, although a considerable one, in the process of bringing nuclear weapons under

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

control; it is not, admittedly, the end of the story. However, we are convinced that the agreement we envisage represents not only a major step toward the effective control of nuclear arms but also a landmark achievement for arms control and disarmament in general. We trust it will serve as a catalyst for progress in other areas as well.

In parallel with the SALT effort, we and our Soviet and British negotiating partners are pushing ahead toward resolution of issues standing in the way of trilateral agreement on a comprehensive test ban.

As the United Kingdom representative has noted, substantial progress has been made in the CTB negotiations during the past year. The three delegations have agreed that the treaty will prohibit all nuclear weapons tests in all environments and will be of fixed duration. An integrally related protocol will impose a moratorium on peaceful nuclear explosions.

A fundamental issue in the negotiations has been verification of compliance. Although agreement in principle has been reached on a number of verification measures, many critical technical details remain to be resolved.

The next round of CTB negotiations will be starting shortly. We will be doing our utmost to find ways to bring these negotiations to a successful conclusion at the earliest possible date, recognizing that success means laying the basis for an international convention which commands the widest possible international support and which is both comprehensive in its application and verifiable in its execution.

The international community has also displayed special interest in our negotiations aimed at achieving a prohibition on chemical weapons and munitions and the means of their production. Achievement of an international convention banning chemical weapons would be a signal accomplishment since it would be a true disarmament measure eliminating completely a whole class of weapons capable of destroying human beings on a massive scale.

It would also be a disarmament measure that would have direct consequences for many countries, whether or not they possess chemical weapons, since an effective world-wide agreement implies a certain measure of control over chemical production capabilities wherever they may be located. This element makes a CW convention a particularly appropriate arms control measure for multilateral consideration.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

The unique characteristics of a ban on CW, however, also make the negotiation of an agreement extraordinarily complicated. The negotiations we have had with the Soviet Union aimed at producing a joint initiative on CW have made progress and we will be resuming them shortly. But I would be less than candid if I were to minimize the difficulties that still remain. In this area, too, we are very conscious of the impatience with which you await our long hoped-for initiative.

In our efforts to achieve bilateral agreement on the elements of a treaty banning radiological weapons we appear to be closer to success. While the threat of radiological weapons is more potential than actual, such an agreement would close a gap in the application of arms control measures to identified weapons of mass destruction, and would shut off any future development of weapons in this field. Bilateral United States-USSR negotiations on RW, which are also of special interest to this body, will resume on 6 February.

The arms control agenda of the United States is heavy with negotiations on many other subjects which are at least of general interest to all who are gathered here today. On Tuesday of this week, in fact, in the capital city of our host country the United States and the Soviet Union resumed discussions of the question of anti-satellite systems. In deference to other speakers I will not prolong my remarks by treating these other activities in detail. The relatively glancing attention I must perforce pay them does not, however, in any way suggest that we relegate them to a lesser order of importance. Indeed such measures as regional arms control and the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons are at the forefront of our national concerns.

Our regional efforts include:

Pursuit of agreement on mutually acceptable and verifiable force reductions in the MBFR talks in Vienna;

Exploration of ways to strengthen the system of confidence-building measures which was an important aspect of the conference on security and co-operation in Europe and which we would like to see applied elsewhere; and

Bilateral discussions with the Soviet Union on mutual restraints on forces in the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

We have also supported regional initiatives by others aimed at reducing force levels in specific regions and have engaged in talks and consultations with both supplier and recipient countries aimed at finding ways to limit conventional arms transfers.

We are greatly encouraged by recent progress toward full implementation of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. We believe this far-sighted effort by the Latin American States significantly contributes to the security of countries in the region and to international non-proliferation objectives.

The subject of non-proliferation is particularly pertinent at this time as the more than 100 States Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty begin preparations for the 1980 Review Conference. The addition of several more nuclear-weapon States by the end of the century would simply not be compatible with the evolution of a political and military environment guaranteeing the survival of human society as we know it. A vigorous international effort is necessary to meet this challenge and all States, regardless of size, can contribute to this endeavour.

The NPT remains the cornerstone of international non-proliferation efforts and the United States continues to encourage universal adherence. We welcomed the statements by Indonesia and Turkey during the special session that the NPT had been submitted to their Parliaments for approval. The Indonesian Parliament has since taken such action, and we are hopeful for similar action by Turkey in the near future. The steps taken by these two countries towards accession to the NPT represent a development of considerable importance in the life of the Treaty.

With respect to article IV of the NPT, the United States remains committed to maintaining and strengthening its programmes for assisting in the peaceful nuclear development of other nations, with particular attention to the needs of the developing countries.

Beyond the problems relating to weapons and forces, there are other disarmament issues on which the United States has been active.

The United States is pleased that one matter left unresolved by the special session was given renewed impetus by the General Assembly at its thirty-third session when it authorized a practical test of a proposed standardized reporting format for nations voluntarily to report their military expenditures. The United States has expressed its willingness to participate actively in this project, and we hope many other countries will take the same view. The development of reliable, standardized international reporting of military expenditures could have a double

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

value: by lifting the veil of secrecy which shrouds much of the world's military spending, it could dampen the action-reaction cycle, based on worst case estimates, which helps drive expenditures ever higher; it would also satisfy one of the preconditions for negotiated agreements to limit or reduce military spending.

The United States is also conscious that aspirations for economic development are among the most fundamental concerns of the non-industrialized nations. The contribution that disarmament might make to the availability of resources for development, both domestically and through foreign assistance, is a question in which many countries have a stake. The United States, therefore, supports and is actively participating in the expert study of the relationship between disarmament and development that was instituted by the special session devoted to disarmament.

A recital of the number and variety of arms control and disarmament activities in which the United States and other member States of this body are engaged sounds superficially impressive. Let us not for a moment, however, lose sight of the fact that activity does not equate with progress; that the issues with which we are dealing are complicated, sometimes imperfectly understood and usually bear importantly on the most sensitive aspects of national and world security.

It is no wonder then that arms control negotiations are among the most difficult and contentious aspects of the conduct of relations between States. The difficulties, however, are not so great or the prospects so bleak as to merit the wry comment attributed to William of Orange in another circumstance, "It is not necessary to hope in order to attempt, nor to succeed in order to persevere." More relevant to our efforts is the reminder of Arthur Clough, "If hopes are dupes, fears may be liars."

Of the qualities needed for success in arms control and disarmament negotiations, perseverance certainly ranks near the top of the list. I am sure that this body will persevere in the pursuit of greater security through arms control measures. I can assure you that my Government will do the same.

Mr. OGISO (Japan): Today, on the occasion of the opening of the Committee on Disarmament, I should like to limit my statement to general remarks, and at a later date I expect to be able to explain at greater length the official position of Japan on matters of substance. The fact that this Committee on Disarmament, as a result of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, has resumed its negotiations with a fresh outlook may certainly be described as opening a new chapter in the history of disarmament negotiations. On behalf of my delegation, I would like to express our heartfelt gratification at the participation of France and the eight non-nuclear-weapon States in this Committee, and at the same time I should like to convey the ardent hope of the Government of Japan that China will participate at the earliest possible date in this Committee which is open to all the nuclear-weapon States.

My delegation believes it urgent and important that, making the best use of the achievements which the CCD has made so far, the Committee on Disarmament will start negotiations as soon as possible on such priority items as a comprehensive nuclear test ban (CTB) and a ban on chemical weapons and, taking into consideration the future prospects of other important questions, the Committee on Disarmament will take, step by step, such measures as are feasible in the current international situation. That is the way in which this Committee can meet the interests of all Member States of the United Nations, and that is the very purpose of this Committee. To this end, the Committee on Disarmament should reopen promptly the expert studies on the issues which the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has conducted so far.

My country, Japan, with a Peace Constitution, earnestly desires the ultimate abolition of nuclear weapons. We have become a party to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. We have, as a matter of policy, consistently upheld the three non-nuclear principles, that is, not to possess, not to manufacture and not to permit the entry into Japan of nuclear weapons, and we have always upheld the position that nuclear energy must be used only for peaceful purposes. On this occasion, my delegation wishes to reiterate Japan's policy on nuclear disarmament as I have just mentioned, and to emphasize that further efforts should be made to promote disarmament, the central issue of which is nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Ogiso, Japan)

Taking into consideration the fact that a regional framework for the maintenance of security is based on the principle of mutual deterrence which is derived from a balance between the sums of the nuclear and conventional weapons held by the parties concerned, and that such a framework contributes to the maintenance of the peace and security of the present world, my delegation believes that the most realistic way to achieve the ultimate goal of the abolition of nuclear weapons is that the world should take various measures to arrest the nuclear arms race, while strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime, and take steps to reduce nuclear armaments gradually. On the basis of such views, my delegation would like to urge all the nuclear-weapon States, which bear a special responsibility in the task of achieving the goals of nuclear disarmament, to work out concrete measures, in particular, a comprehensive nuclear test ban, through negotiations at this Committee at an early date.

My delegation wishes to take this opportunity to express its appreciation for the efforts made in the SALT II negotiations by the United States and the Soviet Union which are reported to have come to a basic agreement on the major issues to be solved, at the Foreign Ministers' talks between the two countries in December last year, and to express its hope that final agreements on SALT II will soon be reached.

Finally, my delegation hopes that fruitful results will also be achieved in the Committee on Disarmament in the field of non-nuclear disarmament, in particular, a ban on chemical weapons.

On the basis of the positions I have mentioned, my delegation will continue to make positive contributions to the negotiating body on disarmament.

Mr. RADULESCU (Romania) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, the Romanian delegation is taking part in the work of this new Committee on Disarmament in the conviction that one of the specific tasks which must now be considered as a priority item on the agenda of international affairs is to combine the determined efforts of Member States, and of all countries, in order to agree on concrete measures which will contribute to the achievement of disarmament, this vital desideratum of the contemporary world.

(Mr. Radulescu, Romania)

In the policy of détente, security and progress promoted by Romania, in the thinking and activities of President Nicolae Ceaușescu, a central place is consistently assigned to the need to launch a set of effective measures designed to halt the arms race in order to build a world without arms and without war. "The Romanian people, and indeed all peoples of the world", President Nicolae Ceaușescu recently stressed, "have a vital need for security and peace. This is why the main goal of our foreign policy is represented by the unremitting struggle against all preparations for war, against the arms race, and in support of the solution of the complex problems of the contemporary world by peaceful means and by negotiation, in order to speed up the course of détente and the establishment of genuine international security and lasting world peace".

Romania believes that it is now necessary to act energetically to implement a concrete and effective programme of negotiation and implementation of disarmament, in accordance with the recommendations adopted at the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In this context, the Romanian Government appreciates the particularly important role to be played in present circumstances by the new Committee on Disarmament which, with its expanded membership and more democratic framework, has the task of launching an effective process leading to the negotiation of and agreement on specific steps on the road to disarmament.

Public opinion and peoples rightly expect the negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament to lead to the analysis of the armaments situation and, in particular, to pave the way for concrete measures designed to halt the arms race and initiate an effective process of disarmament.

In outlining the objectives assigned to the Committee, whose work has just begun, Romania believes that the first step should be to consider the proposals made by a number of States to the United Nations -- proposals which have been accepted and adopted as working papers for our Committee.

The identification of viable and effective disarmament measures likely to meet the concern created by the gravity of the dangers which the arms race and the unprecedented stockpiling of arms, and particularly of nuclear weapons, present

(Mr. Radulescu, Romania)

for the future of all mankind, is in our opinion, the highly responsible task which States and the peoples of the world are entrusting to this new negotiating body in the disarmament field.

Romania regards the implementation of concrete disarmament measures as an inseparable part of the process of improving the international political climate and strengthening détente, confidence and peaceful co-operation among States, on the basis of equal rights, respect for the principles of independence and national sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs, territorial integrity, mutual advantage, and the non-use of force or the threat of force in reciprocal relations.

The realities of the contemporary world clearly demonstrate not only the need to settle all conflicts and disputes between States by political means and by negotiation, but also the great dangers inherent in the use of force and in attempts to solve problems arising between States through military action. The vital interests of peoples call for a combination of all efforts with a view to finding procedures for the political settlement, through negotiation, of any dispute or conflict between States, and the rejection and elimination of the use of force in international relations. We are firmly convinced that this is the only way to promote continuously efforts aimed at détente, peace and security of peoples, while at the same time directly influencing the solution of disarmament problems.

Romania believes that a measure of special importance would be to embody in binding international agreements the undertaking by all States not to resort in any case or in any circumstances to the use or threat of force in order to interfere in the internal affairs of other States, and not to use their armed forces, on any pretext, to support the actions of various groups against the legal Governments of sovereign and independent States.

Romania is determined to work in the future also, for the negotiated settlement and elimination of all conflicts and hotbeds of war, for the complete eradication of the use or threat of force in international relations, in the conviction that these are basic requirements for peace and security, and for the creation of conditions favourable to the achievement of disarmament.

A study of international affairs and of the major changes taking place in the world proves that, despite the conflicts and complications existing in international

(Mr. Radulescu, Romania)

relations, the world is not facing an imminent world war. On the contrary, the profound changes taking place in favour of the forces of peace, national independence and progress show that, through united action, these forces, these peoples, can prevent the unleashing of a new world war and ensure lasting world peace.

This calls for the intensification of action designed to prevent the deterioration of the world political climate and to bring about an immediate halt to the arms race, and for the adoption of effective disarmament measures, which are the only true way to strengthen peace and security.

Mankind has reached a stage where the pursuit of the arms race represents a grave danger to human civilization itself. The arms race weighs like an increasingly heavy burden on the shoulders of peoples and carries with it the seeds of the exacerbation of international conflicts. Gigantic military expenditures lead to the maintenance and deepening of the economic disparities between States; they impede the implementation of programmes for improving the well-being of the population; they also draw into their vortex the developing countries, which are thus deprived of important material and human resources needed in the efforts to eliminate under-development.

This is why Romania is of the view that one of the basic tasks of the modern world is to halt the arms race without any further delay, and to adopt effective measures for military disengagement and disarmament, and above all nuclear disarmament.

Romania considers that the interests of peace and progress of all peoples demand, as a goal of the utmost importance, that the equilibrium necessary for the security of all States should no longer be maintained by escalation of the arms race, increased military expenditures and the build-up of further stockpiles of weapons, but, on the contrary, by reducing military personnel and arms, and by embarking on disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, under adequate and effective international control.

The set of measures proposed by my country at the special session of the General Assembly have recently been reaffirmed in the Appeal addressed to the parliaments and Governments of all States throughout the world by the Grand National Assembly, on the occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of the founding of the unified

(Mr. Radulescu, Romania)

Romanian national State. This Appeal gives expression to the Romanian people's unshakeable desire for peace; it contains an invitation to strengthen co-operation among peoples with a view to speeding up the process of détente and strengthening international security, putting an end to the arms race and implementing genuine disarmament measures and ensuring lasting world peace.

Romania believes that, in defining the role to be played by the Committee on Disarmament, it is necessary to have in view above all the negotiation, as a matter of priority, of measures designed to halt the arms race, to put an end to the allocation, by all States, of any additional financial resources for the purpose of increasing military potential particularly the heavily armed States.

In this regard, we wish to recall that Romania, in line with the ideas also expressed by other States, has proposed the freezing of military budgets, as well as of military forces and arms, with a view to their subsequent gradual reduction, by 10 to 15 per cent in the first stage. Countries reducing their military budgets could channel the funds thus made available into the implementation of programmes for their own development, and into support for the efforts of developing countries, with a view to their more rapid economic and social progress, and the elimination of under-development and the disparities between them and the industrialized countries.

It is the conviction of the Romanian Government that the adoption of such measures as a matter of urgency would produce a powerful positive response, open the way to a more profound approach to the problems of disarmament, create conditions for the subsequent implementation of a long-term disarmament programme designed to lead to the achievement of general disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, and contribute to the strengthening of international peace and security.

Romania's comments on general disarmament problems are prompted by the fact that the present military situation in Europe represents the gravest threat to world security, and international peace and co-operation. It is precisely in Europe that vast quantities of arms are stockpiled and the greatest number of troops equipped with the most sophisticated means of mass destruction are concentrated; it is also here that more than two-thirds of the world's total outlay on armaments takes place. It is on this continent that the two most heavily armed military blocs face each other.

(Mr. Radulescu, Romania)

Determined to make an effective contribution to the creation of a climate of peace, co-operation and understanding on the continent of Europe, Romania places particular emphasis on the implementation of military disengagement and disarmament measures, without which no real security is conceivable on this continent or anywhere else in the world.

Accordingly, Romania considers it particularly important for the peace and security of the continent to bring about the adoption of an undertaking not to deploy any more troops or weapons in the territory of other States and to proceed to the gradual reduction of those already there and the subsequent withdrawal of all foreign troops and weapons within national frontiers, the dismantling of military bases in the territory of other States, and the curtailment and eventual cessation of military manoeuvres and all demonstrations of force in general near the frontiers of other States.

Strengthening peace and the security of States means continually limiting the military activity of the blocs and intensifying action in order to create the necessary conditions for the simultaneous dissolution of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. As a means of strengthening mutual trust to attain that end, Romania attaches particular political importance to the establishment between the military blocs of a zone in which no armies or weapons would be stationed and no manoeuvres or military demonstrations would take place.

Romania considers that a prominent place in the Committee's work should be assigned to stopping the nuclear arms race and creating favourable conditions for nuclear disarmament.

To strengthen international peace and security, it is imperative to take effective measures leading to a ban on the use of nuclear weapons, the cessation of their manufacture and development, the gradual reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and delivery systems until they have been entirely eliminated, and the negotiation of an agreement completely banning nuclear weapons. We consider it equally important to agree, in the Committee, on a treaty whereby States possessing nuclear weapons undertake not to use, in any form, in any circumstances or under any pretext, nuclear weapons or any other weapons or the

(Mr. Radulescu, Romania)

threat of force against States which do not possess nuclear weapons, have renounced the manufacture or acquisition of nuclear arms and the deployment of such weapons in their territory.

Nuclear disarmament measures should in no way hinder the free access of all States to the use of atomic energy and nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

Romania is also in favour of the adoption, in the Committee on Disarmament, of measures designed to halt production, to remove from military arsenals and to ban the use of chemical, biological, radiation and any other weapons of mass extermination, including neutron weapons.

Measures taken to achieve military disengagement and disarmament must, of course, ensure a reasonable balance of military power that does not confer a military advantage on any one country; they must, on the other hand, guarantee full respect, throughout the disarmament process, for the principle of the equal security of the parties and constantly foster détente and mutual trust between States.

The Romanian delegation attaches particular importance to the Committee's organizational arrangements and procedures, which have a decisive influence on its work. The Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament merely outlined those arrangements. Now, in the light of the new spirit which the special session decided to infuse into the disarmament negotiations, those procedures should be worked out in detail.

It is in that spirit that we consider it necessary to agree, at this session, that all the work of the Committee will be based on the right of all member States to participate in all the work of the Committee and its subsidiary bodies as sovereign independent States, in conditions of complete equality, independently of any military blocs or closed groupings.

What is of decisive importance for the Committee's work is not membership of a particular bloc, but the manner in which States, as subjects of international law, intend to make their contribution to the joint efforts to negotiate effective measures leading to disarmament, strengthening trust between States and international peace and security. That presupposes examining and solving all the problems before the Committee with the participation of all the Member States in accordance with its own organizational arrangements. The Committee should be open and receptive to the proposals and initiatives of all States, including non-members.

(Mr. Radulescu, Romania)

Accordingly, we believe that the Committee's rules of procedure should expressly recognize the right of non-member States to participate in the work, express their views and submit proposals for the purposes of negotiation.

Far from being a matter of form, the organizational arrangements and procedures should be an expression of the relations between independent sovereign States and have a direct impact on substantive negotiation, which can open up or restrict prospects for the work of the Committee.

We therefore consider that, as the next step, it would be appropriate for the Committee to draw up a specific programme of work and its rules of procedure, taking into account proposals and suggestions by all States, whether or not they are members of the Committee.

All the Committee's decisions should be adopted by consensus of the participants, based on the freely expressed consent of each member as a sovereign State with equal rights and taking into account the security interests of all States.

The procedural arrangements should also clearly reflect the relations between the Committee and the United Nations, in view of the primordial responsibility borne by the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

The interest of the entire international community in disarmament makes it essential that the Committee's work should be conducted openly and that the Committee should fully inform the public about the course and actual status of negotiations.

Those are the main points of substance which Romania wishes to make at this opening stage of the Committee's work.

The imperatives of international peace and security require us to act with a proper sense of responsibility, before it is too late, to stop the arms race and bring about disarmament, above all nuclear disarmament, under an adequate and effective system of control.

Convinced of the importance of this session for the proper conduct of the Committee's work and for all its future activities, the Romanian delegation wishes to assure you, Mr. Chairman, as well as the distinguished representatives of other States, that it is determined to contribute actively and constructively, together with the delegations of other States, at this crossroads in the disarmament negotiations, to their positive outcome and to the attainment of man's most cherished ideal: the right to international peace and security.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): It is a happy augury for this Committee that its inaugural session is being held under your chairmanship. For your country played an active role in the series of initiatives which resulted in the reactivation of multilateral consideration of disarmament issues. The inclusion of Algeria in the Committee is a fitting recognition of the great contribution which your country had made and can continue to make to the search for a solution of the crucial question of disarmament.

On behalf of the Nigerian delegation, I wish to express, through you, my hearty welcome to other new members of the Committee, namely, Australia, Belgium, Cuba, Indonesia, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Venezuela, whose representatives are taking their seats for the first time this session.

The agreement reached during the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament on the multilateral negotiating body represents one of the most concrete achievements of the session. In reaching that agreement, the special session was conscious "of the considerable and urgent work that remains to be accomplished in the field of disarmament". Details of the considerable and urgent work are reflected in the Programme of Action adopted by the special session by consensus. Thus, we should not see as an end in itself the democratization and enlargement of the multilateral negotiating body, as a result of which the Committee on Disarmament is now assembled. A suitable negotiating body is indeed important to the achievement of results. Considering, however, the working method prescribed for the Committee on Disarmament by the General Assembly -- to take decisions on the basis of consensus -- it is absolutely essential that a willingness to reach concrete results should be demonstrated by all members. In this connexion, it is hardly necessary for us to recall that the results achieved in the past 17 years since the multilateral disarmament negotiating body first met have been rather disappointing.

Let us not forget, in our satisfaction at reaching agreement on convening the Committee on Disarmament, that this is not the first time that the multilateral negotiating body has been reviewed and enlarged. The Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee which first met in 1962 ended as the 31-nation Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Successive increases in the membership of the Committee did not, in the past, lead to greater productivity. We should therefore have no illusions in this regard. What we like to hope for, is that the democratization of the multilateral negotiating body resulting in the participation, as equal partners, of nuclear-weapon States as well as non-nuclear-weapon States, combined with the urgency indicated in the Programme of Action of the special session, will give the process of disarmament negotiations a new direction and purpose.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

In this connexion, my delegation is encouraged that France which had hitherto not participated in the multilateral negotiating body has now found it possible to do so. This development gives us the hope that, before long, all nuclear-weapon States will take their rightful places in this body. If nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization, then it is obvious that realistic negotiations for effective measures should involve all nuclear-weapon States. The automatic opening of the Committee on Disarmament to participation by nuclear-weapon States was the special session's way of recognizing these realities.

I said earlier on that the convening of this Committee represents one of the concrete achievements of the special session. So also was the consensus reached on the Programme of Action. I am, and this is all I can do at this stage, taking a short-term view of the special session. For how long, however, can we base our assessment of the special session on its historic nature, on the adoption of a Final Document? I say not for long. In the first place, the very awakening of international consciousness to the danger posed by the arms race puts on this organ as well as the United Nations itself the onus of adopting concrete measures to stem the danger. World opinion will not for long be satisfied with a finely composed document of four parts, if the arms race continues to escalate, if no effective measure is taken to reduce the danger of nuclear holocaust, and if much-needed resources are increasingly wasted on armaments when much of the world's population lives below starvation level.

A second reason why we cannot for long rely only on the historic special session is the decision of the General Assembly at its thirty-third session scheduling a second special session devoted to disarmament for 1982. It will be a great disappointment if we go to the second special session without concrete measures of disarmament arising from the Programme of Action adopted in 1978. We are bound to arouse bitter skepticism if we again embark on the elaboration of a final document when the first such document remains largely unfulfilled.

The stakes in the armaments race are so high that we cannot afford to allow the consensus document arising from the first special session to suffer the fate of many other United Nations documents which are forgotten as soon as they are adopted.

In its decision on machinery, the special session devoted to disarmament rightly concluded -- and I quote from paragraph 113 of the Final Document -- that:

"For maximum effectiveness, two kinds of bodies are required in the field of disarmament -- deliberative and negotiating. All Member States should be represented on the former, whereas the latter, for the sake of convenience, should have a relatively small membership".

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

If we are to sustain the hopes raised by the special session then we should ensure that each of the two bodies -- deliberative and negotiating -- faithfully keeps to its assigned area. The danger is very real that the Committee on Disarmament, if it fails to chart out for itself a real programme of negotiations on concrete measures, will soon lapse into the area of deliberation. If anyone wonders how this can happen, he or she only needs to pick up some reports of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. The CCD spent the last few years without any real negotiations, as distinct from discussions on any of the disarmament issues which many, inside and outside of the body, believed to be ripe for the elaboration of legal instruments.

With the convening of the Committee on Disarmament, let us learn from the mistakes of the CCD. Let us eschew general debates for which there are adequate forums in the Disarmament Commission and the First Committee. Let us bear in mind that the objective of general and complete disarmament can best be achieved, in present circumstances, by the conclusion and implementation of concrete agreements. If this negotiating forum loses sight of this fact, if it decides to talk about negotiating agreements rather than negotiating these agreements, then it runs the danger of defeating the purpose for which the General Assembly in its wisdom drew the line between the deliberative organ and the negotiating organ.

If this body should decide, as I think it should, to strike while the iron is hot, it will not lack the wherewithal to do so.

There are measures on which deliberations by the former negotiating body have gone far enough. These same measures have been singled out for urgent conclusion of legal instruments by the special session. In paragraphs 21 and 75 of its Final Document, the special session emphasized that an agreement on the elimination of all chemical weapons should be concluded as a matter of high priority. Needless to say that earlier regular sessions of the General Assembly had adopted similar resolutions on chemical weapons.

Moreover, in paragraph 51, the special session considered that the cessation of nuclear-weapon testing by all States would make a significant contribution to the aim of ending the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and the development of new types of such weapons and of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The special session therefore urged that the tripartite negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty should be urgently concluded and the result submitted for full consideration by the negotiating body with a view to the submission of a draft treaty to the General Assembly at the

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

earliest possible date. Nigeria, as party to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty believes that a positive measure like the CTBT is more likely to persuade those outside the Non-Proliferation Treaty that the nuclear-weapon States are willing to remove the inherent discrimination in the Treaty.

Speaking in the CCD on 17 August 1978, I said that since it was too late to expect the submission of a draft CTBT to the summer session of the CCD then in progress, my delegation would like to suggest that the Committee on Disarmament should be given a birthday present of a draft comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty, or that part of it on which work by the tripartite negotiators had advanced.

My delegation is still looking forward eagerly to the presentation of a draft CTBT to this session of the Committee on Disarmament. However, even if that submission is not made, this should not prevent the Committee, at the appropriate stage during the session, from commencing work on elaborating a text. The restructuring of the Committee gives us a chance to place initiatives by a member or group of members in proper perspective. These initiatives, particularly if they come from nuclear-weapon States, can be vital in advancing the course of negotiations in the Committee. They should not, however, be considered as substitutes for action by the Committee as a whole; nor should they indefinitely prevent the Committee from fulfilling its task in specific areas.

A comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty and chemical weapons treaty are two examples of measures which should occupy the immediate attention of this Committee. There are other tasks, particularly in the field of nuclear armaments, which the General Assembly at its thirty-third session again called upon the Committee to undertake: prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes, the conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States.

Following the consideration by the Disarmament Commission of elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, this Committee will have to undertake the elaboration of such a programme. For the meantime, therefore, we should seek to concentrate on specific issues rather than crowd our immediate work programme with all the issues.

In conclusion, my delegation pledges its co-operation with other members and we are optimistic that its transformation will provide the Committee with the dynamism necessary to tackle the substantive issues before it with purposefulness.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.

CD/PV.5
26 January 1979
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIFTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday, 26 January 1979, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. R. BOUDJAKDJI

(Algeria)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. R. BOUDJAKDJI
Mr. A. FASLA
Mr. A. BENSMAIL
Mr. N. KERROUM

Argentina: Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS
Mr. F. JIMÉNEZ DÁVILA
Mr. A.N. IOLTEINI

Australia: Mr. L.D. THOMSON
Mr. A.J. BEHM
Ms. M.S. WICKES

Belgium: Mr. P. NOTERDAEME
Mr. P. BERG
Mr. G. VAN DUYSE

Brazil: Mr. G.A. MACIEL
Mr. L.P. LINDENBERG SETTE

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUMOV
Mr. I. PETROV
Mr. I. SOTIROV

Burma: U SAW HLAING
U THEIN AUNG
U THAUNG HTUN

Canada: Mr. G.A.H. PEARSON
Mr. R. HARRY JAY
Mr. J. GAUDREAU

Cuba: Mr. L. SOLA VILA
Mr. F.O. RODRÍGUEZ
Mrs. V.B. JACKIEWICH
Mr. C. PAZOS BECEIRO
Mr. R. VALIENTE
Mr. R.L. GARCIA

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. V. TYLNER
Mr. E. ZÁPOTOCKÝ
Mr. J. JIRŮSEK

Egypt:

Mr. O. EL-SHAFFI
Mr. F. EL-IBRASHI
Mr. M. EL-BARADEI
Mr. N. FAHMY

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. TERRETE
Mr. G. ALULA

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. S. KAHN
Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. G. VAN WELT
Mr. F. RUTH
Mr. G. PFEIFFER
Mr. H. SCHNEPPEN
Mr. J. POHLMANN
Mr. E-J. VON STUDNITZ
Mr. H. MULLER

Hungary:

Mr. M. DOMOKOS
Mr. C. GYÖRFFY
Mr. A. LAKATOS

France:

Mr. F. DE LA GORCE
Mr. F. BEAUCHATAUD
Mr. J. FEVRE
Mr. J.C. PARAVY

India:

Mr. C.R. GHAREKHAN
Mr. S.T. DEVARE

Indonesia:

Mr. A. SANI

Iran:

Mr. M. FARTASH
Mr. D. AMERI

Italy:
Mr. N. DI BERNARDO
Mr. F. FERRETTI
Mr. M. ALESSI
Mr. M. MORENO
Mr. C. FRATESCHI
Mr. G. VALDEVIT

Japan:
Mr. M. OGISO
Mr. T. NONOYAMA
Mr. Y. KIKUCHI
Mr. T. IWANAMI
Mr. Y. NAKAMURA

Kenya:
Mr. C.G. MAINA
Mr. G.N. MUNIU

Mexico:
Mr. A. GARCÍA ROBLES
Miss A. CABRERA

Mongolia:
Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
Mr. L. BAYART

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

Netherlands:
Mr. R.H. FEIN
Mr. A.J. MEERBURG

Nigeria:
Mr. O. ADENIJI
Mr. K. AHMED
Mr. R.A. FATUNASE

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

Peru:
Mr. J.A. MONTERO

Poland:

Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. A. OLSZOWKA
Mr. H. PAĆ
Mr. S. KONIK
Mr. H. KRUCZYK

Romania:

Mr. I. RADULESCU
Mr. C. ENE
Mr. T. MELESCANU
Mr. G. TINCA

Sri Lanka:

Mr. A.C.S. HAMEED
Miss M.L. NAGANATHAN

Sweden:

Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. L. NORBERG
Mr. J. PRAWITZ
Mr. J. LUNDIN

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN
Mr. A.M. VAVILOV
Mr. E.D. ZAITSEV
Mr. V.A. VERTOGRADOV
Mr. Y.V. KOSTENKO
Mr. M.G. ANTIUKHIN

United Kingdom:

Mr. N.H. MARSHALL
Mr. C.L.G. MALLABY
Mr. C.K. CURWEN
Mr. P.M.W. FRANCIS

United States of America:

Mr. A. FISHER
Mr. C. FLOWERREE
Mr. A. AKALOVSKY
Mr. R. HAGENGRUBER
Ms. BLAIR L. MURRAY
Mr. M.L. SANCHES
Mr. A. YARMOLINSKY

Venezuela:

Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT
Mr. H. ARTEAGA
Miss D. SZOKOLOCZI
Mrs. R. LISBOA DE NECER

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. VRHUNEC
Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIĆ
Mr. D. DJOKIĆ

Zaire:

Mr. BUKETI-BUKAYI
Mr. M. ESUK

Assistant Secretary-General
for Disarmament:

..
Mr. R. BJORNERTEDT

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): Before I turn to my statement, permit me to express the gratification of the Polish delegation at the fact that we can work now under your wise chairmanship. Indeed, the inauguration of this session of the Committee by the distinguished statesman from Algeria, Foreign Minister Bouteflika, is in itself a most auspicious start to our endeavours. At the same time I would like to offer to the delegations of the Soviet Union and of the United States our sentiments and words of appreciation for the years of guidance which they have provided to the Committee as its Co-Chairmen. Looking forward to their active participation in this Committee, we are confident that they will not fail to willingly share with us their vast experience in the conduct of our negotiating process.

Taking the floor on behalf of Poland, one of the countries which have actively contributed to the multilateral negotiations since they opened in Geneva in 1962, I have the pleasure to welcome the new members who are now joining this Committee as a result of the decisions of the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament.

I have the honour in particular to place on record the satisfaction of my Government at the fact that among those members we can welcome France, an important nuclear-weapon Power and a State with which my country has had traditionally fruitful co-operation.

Poland is determined to continue her constructive involvement in efforts to consolidate peace and international security wherever they are made. Accordingly, I wish to assure all members of the Committee on Disarmament that the Polish delegation is ready to co-operate closely with all of them in our common endeavour to discharge the mandate which this organ has received from the special session as well as from the thirty-third regular session of the General Assembly.

Indeed, as we are all aware, the ultimate positive solution of the important tasks facing this and other disarmament negotiating forums -- that is, effective progress towards genuine disarmament with undiminished security of all parties -- may prove difficult, if not elusive, unless States are willing and able to muster their collective determination and political will to closely co-operate with one another in search of those objectives.

In the view of the Polish Government the fundamental and imperative task today is to sustain and consolidate the process of détente by taking decisive steps to halt the arms race and bring about meaningful measures of real disarmament. The technological arms race -- as it were -- has long overtaken the pace of disarmament negotiations and now constitutes one of the major threats to world

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

peace and stability. Poland, therefore, attaches great significance to the Soviet Union-United States negotiations on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons. A SALT II agreement would bring down the level of military confrontation, thereby strengthening the course towards détente, peace and international security. Moreover, it would create a more propitious climate for disarmament efforts pursued in other negotiating fora, the Committee on Disarmament included.

It is generally recognized in fact that, in the long run, the arms race and détente are irreconcilable and incompatible with one another. Given the existence in the world today of vast stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction, a further unrestrained technological arms race, both in the nuclear and in the conventional fields, could work not only to subvert détente but also to undermine the results of progress made so far in the realm of arms limitation and disarmament. There are important security and economic considerations which more eloquently than ever are now arguing for the pressing need to halt and reverse the upward spiral of the arms race. Indeed, it would seem that unless the international community succeeds in that regard, there may well emerge the real danger of the development of qualitatively new types of weapons as well as the prospect that material and human resources may well continue to be denied for the solution of such dire problems facing mankind as the fight against hunger, eradication of disease, illiteracy, the development of new sources of energy and so on.

It will be recalled that the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was particularly emphatic in underlining the close interrelationship between advances in the field of disarmament, détente and the strengthening of international security. Its Final Document is explicit in stressing that "the dynamic development of détente, encompassing all spheres of international relations in all regions of the world, with the participation of all countries, would create conditions conducive to the efforts of States to end the arms race Progress on détente and progress on disarmament mutually complement and strengthen each other". Moreover, the special session left no doubt in anybody's mind that further continuation of the arms race would be incompatible with the implementation of the new international economic order based on justice, equality and co-operation. This is by no means a surprising statement. Against the staggering requirements of the socio-economic development of States everywhere, to spend well over \$1 billion a day on the implements of war is absurd. As a global phenomenon, which it is, the arms race is irrational and unpardonable.

We can safely say that international relations are now approaching a crossroads, which can lead either to the growth of mutual trust and co-operation, or to the growth of mutual fears, suspicions and arsenals. They may lead

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

ultimately either to lasting peace, or at best to a balancing on the brink of war. Détente and disarmament open the road towards peace. To miss this opportunity would border on the irresponsible, especially when we recognize that peace is no longer a Utopian dream, that there is no alternative to peace if mankind is to survive.

We believe that the cause of durable peace in a disarming world would best be served and facilitated by greater all-round recognition of the fact that the peaceful co-existence of States with different systems and the non-use of force in international relations represent the two basic pre-conditions for the successful development of the present day world and for the effective solution of its nagging problems. In other words, international security can be strengthened most effectively by expanding the areas of mutual understanding and co-operation and by substituting them for the areas of confrontation, especially in the military field. By the same token, it would be a gross disservice to the cause of international security and mutual understanding if the military-industrial complex in certain countries were to be allowed to accelerate the arms race in pursuit of deceptive "military superiority", or -- as the case may be -- to conjure the threat of alleged "superiority" on the part of others in order to cover and justify its own designs.

In the considered view of the Polish Government, it is imperative for the international community to proceed promptly with practical implementation of the ideas and recommendations formulated in the Final Document of the special session.

We believe that the most important and urgent question is the question of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war, which -- as we know -- corresponds to the priorities set forth by the special session. In this connexion, it is of particular significance to commence, without further delay, negotiations by all nuclear-weapon States on the halting of nuclear arms race, as urged by the General Assembly in its resolution 33/71 H, adopted at the thirty-third session.

A realistic, matter-of-fact and straightforward course towards disarmament and meaningful military détente in Europe and throughout the world has been offered recently in the Declaration of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty. As will be recalled, the Declaration, which was adopted at a meeting of the Political Consultative Committee held in Moscow last November, has been circulated as an official document of the General Assembly (A/33/392).

The document has placed on record the grave concern of public opinion everywhere at the attempts of certain militaristic circles in the West to accelerate the technological arms race. While voicing alarm over this dangerous tendency, the Declaration puts forward a comprehensive programme of measures which could pave the

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

way towards reversing the arms race and ultimately towards genuine disarmament. The States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty register in the document their determination to press for the achievement of these objectives, in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the recommendations of the special session.

As it were, the signatories stressed the continued validity of the proposals which the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have made in the field of disarmament, as well as their readiness to proceed, together with other countries, to a constructive and productive consideration of such proposals.

In the view of my delegation, the most significant message conveyed in the Declaration is the statement that there is no type of weapon, whether nuclear or conventional, which the socialist States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty are not ready to limit or reduce, whether on regional or on global scale, on the basis of strict observance of the principle of undiminished security of each side. It may well be worthwhile recalling that the signatories of the Declaration expressly reaffirm that they have never sought, and do not seek at present, military superiority over any State or group of States, that their military efforts are and always will be aimed exclusively at ensuring their own defence capacity. Indeed, this posture directly reflects their underlying belief that military balance in Europe, and in the world for that matter, should be maintained not by increasing armouries but by their reduction and by resolute transition to specific measures of disarmament, especially in the nuclear field.

At the very outset of my statement I took the liberty to refer in passing to the fact that my country has actively participated in the Geneva multilateral disarmament negotiations ever since 1962. In actual fact, Poland sought to make a meaningful contribution to all the efforts aimed at consolidating international security and promoting genuine disarmament throughout the past 33 post-war years. It may be worth recalling that the first proposal in the field of disarmament which Poland made at the United Nations dates back to 1946. More than a decade later, in 1957, Poland used the same forum -- and, after a few years, the opening session of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament -- to submit a specific and realistic plan for the creation of an atom-free zone in Central Europe. The plan was subsequently modified to become something of a blueprint for a denuclearized and limited armaments zone.

While that idea has, regrettably, not materialized in our part of the world, it certainly had direct impact upon the political climate in Europe and helped to encourage imaginative thinking elsewhere, leading ultimately to its practical application on the Latin American continent.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

In 1964, again at the United Nations, my country formulated a proposal to convene a conference of all European States in order to examine the problem of European security in its entirety. Some ten years later, owing to the active and constructive input from countries of the socialist community as well as from other States, that idea came to fruition with the signing at Helsinki of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

Dedication to peace and disarmament is deeply ingrained in the social system of People's Poland, which has established a strict correlation between the successful socio-economic development of the country and consistent efforts to secure for Poland the best possible external conditions, the conditions of peace and security. Peace and security are the supreme aims of the foreign policy of Poland, and, indeed, also of other socialist countries. Imaginative and consistent efforts to promote détente and genuine disarmament are -- in our view -- the best instruments to attain these objectives. We try to practice what we preach when we get intimately involved in the Vienna talks to lower the dangerous level of military confrontation which now exists in Central Europe. We also try to translate our principles into practical action at the United Nations when, recognizing that the first line of defence against war is man himself, we propose that something should be done about it.

Indeed, bearing in mind the maxim which asserts that "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed", we took the initiative of proposing to the thirty-third session of the General Assembly -- and we have received its unanimous endorsement for -- a Declaration on the preparation of societies for life in peace. This subject was first raised by Edward Gierek, the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party who, in addressing the General Assembly in 1974, stressed in particular the right of all nations to life in peace.

As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Poland, Emil Wojtaszek, noted when introducing the Polish initiative to the session of the General Assembly last September:

"Preparation for life in peace is the kind of activity which could be defined as the building of an infrastructure of peace in the consciousness of nations. The making of a peaceful world can neither be fully effective nor durable unless there is a most profound awareness in the minds of men that world peace is the supreme value and thereby an objective of the highest priority".

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

Tabling the text of the draft Declaration on the preparation of societies for life in peace, Poland regarded that act as a valid contribution to generating a climate of mutual trust and an atmosphere conducive to more significant advances in the field of disarmament. We believed, in fact, that our step was tantamount to promoting the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations -- most specifically, lasting peace and security for all. It was a matter of special satisfaction for public opinion in Poland that the debate on the draft Declaration and its universal approval were bearing out not only the timeliness of the document but also the fact that aspiration for lasting peace is the predominant factor in the policies of States.

I should like to turn now to several preoccupations, more immediate and practical, which are related to the work of this disarmament negotiating organ, an important multilateral forum which has obvious world-wide relevance. My Government shares the widely held view that the enlargement of the Committee's membership embracing, as it does, both nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States, developed and developing ones, aligned and non-aligned alike, will be a more representative body wherein the responsibility for the course and for the results of disarmament negotiations will be shared by the international community more equitably. We must not forget, furthermore, that the special session has also provided for specific procedural and substantive arrangements whereby States not members of the Committee will be able, if they so wish, to make proposals, to participate in -- as many of them are in fact doing right at this meeting -- and otherwise to follow the proceedings of the Committee, all of which substantially adds to the representative character of this organ.

The Final Document adopted by the special session has mapped the road for the Committee on Disarmament to follow in the days and months ahead. The programme of action outlined in the document sets realistic priorities which must be followed precisely and with due determination. Continuing its work, the Committee on Disarmament must take full advantage of the previous experience and expertise, putting them to the best use of the interest of its own effective work.

Poland feels strongly that, above all, the Committee on Disarmament must continue the pending business, especially where the negotiating process has reached a crucial stage, or where seriousness of the problems involved calls for urgent and positive action by the enlarged Committee. Thus, while we are looking forward to the early and positive outcome of the tripartite negotiations on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, we feel that the Committee must pursue its consideration of that matter with renewed vigour.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

The important tasks of the international community include the question of effective prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons, the subject of one of the foremost recommendations of the special session. My country has always believed that the universalization of the régime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, as embodied in the NPT, would be the surest way to preclude the physical spread of these weapons and to promote the widest international co-operation in the peaceful applications of energy of the atom. Both these objectives would be served by enhanced effectiveness of the IAEA safeguards, which Poland consistently seeks within the Agency framework and through contributions to the work of the "London Club".

Parallel political or international legal measures capable of contributing to a heightened sense of security of non-nuclear-weapon States would constitute integral elements of the broad range of measures aimed at preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and avoiding the threat of a nuclear conflict. I would like to recall that in this regard, responding to an initiative of the Soviet Government, the thirty-third session of the General Assembly has requested our Committee to take effective measures for the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States through appropriate international arrangements. Indeed, we are urged to consider, at the earliest possible time, specific drafts of an international convention. As the Secretary-General, Dr. Kurt Waldheim, has rightly noted in his valuable and penetrating message addressed to this session of the Committee — "... if progress can be achieved on this question, an important element of stability will be introduced in the international situation, with beneficial effects on other disarmament questions".

We are confident that no one would legitimately claim that the aspirations of people anywhere could be possibly met by further improvement of the existing or the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction. Quite to the contrary. We, therefore, wish to urge the Committee to accord high priority to the question of the prohibition of the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction, as required by the Final Document of the special session. We believe that there are no insurmountable obstacles to the elaboration of a comprehensive agreement, supplemented by agreements on specific weapons, if and when identified.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

While on the subject of weapons of mass destruction, I feel duty-bound to stress the particular concern of the people and of my Government over two types of such weapons which are specifically meant to annihilate life, in the first place human life. I refer, of course, to chemical weapons. As we know, a ban on their development, production and stockpiling is long overdue. And I also refer to the nuclear neutron weapons, the prospect of whose deployment in the heart of Europe has been revolting to public opinion in Poland and throughout Europe ever since such a design became known. We would wish to hope that in the interest of objectives which we all cherish, the plans to develop and deploy nuclear neutron weapons will be put to rest once and for all.

The Polish delegation confidently expects that this important body will not fail to consider at the earliest opportunity, as it is obligated under General Assembly resolutions and in the light of the Final Document of the special session, the elaboration of further international agreements in the field of disarmament for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed and the ocean floor.

My list of the pressing items which await urgent and constructive examination by the Committee at its current and future sessions would be far too incomplete without adding two questions: the reduction of military budgets and the limitation of conventional arms transfers. My delegation feels very strongly, in particular, that it would be in the immediate interest both of the cessation of the arms race and of aid to developing countries if the question of the reduction of military budgets of States with major economic and military potentials were to be considered in the light of its political merits rather than in the context of endless technical studies.

In concluding, let me underline two considerations which, in the view of my country, are paramount to our endeavours:

1. To achieve meaningful progress towards genuine disarmament, States must forswear attempts at gaining unilateral advantage at the expense of the legitimate security interests of others. To make such genuine disarmament possible and enduring, it is indispensable to secure universal adherence to disarmament agreements.
2. While important and relevant, no institutional or procedural arrangements in the field of disarmament negotiations can be substituted for the political will of Governments and peoples to seek disarmament.

As far as Poland and the Polish people are concerned, they will never be found wanting when it comes for the will to seek peace and security through genuine disarmament. It is in this spirit that my delegation will participate in the endeavours of the Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. EL-SHAFEI (Egypt): Mr. Chairman, may I associate myself, as well as my delegation, with all the expressions of kind sentiments and words of praise addressed to you and, through you, to your country. The leading and ominous role of Algeria in the eradication of the unjust legacies and shackles of the past, and in the establishment of a new international order, based on sovereign equality, political independence, economic justice and a reliable system of collective security, augurs well for this new important phase in disarmament negotiation.

It is with a deep sense of cautious optimism that my delegation is taking part in this first session of the newly constituted multilateral disarmament negotiating Body. We hope and trust that this new restructuring -- a positive outcome of the tenth special session of the General Assembly -- will lead to a more effective international negotiating body, one which is more reflective of world realities and of the shared interests of the whole international community in the sphere of disarmament.

We believe that this could be attained if the ground rules adopted by the General Assembly for this body are complemented by and matched with a programme of work reflecting the new determination and fresh approach adopted at the tenth special session. An agenda which clearly and adequately identifies and focuses upon priorities, a set of rules of procedure which insure the principles of democracy and guard against paralysis and stagnation, are some of the important elements which can secure success.

Further, we regard the participation of all nuclear-Power States in disarmament negotiations to be a necessary prerequisite for any meaningful and pragmatic approach towards a universally applicable disarmament measure. It is therefore appropriate to renew our hope and expectation that the People's Republic of China will deem it fit to take an active part in this body in a not so distant future.

I would, however, hasten to add a proviso of cardinal importance, namely that all our efforts will be of no avail and the whole exercise will be rendered futile if the required political will to act courageously is lacking, and the moral commitment to our cherished goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control is absent.

In its resolution 33/71 F, the General Assembly expressed its conviction that the Final Document of the special session devoted to disarmament provided a

(Mr. El-Shafei, Egypt)

solid basis to set in motion an international disarmament strategy that makes it possible at the same time:

- "(a) To carry out what is the most active and urgent task of the present day, namely, the removal of the threat of a world war, which would inevitably be a nuclear war;
- (b) To channel the negotiations among States towards the final goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, on the understanding that such negotiations shall be conducted concurrently with negotiations on partial measures of disarmament;
- (c) To strengthen international peace and security and to promote the economic and social advancement of all peoples, thus, facilitating the achievement of the new International Economic Order".

Consonant with that strategy, the Final Document Programme of Action defines the priorities of disarmament negotiations to be nuclear weapons; other weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons; conventional weapons, including any which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effect, and reduction of armed forces.

It was gratifying to note the high priority which has been accorded in the Final Document to nuclear weapons as the greatest danger to mankind and its survival, as well as the special responsibility borne by the nuclear-weapon States -- in particular, those among them which possess the most important nuclear arsenals -- in the task of achieving nuclear disarmament.

The call for nuclear disarmament was -- my delegation would like to recall -- one of the main pleas of the non-aligned countries during the special session, out of the firm conviction that the complete elimination of nuclear weapons is the most effective guarantee against the danger of nuclear war and an essential condition for strengthening international peace and security.

The Programme of Action adopted during the special session specified that the achievement of nuclear disarmament will require, among other things, urgent negotiations of agreements for the cessation of the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear-weapon systems.

High among these negotiations is the one concerning the conclusion of a treaty prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests. My delegation cannot but register its regret that the multilateral negotiating body has not been able as yet to start negotiations on this matter of highest priority, due to the non-submission of the

(Mr. El-Shafei, Egypt)

joint draft treaty expected from the three nuclear-weapon States. It cannot but urge these States to use their utmost endeavours to comply with the General Assembly's request and submit to this Committee the draft of such a treaty at the beginning of this session. Further, my delegation reiterates its hope that the moratorium called for by the General Assembly with respect to the conduct of any testing of nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices be respected and upheld.

Another measure of significant importance towards the same end would be the conclusion of the agreement in the second series of the strategic arms limitations talks. This agreement which has been regrettably overdue should, at the earliest possible date, be transmitted to the General Assembly to be promptly followed by further strategic arms limitation negotiations between the two parties leading to agreed significant reductions and qualitative limitations on strategic arms.

In its quest for peace, Egypt cannot lose sight of the frightening prospect of the introduction of nuclear weapons to the Middle East, a nightmare which could greatly threaten international peace and security, inflict irreparable damage upon the confidence-building efforts and further complicate the situation in that region. It was therefore Egypt's persistent demand to take practical and urgent steps to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. The Iranian-Egyptian initiative in this regard five years ago was a clear manifestation of this goal. Egypt, in compliance with paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 33/64, is prepared to declare, on a reciprocal basis -- pending, and in the process of the establishment of such a zone in the Middle East -- that it will refrain from producing, acquiring, or in any other way, possessing nuclear weapons and nuclear explosive devices, and from permitting the stationing of nuclear weapons on its territory by any third party and to agree to place all its nuclear activities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. It, further, stands ready to declare its support for the establishing of such a zone in the region and to deposit its declaration with the Security Council.

It is regrettable, however, that the overwhelming support of the international community for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East has been so far frustrated by the intransigent and unyielding policies and attitudes of the Government of Israel which stand as a stumbling block in the way of the establishment of such a zone. These policies, combined with the Israeli refusal to be bound by the NPT or to subject its nuclear activities to IAEA

(Mr. El-Shafei, Egypt)

safeguards, can only subject the whole Middle East to the incalculable menace of the nuclear arms race and challenge the efforts of the international community and make the search for peace in the Middle East more intricate and troublesome.

Another policy of defiance of the will of the international community is the persistent attempt by the racist régime of South Africa to challenge the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, and its close nuclear collaboration with Israel. This policy is of an equally important concern for my country, since it constitutes, we believe, a serious threat to international peace and security and places a grave responsibility upon the international community.

The goal of nuclear non-proliferation is an integral part of the effort to halt the arms race. It could only be guaranteed through the universal application of the NPT. In this respect, I would like to re-emphasize that Egypt is ready to complete the legal formalities required for becoming a party to the NPT the moment Israel would accede to that treaty. On this subject, we are of the view, however, that all efforts should be exerted to redress the imbalance between the obligations and responsibilities of the nuclear and non-nuclear weapon States respectively. Further, the inalienable right of access to technology, equipment and materials for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for economic and social development should be unquestionably guaranteed, given adequate safeguards, to all States, with particular regard to the needs of the developing countries. The coming Review Conference of the NPT to be held in 1980 provides an ample opportunity for the realization of these legitimate and just demands.

The prohibition and prevention of the development, production and use of other weapons and systems of mass destruction figures as one of the high priority items in the final document of the special session. Among them, the conclusion of a convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their destruction was considered to be one of the most urgent tasks of multilateral negotiations. It is therefore, pertinent that the General Assembly has requested this Committee to undertake at its first session on a priority basis, negotiations on this convention and, at the same time, has urged the USSR and the United States of America to submit their joint initiative to the Committee on Disarmament in order to assist it in achieving an early agreement on this subject.

Another urgent priority in disarmament negotiations is the prohibition or restriction of the use of certain conventional weapons which may be deemed to be

(Mr. El-Shafei, Egypt)

excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects. It is our hope that the United Nations Conference on this subject -- to be held this year -- will be able to reach an agreement on specific instruments. Egypt's position in this connexion is based on the assumption that positive results in this field would stimulate further measures in the broader field of disarmament, and on the humanitarian consideration that undue suffering should be avoided. Having, unfortunately, been subjected to many inhumane weapons with a capacity to overkill, it is only natural for Egypt to support the consideration by the coming Conference of the full range of weaponry which fits the mandate assigned by the General Assembly. We believe that such an endeavour is a multidimensional one and that all aspects, of a humanitarian or national security nature, should be duly considered in order to attain the ultimate objective of the total prohibition of such weapons.

Similarly, negotiations on the limitations and reduction of conventional weapons should be initiated and actively pursued on the basis of parity and undiminished mutual security for all. It should also be without prejudice to the inherent right of individual and collective self-defence and the right to self-determination and independence of peoples under colonial or foreign domination.

My delegation, while fully aware of the priorities set forth in the Final Document, cannot nonetheless lose sight of the fact that the implementation of these priorities should lead to general and complete disarmament under effective international control, which remains the ultimate objective of all efforts exerted in the sphere of disarmament. It is our hope, therefore, that the Disarmament Commission will be able, in the near future, to transmit to our Committee -- through the General Assembly -- the duly considered elements of the comprehensive programme for disarmament. In this way, we will be able to discharge our mandate -- namely, to undertake the elaboration of 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 reality.

The first Disarmament Decade is fast coming to an end. Practical measures towards the fulfilment of the objectives set forth in General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV) have been, to our regret and alarm, quite scarce.

Annual military expenditure has reached the astronomical figure of \$350 billion. Five to six per cent of the total production of goods and services is being diverted to military needs. Military activities throughout the world

(Mr. El-Shafei, Egypt)

absorb a volume of resources equivalent to about two-thirds of the aggregate gross national product of these countries which comprise the poorest half of the world's population. The opportunity cost of this colossal military expenditure is awesome in both financial and human terms.

Paragraph 35 of the Final Document of the General Assembly's tenth special session on disarmament clearly asserts that:

"There is a close relationship between disarmament and development. Progress in the former would help greatly in the realization of the latter. Therefore resources released as a result of the implementation of disarmament measures would be devoted to the economic and social development of all nations and contribute to the bridging of the economic gap between developed and developing countries".

The International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade envisaged Government assistance of 0.7 per cent of the GNP to facilitate a growth rate of 6 per cent for developing countries. It has been estimated that a 5 per cent shift of current expenditures on arms to development would suffice to approach the official targets for aid. The fulfilment of this target would be an important and constructive step towards erasing the want and poverty in which two thirds of the world's population live, as well as a solid contribution to the establishment of the new international economic order.

In its tenacious search for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, Egypt is fully cognizant of the close relationship between disarmament and development. The establishment of a durable and honourable peace in this troubled region of the world will definitely provide a solid basis for security. But it will also permit the States of the region to transfer huge resources, long being allocated to military purposes, towards the economic and social development and welfare of the whole region and its peoples.

It is a truism that the process of disarmament will be greatly enhanced with the pursuance of policies and the taking of measures to strengthen international peace and security and to build confidence among States. My delegation would like to recall what has been stated in this connexion in the Final Document, namely that "Disarmament, relaxation of international tension, respect for the right to self-determination and national independence, the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the strengthening of international peace and security are directly related to each other".

The task facing this negotiating body is a most difficult and challenging one. But we are convinced nonetheless that with added determination and renewed commitment we will be able to fulfil world expectations and set the stage for the establishment of a genuine and lasting peace based on the respect of the rule of law.

Mr. TERREFFE (Ethiopia): Mr. Chairman, the Ethiopian delegation joins others who have spoken before in congratulating you on assuming the chairmanship of this first session of the Committee on Disarmament. We express full confidence in your leadership and pledge complete support towards achieving concrete results. We welcome those members who are participating for the first time in these disarmament negotiations. We are particularly gratified that a considerable number of them come from the developing and non-aligned countries, which makes participation more representative. We also welcome the fact that more of the nuclear-power States are playing their proper role and hope that this trend will continue until all take an active part in disarmament negotiations.

The tenth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament demonstrated the overwhelming desire of the vast majority of mankind for an end to the arms race. In his message to the special session, the Ethiopian Head of State, Lt. Colonel Mengistu Haile Mariam, pointed out that "the advent of the nuclear age and the subsequent stockpiling of increasingly sophisticated and deadly weapons is today imperilling mankind and all human civilization with nuclear annihilation".

More than 10 years ago, the previous Committee on Disarmament agreed on a provisional agenda setting out priority items relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race, chemical and bacteriological warfare, regional arms limitations and other collateral measures which would lead eventually to general and complete disarmament. Today, we have before us an almost identical set of priorities emanating from the tenth special session of the General Assembly and endorsed by resolution 33/71 H of the thirty-third regular session of the General Assembly. Even more disturbing is the fact that in the intervening period, far from declining, the arms race has accelerated to alarming proportions: more nuclear warheads and new weapons of mass destruction have been developed. Hostilities around the world have continued apace.

As we embark upon a new attempt to proceed with disarmament negotiations, the Ethiopian delegation ventures to ask why efforts in this sphere have scored so little success in the past and why the world stands on the brink of self-annihilation? We recognize that the task of disarmament negotiations is inextricably linked to the question of international peace and security and to the building of confidence among States.

(Mr. Terrefe, Ethiopia)

There are forces at work in the world today, which through covert and overt operations destabilize countries, crush progressive movements and perpetuate aggression while attempting to realign countries against their own interest. These activities are responsible for mounting world tension and must cease if international détente is to be deepened. Ethiopia is well placed to appreciate this necessity, because she has been a victim of such type of international machinations not only throughout modern times but also only less than two years ago when hostile forces attempted to dismember the nation and halt the processes of change set in motion by the Ethiopian people in their quest for equity, justice and peace in Ethiopia. A wider conflagration could have ensued had the Ethiopian people not made all the sacrifices necessary to maintain their national integrity and promote peace in the Horn of Africa.

To secure peace it is necessary that equitable and progressive social, political and economic changes take place within and between nations and that mutual respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity and political and economic independence be promoted. The right of a nation to choose its own social and political system and the non-use of force in the settling of international disputes demand nothing more than adherence to the purposes and fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, to which Ethiopia remains firmly committed.

Concurrent with the tenth special session, the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) convened a summit meeting at which they decided to embark upon a qualitative and quantitative increase in armaments, unprecedented in the history of that organization. This action has been regretted by many countries, including Ethiopia, as evidence of a surprising degree of contempt for the world-wide struggle for détente, peace, security and disarmament.

Representatives of peoples and their Governments, particularly those of the developing countries, wish to see an end to the arms race. They have expressed similar concerns before the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Many have deplored the callous waste of vast human, technological and material resources being devoted to maintain a "balance of terror" and to keep the war industry going. The Ethiopian delegation notes again with concern the staggering figure of \$1 billion per day being spent on armaments. This sum when calculated annually is equivalent to the aggregated GNP of those countries which

(Mr. Terrefe, Ethiopia)

together comprise the poorer half of the world. Diverting part of these resources to economic and social development would make the difference between life and death for millions who lack basic health care services, between starvation and the availability of minimum quantities of nutritious food and between the darkness of illiteracy and the acquisition of basic knowledge and skills for hundreds of millions of human beings.

Ethiopia, therefore, both appreciates and supports the initiative taken and the efforts made by the community of socialist States, in particular the Soviet Union, at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to introduce resolutions designed to ensure the survival of man, by averting a nuclear holocaust. We find even more encouraging the message to the Committee on Disarmament by the Head of the Soviet delegation which called for practical results in 1979 and "quicker progress in solving principal problems of disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament".

The re-activated Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body of the General Assembly and the expanded Committee on Disarmament should provide to the community of nations the means by which to adopt bold measures of disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament. Nuclear-weapon States not only must remove the difficulties standing in the way of negotiations, but they should also make genuine efforts to achieve détente, peace and stability so that the deprived peoples of the world will be able to provide for their own genuine security and economic needs and aspirations. It is against this background that the thirty-third session of the General Assembly defined priorities which it requested the Committee on Disarmament to consider and act upon. In our view the Committee on Disarmament has before it the following major tasks: resolution 33/71 H of the General Assembly requests the Committee on Disarmament to undertake on a priority basis negotiations on a treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. Many countries recognize that some progress has been made in the tripartite talks between the United Kingdom, the USSR and the United States of America. However, an agreed text resulting from these negotiations has as yet to be submitted for consideration. The Ethiopian delegation, while fully aware of the technical difficulties involved, is nevertheless convinced of the possibility of concluding a comprehensive test-ban treaty if all the nuclear-weapon States

(Mr. Terrefe, Ethiopia)

demonstrate equally the political will to adhere strictly to the many resolutions of the General Assembly on the subject. That nuclear weapons pose the most serious threat to the survival of mankind has been reaffirmed. The threat or the use of force as a means of settling international disputes has long been established to be against the principle of the United Nations Charter. The attitude of the nuclear-weapon States toward these crucial issues is a measure of their genuine desire to move toward disarmament goals. It is our hope that the new momentum given to the Committee on Disarmament by the General Assembly will so influence our deliberations in this Session of the Committee on Disarmament that we will achieve concrete measures toward negotiations of a comprehensive test-ban (CTB) treaty.

The development of other weapons of mass destruction including chemical weapons is another subject which would require our immediate attention. It has been repeatedly stated that the development of the neutron bomb will inevitably intensify the arms race, jeopardize ongoing negotiations and undermine the positive process of détente. We reaffirm the view, that this new weapon, which is particularly targeted against human beings, should not be developed and deployed.

Resolution 33/59A requests the Committee to give high priority to a treaty or convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all types of chemical weapons and on their destruction. The United States of America and the USSR are urged to submit their joint proposal to the Committee on Disarmament. While the former CCD fully appreciated that there had been a narrowing of views on the part of the nuclear Powers towards a ban on chemical weapons, several members, including the Ethiopian delegation, were disappointed that complete agreement had not been reached. Ethiopia, because of its bitter experience, has always advocated vigorously the banning of chemical and biological weapons and lends full support to the initiatives taken so far. Nevertheless, we look forward, with other members of the Committee on Disarmament, to a speedy completion of negotiations and submission of a joint proposal on this issue.

A fourth point concerns the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones: resolution 33/63, sponsored by 36 African States, and adopted by a roll-call vote from which regrettably three important nuclear-weapon States abstained, calls for the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. With

(Mr. Terrefe, Ethiopia)

farsightedness and wisdom the African Heads of State and Governments, at their summit-conference-in 1964, adopted a Declaration in which they expressed their readiness to undertake an international treaty to be concluded under the auspices of the United Nations. They urged the nuclear Powers to respect the declaration. The resolution condemns any nuclear collaboration by any State, corporation, institution or individual with the racist régime of South Africa which could frustrate the objective of OAU to keep Africa a nuclear-weapon-free zone. In open defiance of the Declaration, the General Assembly's resolutions and the decisions of the Security Council, certain Western allies of the racist South African régime have continued to develop that régime's nuclear capability. South Africa's racial policy, abhorred by all Africans, based as it is on the oppression and the degradation of man by man, has now reached a stage whereby it is now backed by a possible testing of a nuclear device. The security of all African States is directly threatened by such a move. Peace has been undermined in the region and the peoples of southern Africa are exposed to a new form of imperialism acting through the apartheid régime of South Africa. The Committee on Disarmament by resolution 33/72 A is requested to consider at the earliest possible date an international convention which should assure the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use of threat of use of nuclear weapons.

In conclusion, may I say that the desire of the peoples of the world for international peace, security and prosperity can only be achieved if the community of nations work together toward a common goal and create a situation in which the world is free from war or the threat of war, in particular nuclear war.

The nuclear-weapon States can no longer delay putting before this Committee concrete proposals for a comprehensive test-ban treaty, and complete prohibition of weapons of mass destruction, so that the Committee on Disarmament will play a more effective negotiating role thus ensuring a bright future for mankind. This is what the world expects of this Committee.

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): It is particularly auspicious that the launching of the Committee on Disarmament has taken place under the chairmanship of Algeria which contributed in no small measure to its establishment, and that the words of guidance first spoken here have been those of its Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Abdelaziz Bouteflika who, with his colleagues, has promoted the cause of disarmament in so many forums.

The Argentine delegation is delighted at this coincidence and asks you, Mr. Chairman, to accept its cordial congratulations and the expression of its brotherly friendship.

At the same time, we should like on this occasion to extend our greetings to all other members of the Committee and to assure them of my delegation's co-operation in the joint task on which we have now embarked.

This first session of the Committee on Disarmament is an event of singular importance that marks the culmination of a lengthy process. The principal multilateral disarmament negotiating body, whose origins go back to resolution 1722 (XVI) adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1961, has commenced its activity with substantial reforms in its structure, membership and system of work, reforms which are aimed at eliminating the deficiencies of its immediate predecessor, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

For a number of years, my delegation, together with others holding similar views, emphasized the need to make these changes in the negotiating body -- in particular the replacement of the co-chairmanship system by a rotating chairmanship system -- in order to make it more effective, balanced and capable of discharging its responsibilities properly. These aspirations have been met. We therefore wish to place on record our satisfaction and, at the same time, to express the hope that these changes will genuinely help the Committee to bring its delicate mission to a successful outcome.

In commencing its work now, this Committee is completing the cycle of machinery provided for by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which was held scarcely six months ago at United Nations Headquarters. As is well known, the Final Document, adopted by consensus on that memorable occasion, acknowledged in its section IV the urgent need to improve and revitalize the international disarmament machinery so that, given the indispensable

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

political will of Governments, it would be in a position to implement the Programme of Action. To that end, it instituted two types of bodies with different characteristics: deliberative bodies, in which all States are represented, and negotiating bodies, which, because of their nature, have a limited membership.

After reaffirming the indisputable "central role and primary responsibility" of the United Nations in this field, the General Assembly logically reserved for itself the untransferable right to consider all problems relating to disarmament, and it decided that the First Committee should deal only with these questions and related international security questions. However, since its sessions are normally held for only three months in the year, it decided to establish a subsidiary intersessional body, the Disarmament Commission, which has wide terms of reference and has already begun its work very efficiently. Further, the Final Document provided for the convening of a second special session devoted to disarmament -- which has been fixed for 1982 -- and stated that a world disarmament conference should be convened at the earliest appropriate time.

Lastly, the Secretary-General of the United Nations was requested to set up an advisory board of eminent persons to advise him on various aspects of studies to be made by the world Organization in the field of disarmament and arms limitation. The Board has also been established and has already held its first meeting.

All of the foregoing relates to deliberative forums. With regard to the negotiating machinery, the main provisions are contained in paragraph 120 of the document in question, which is both the birth certificate of this Committee on Disarmament and a genuine constituent charter establishing its membership and outlining the modalities of its proceedings.

The affirmation that the Committee is open to the participation of all the nuclear-weapon States, an affirmation which has the effect of granting them the status of de jure members, has remedied one of the most glaring defects of the CCD. On many occasions, we have pointed to the grave omission involved in discussing and agreeing on international instruments on disarmament without the participation of two of the five nuclear Powers in the negotiations concerned; and we have expressed our justified doubts as to the degree of application that the instruments might have in view of the absence of those two Powers. The obstacles that stood in the way of their participation on an equal footing have

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

been removed, and henceforth each of those States is free to decide whether or not to be represented in this Committee. The Argentine delegation wishes to express once again its satisfaction at the presence of France from which, on the first day of our work and with the authoritative statement of its Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. François-Poncet, we have already received such an expert and significant contribution. We should also like to express the conviction that the People's Republic of China will soon be taking its place among us and will be playing an active part. In that way we shall achieve a total membership, and the negotiations which take place here will have a genuine content.

In conformity with the terms of reference which have been given us, the Committee on Disarmament will have to conduct its work by consensus and adopt its own rules of procedure. Without prejudice to substantive matters, to which I shall refer later, it is obvious that this problem will take up a large part of our immediate activities. It is impossible to ignore the importance of establishing, from the very outset, rules of procedure that are clear and are suited to the specific task we are going to undertake. Some points have already been set out in the Final Document, such as the rotation of the chairmanship of Committee among all its members on a monthly basis, the reports to be submitted to the General Assembly, the submission of written proposals by interested States which are not members of the Committee and the possibility for them to participate in its deliberations, and the opening of plenary meetings to the public. These matters will be duly covered in the rules of procedure, but it will doubtless be necessary to include others.

There are two possibilities in this connexion. One is to agree on a set of simple basic rules which could be improved on later, as our needs and experience require; the other option would be to examine carefully and elaborate forthwith comprehensive rules of procedure that will not require major changes in the future.

The elements that we have to consider include the question of the method of consensus which is to govern the adoption of our decisions.

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

The question is a delicate one. The concept of consensus in the field of disarmament has not been officially defined by the United Nations. The CCD operated by consensus but never attempted to define its meaning. The Committee on Disarmament can follow the same approach or can endeavour to define what is to be understood by consensus. Both alternatives are valid; but what is essential is that, whether consensus is defined or not, exactly the same approach must be strictly applied in all disarmament forums. We emphasize this from the start because my delegation is not ready to accept different or changing interpretations that serve the interests of one group of countries at the expense of others.

Now that the objections to the CCD have disappeared, we shall not be able to use formal excuses in order to justify further delays in the negotiations on disarmament. We now have a suitable means for conducting them. Naturally, if they are to proceed effectively, one imponderable and frequently elusive element -- the political will of the members -- must play its part. We trust that this new point of departure will be heralded by a general resolve to secure progress in the various matters that we have to consider.

Apart from the rules of procedure, we have to agree on our programme, bearing in mind the priorities established in paragraph 45 of the Final Document and the recommendations of the General Assembly which, at its recent session, decided on a number of tasks for our Committee. Intense activity therefore awaits us.

To begin with, in conformity with resolution 33/71 we must, on a priority basis, undertake negotiations on "a treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests" and "a treaty or convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all types of chemical weapons and on their destruction".

With regard to the first of these topics, we continue to note unfortunately that, despite the lengthy discussions in progress, we still do not have the relevant draft treaty. The revitalization of this negotiating body is an auspicious occasion for submitting this text to it as soon as possible and, if feasible, at this very session. The Committee's new and more representative structure and the membership of other nuclear

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

Powers are a guarantee in advance that this document will be given in-depth consideration and that the necessary care will be taken to secure the support first of all the nuclear-weapon Powers and also of all members of the international community.

We understand and share the urgent concern of many delegations that such a treaty should be concluded as soon as possible. However, this legitimate interest and understandable haste must not diminish the Committee's responsibility in the examination of this question. I venture to reiterate what was said in this connexion by the Argentine delegation on 17 November 1978, during the general debate of the First Committee of the General Assembly.

"All States represented here have agreed by consensus, as stated in paragraph 51 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, that the result of the negotiations on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests'... should be ... submitted for full consideration by the multilateral negotiation body ...'. I emphasize the words 'full consideration', which were chosen after lengthy discussion in order that we should not lose sight of the fact that the functions of the Committee in Geneva should not be those of a mere intermediary between the negotiating parties and the General Assembly.

"The competence of the Committee on Disarmament involves the receipt of any draft treaty submitted, its consideration in detail and in depth, and the whole negotiating process that is called for, including that of amendments to any provisions, in order that a consensus may be reached among all the Committee's members. Any restrictive interpretation of the functions we have assigned to the Committee on Disarmament would be detrimental to its role and would even cast doubt on the need for its very existence.

"Only after the negotiating body has, in the opinion of all its members, completed its full consideration of the draft international treaty will it be in a position to bring that draft before the General Assembly for its consideration. Apart from any other merit, that procedure will serve to ensure, in principle, wider acceptance by the most representative body in the United Nations"

(A/C.1/33/PV.42 (provisional), pp. 21-22).

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

Similar comments apply to the overdue draft treaty or convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. Although we should like it to be presented to us without delay, we are aware of the difficulties involved in preparing it and we hope that they will soon be overcome so that a detailed study can be made of its provisions.

At its thirty-third session, the General Assembly considered an important topic entitled "Strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States", whose inclusion in the agenda had been requested by the Soviet Union. During the discussion the Argentine delegation stated its views on this commendable initiative and listened with interest to the opinions expressed by many delegations, particularly that of Pakistan, the sponsor of one of the two draft resolutions, for both of which we voted.

Since the Committee on Disarmament has been requested to consider the proposals submitted, my delegation will take the floor again when our heavy agenda permits us to take up this point. Meanwhile, we shall simply reiterate the importance that we attach to the question and the desirability of giving it all the attention it deserves.

Also, in resolution 33/66, the Committee is requested to pursue its examination of the "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons" with a view to reaching agreement on this matter.

It is not my intention to draw up an exhaustive list of the subjects that have to be taken up by the Committee on Disarmament. Document CD/1 is in itself sufficiently eloquent in this respect. I have simply wished to mention some topics that call for priority treatment, without overlooking or underestimating others which may also be contained in the programme that we have to approve.

Nor is it my aim to expatiate on the dangerous situation created by the quantitative and qualitative speed-up in the arms race. The temptation is great. However, as the distinguished Minister of State of the United Kingdom, Lord Goronwy-Roberts, rightly reminded us in his statement, this is a place for negotiating disarmament agreements and not for making general statements.

By way of conclusion, I shall therefore prudently confine myself to stating that, no matter what determination we display in our task, the negotiations are proceeding much more slowly than the scientific and technological advances applied to the production of armaments. Hence we have an obligation to redouble our efforts and sharpen our imagination in order to control accumulation of armaments, before it is too late and before events that nobody wants overwhelm us with their dialectic of confrontation and destruction.

The pieces are now duly set out on the disarmament board. The time has come to use them properly and without delay.

Mr. VAN WELL (Federal Republic of Germany): The year 1978 was an important year for worldwide efforts to achieve disarmament and arms control. Never before have representatives of so many countries dealt so comprehensively with this subject as during the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted exclusively to disarmament. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany contributed with a number of proposals to the positive outcome of that conference. The Final Document adopted by consensus represents an important stage on the road towards the realization of the aims of the United Nations. It will be a major point of orientation for the disarmament and arms control policy of the Federal Republic of Germany. It is at the same time the basis for the work of the Committee on Disarmament.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany welcomes the establishment of this Committee, which in its present form is more suited to the ideas of many countries than the CCD. We are especially pleased that France is participating in the work of the Committee, which now includes four of the five nuclear-weapon States. We have listened with interest to the statement of the French Foreign Minister and see it as an important contribution to the debate we are beginning with this opening session. We hope that China will take its place here as soon as possible. We welcome in our midst as new participants Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Indonesia, Kenya, Cuba, Sri Lanka and Venezuela. The Federal Republic of Germany is interested in close co-operation with the representatives of these countries, and we are hopeful that their participation will generate strong impulses.

The worldwide disarmament machinery has been modified in keeping with the wish of the community of nations to have a "special platform with a more representative character" for both debate and negotiation. In opting for this change, the special session of the General Assembly held the view that for reasons of efficiency the negotiating body should be kept as small as possible. Owing to that decision, it has not been possible to include all countries whose presence in the Committee we would have welcomed. We therefore deem it necessary to make full use of the relevant provision of paragraph 120 of the Final Document and enable all non-member States which so desire to play an active part in the work of the Committee. At the same time, however, we are convinced that the newly-established institution must at first have a chance to consolidate itself, before the question of its composition will be reconsidered.

(Mr. Van Well, Federal Republic of Germany)

Substantive progress will require the combined efforts of all members of the Committee. This co-operation should increase the general awareness of the need for international security partnership. As Chancellor Schmidt said in his address to the special session on 26 May 1978: "No one can guarantee his security and peace by himself". Consequently, the work of this Committee must be governed not by confrontation but by consensus and co-operation. While the system of CCD co-chairmanship by the United States of America and the USSR has ceased, we all continue to recognize their keyrole in worldwide efforts towards disarmament and arms control. Without the specific contribution of the United States of America and the Soviet Union, progress is not conceivable.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore attaches great value to the progress achieved in the United States-Soviet negotiations on the limitation of strategic nuclear arms which hold out the prospect of an early SALT II agreement. Though bilateral in form, these negotiations help to stabilize the relationship not only between those two big Powers but between the two alliance systems as a whole; they thus also enhance world security.

The SALT process serves to establish a stable balance between East and West and thereby creates an important basis for more extensive efforts towards stabilization. My Government is convinced that this negotiation process should be developed further.

Already at the special session of the General Assembly, Western representatives drew attention to the growing superiority of the Warsaw Pact in the field of medium-range nuclear weapons. These weapons must give rise to deep concern in Western Europe and in other regions of the world within their reach.

For some time, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has been stressing the threat emanating from these so-called grey-area weapons to the stability of the overall nuclear balance agreed in SALT. It considers that the growing disparity in medium-range weapons must not be left out of consideration in the efforts to achieve a stable nuclear balance between East and West and must be taken into account both in the bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union and in the defence arrangements of the Western alliance.

From the beginning, the Federal Republic of Germany has supported the aim of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. It has declared its willingness to participate in concrete partial measures of arms limitation until such time as the long-term objective of general and complete disarmament has been

(Mr. Van Well, Federal Republic of Germany)

achieved. This willingness has found expression in the treaty policy of the Federal Republic of Germany. It is also manifest in our participation in the work of this Committee.

The Federal Republic of Germany has played an active part in the work of the CCD ever since it joined in 1975. It intends to intensify its participation in the Committee on Disarmament. We plan to make specific contributions in the following fields:

- verification of a worldwide prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons;
- seismological verification of a comprehensive test-ban treaty;
- the development of confidence-building measures.

My Government is of the opinion that priority should be given to the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and their destruction. It considers such a convention as a logical supplement to the Geneva Protocol of 1925 banning the use of chemical weapons.

In our view, a convention prohibiting chemical weapons calls for an adequate verification system commensurate with the military significance of these weapons of mass destruction. The willingness to agree to inspections is both proof and the basis of confidence in compliance with such a convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is therefore convinced of the need for an international verification system including on-site inspections. It considers such a system to be both desirable and feasible without prejudice to the interests of industry and research. Our experience as a country which undertook as early as 1954 not to manufacture chemical weapons, and which agreed to international controls of production plants, demonstrates that such controls can be effective and at the same time economically acceptable.

It was for this reason that Chancellor Schmidt, at the special session on Disarmament, in agreement with our chemical industry, invited all interested countries to send experts to the Federal Republic of Germany to see for themselves that adequate verification of a ban on the production of chemical weapons is possible. On behalf of my Government, I wish to extend here our invitation to visit three chemical companies between 12 March and 14 March this year. The plants to be visited, which manufacture phosphorous compounds, are BASF in Ludwigshafen, Bayer in Dormagen, and Hoechst in Knapsack.

(Mr. Van Well, Federal Republic of Germany)

We welcome the announcement made by Lord Goronwy-Roberts two days ago that experts in this field will, following our demonstration, be invited to visit the United Kingdom to see a plant producing phosphorus compounds as well as a pilot plant for the manufacture of nerve gas which is being dismantled. We are convinced that these demonstrations by both countries will help to clarify questions concerning the verification of a chemical weapons ban.

The Federal Republic of Germany is following with great interest the negotiations on a comprehensive test ban and has long been advocating a treaty to this effect. It would like to see the results of these negotiations put before the Committee soon so that it can draft a convention.

In this connexion, too, the Federal Republic of Germany deems satisfactory verification to be essential. It will, therefore, continue to attach great significance to the work of the Ad Hoc Group of Seismological Experts for the detection, localization and identification of underground nuclear explosions and will participate in it as well. It has declared its willingness to make its seismic facilities available for the international monitoring of a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

My Government sees in a comprehensive test ban a contribution towards the quantitative and qualitative limitation of nuclear armaments and towards a worldwide non-proliferation policy.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany takes the view that the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is a major prerequisite for safeguarding peace.

Even before the Non-Proliferation Treaty was concluded, it had renounced the manufacture of nuclear weapons. It has acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, adheres strictly to its provisions, and expects the other signatories to do the same. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany appeals to all States to adhere to this Treaty which established rights and responsibilities for both nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States alike, and which it regards as an indispensable basis for a universal non-proliferation policy. My Government is prepared to continue to make every effort on the basis of that Treaty to help develop an effective non-proliferation policy. It will contribute in this spirit to the second Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly has requested the Committee on Disarmament to consider by what alternative measures non-nuclear-weapon States can be effectively protected against use and threat of use of nuclear weapons by nuclear-weapon States. In its examination, the Committee is to take into account all declarations and proposals on this subject made up to now.

(Mr. Van Well, Federal Republic of Germany)

My Government welcomes the declarations made by the United States of America and the United Kingdom during the special session of the General Assembly. During the thirty-third session the two Governments emphasized once more that in so doing they had taken obligations upon themselves which went beyond the general prohibition of the use of force under existing international law. The Federal Republic of Germany reaffirms its support for those declarations and considers that they serve the security interests of all concerned better and more comprehensively than a worldwide convention could.

As in the case of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is important to work out arrangements that are adapted to specific conditions for security and stability which vary from region to region.

A policy of concrete and practical arms control must be geared to the respective conditions and consequences of security policy if it is to enhance the security of all concerned. This means that negotiations and measures must be differentiated according to whether they apply to a specific region, or worldwide. One major criterion in this respect is how far nuclear potentials are an integral part of a region's security structure or whether the introduction of nuclear weapons to hitherto nuclear-weapon-free zones threatens their security and stability.

The recent initiative by Mexico and other Latin American and Caribbean countries for limiting the transfer of weapons and military equipment is a good example of a regional contribution towards the increasingly important subject of arms control. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany welcomes this initiative as a stimulus for worldwide efforts to release resources spent on arms for economic and social development. This is in line with the restrictive arms export policy of the Federal Republic of Germany.

My Government does not allow any arms and military equipment to be exported to areas of tension. The restrictive character of that policy is reflected in the small proportion of the Federal Republic's total exports accounted for by arms; in 1977 it was only 0.7 per cent.

Encouraged by the positive experience in Europe with the confidence-building measures provided for in the Final Act of Helsinki, the Federal Republic of Germany tabled a draft resolution during the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, which contained a recommendation to all States Members of the United Nations to conclude agreements on a regional basis concerning confidence-building measures, taking into account the specific conditions and needs of the region concerned.

(Mr. Van Well, Federal Republic of Germany)

Confidence-building measures should help to strengthen stability and security by making military and political conduct more calculable and more predictable. The almost unanimous approval of this resolution gives us hope that it will be possible in other parts of the world as well to improve the conditions for concrete arms limitation and disarmament measures by arrangements which help to establish and strengthen mutual confidence.

Mr. Chairman, in Europe a further contribution towards regional stabilization can be made by the Vienna negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions. Together with its allies, the Federal Republic of Germany hopes that concrete progress can be achieved in these important negotiations. Their object is to help create more stable relations and to reduce the dangers of military confrontation in Europe. The Western participants have therefore proposed to establish approximate parity in the form of a common collective ceiling for ground force personnel and a reduction of the battle tank disparity. The establishment of parity as well as the maintenance of the common collective ceiling require agreement on the existing manpower figures. We are convinced that such a verifiable result of the Vienna negotiations will meet the defence requirements of both sides, guarantee undiminished security, and serve to strengthen peace and security in Europe.

The establishment of parity in MBFR would also be a major contribution towards a more stable overall balance between East and West. Negotiations which are not aimed at establishing a stable balance offer little prospect of lasting success. The establishment and maintenance of such a balance is indispensable for progress in the sphere of arms control; it is at the same time the essential requirement for the further development of détente.

Regional and global measures of arms control, arms limitation and disarmament must be combined in order to secure peace through co-operation in an increasingly interdependent world. General and complete disarmament on the basis of effective international control remains the long-term objective; but we have already now to strive for gradual solutions of the urgent problems of arms control.

A realistic policy of arms control must neither raise hopes too high nor cause resignation. Pointing to the hitherto unsatisfactory results will get us no further. The worldwide efforts to achieve disarmament and arms control must continue. The Committee on Disarmament starting its work with this session is an important instrument of this policy. It should reflect the growing worldwide partnership in the field of security. The Federal Republic of Germany will play its part to meet the expectations linked with this new beginning.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I have no more speakers on my list for this morning and before closing the meeting, I should like to propose to you that we should hold an informal meeting at the end of this afternoon, following our plenary meeting.

The points on which I hope that a rapid agreement can be reached at this informal meeting are the following:

(1) An agreement on the country to succeed Algeria on 1 February 1979 as Chairman of the CD;

(2) An agreement on the seating to be reserved in the conference room, after the opening meetings, for representatives of countries which are not members of the CD;

(3) An agreement on the use of the CD's time during the coming days.

In other words, I am therefore proposing to you that the sixth plenary meeting of the Committee should be suspended after the list of speakers is exhausted and that we should then hold a short informal meeting. As soon as agreement has been reached on the three points mentioned, we shall resume the plenary meeting in order to adopt formally the agreements which have been approved informally. The informal meeting will, of course, be open only to representatives of countries members of the Committee on Disarmament.

If there are no objections to what I have just proposed, I should like to remind you that the sixth plenary meeting is scheduled for 3 p.m. in this room.

I see no other delegation wishing to take the floor, and I therefore adjourn the meeting.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

CD/PV.6
26 January 1979
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIXTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday, 26 January 1979, at 3 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. R. Boudjakdji

(Algeria)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria:

Mr. R. BOUDJAKDJI
Mr. A. FASLA
Mr. A. BENSMAIL
Mr. N. KERROUM

Argentina:

Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS
Mr. F. JIMENEZ DAVILA
Mr. A.N. MOLTENI

Australia:

Mr. L.D. THOMSON
Mr. A.J. BEHM
Ms. M.S. WICKES

Belgium:

Mr. P. NOTERDAEME
Mr. P. BERG
Mr. G. VAN DUYSSE

Brazil:

Mr. G.A. MACIEL
Mr. L.P. LINDENBERG SETTE

Bulgaria:

Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. I. PETROV
Mr. I. SOTIROV

Burma:

U SAW HLAING
U THEIN AUNG
U THAUNG HITUN

Canada:

Mr. G.A.H. PEARSON
Mr. R. HARRY JAY
Mr. J. GAUDREAU

Cuba:

Mr. L. SOLA VILA
Mr. F.O. RODRIGUEZ
Mrs. V.B. JACKIEWICH
Mr. C. PAZOS BECEIRO
Mr. R. VALIENTE
Mr. R.L. GARCIA

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. V. TYLNER
Mr. J. JIRUSEK

Egypt:

Mr. O. EL-SHAFEI
Mr. F. EL-IBRASHI
Mr. M. EL-BARADEI
Mr. N. FAHMY

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. TERREFE
Mr. G. ALULA

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. S. KAHN
Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. G. VAN WELL
Mr. F. RUTH
Mr. G. PFEIFFER
Mr. H. SCHNEPPEN
Mr. J. POHLMANN
Mr. H. MULLER

Hungary:

Mr. M. DOMOKOS
Mr. A. LAKATOS

France:

Mr. F. DE LA GORCE
Mr. F. BEAUCHATAUD
Mr. J. FEVRE
Mr. J. C. PARAVY

India:

Mr. C. R. GHAREKHAN
Mr. S. T. DEVARE

Indonesia:

Mr. A. SANI
Mr. A. KAMIL
Mr. M. SIDIK
Mr. I. DAMANIK

Iran:

Mr. M. FARTASH
Mr. D. CHILATY
Mr. D. AMERI

Italy:

Mr. N. DI BERNARDO
Mr. F. FERRETTI
Mr. M. ALESSI
Mr. M. MORENO
Mr. C. FRATESCHI

Japan:

Mr. M. OGISO
Mr. T. NONOYAMA
Mr. Y. KIKUCHI
Mr. T. IWANAMI
Mr. Y. NAKAMURA

Kenya:

Mr. K. MWAMZANDI
Mr. C.G. MAINA
Mr. G.N. MUNIU

Mexico:

Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES
Miss A. CABRERA

Mongolia:

Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
Mr. LUVSANDOR BAYART

Morocco:

M. ALI SKALLI
M. MOHAMED CHRAIBI

Netherlands:

Mr. R.H. FEIN
Mr. A.J. MEERBURG

Nigeria:

Mr. O. ADENIJI
Mr. K. AHMED

Pakistan:

Mr. J.K.A. MARKER
Mr. M. AKRAM
Dr. M. HUMAYUN KHAN

Peru:

Mr. J.A. MONTERO

Poland:

Mr. H. PAC
Mr. S. KONIK
Mr. M. KRUCZYK

Romania:

Mr. T. MELESCANU

Mr. G. TINCA

Sri Lanka:

Mr. A.C.S. HAMEED

Miss M.L. NAGANATHAN

Mr. I.B. FONSEKA

Sweden:

Mr. C. LIDGARD

Mr. L. NORBERG

Mr. J. PRAWITZ

Mr. J. LUNDIN

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN

Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN

Mr. A.M. VAVILOV

Mr. E.D. ZAITSEV

Mr. V.A. VERTOGRADOV

Mr. Y.V. KOSTENKO

Mr. M.G. ANTIUKHIN

United Kingdom:

Mr. N.H. MARSHALL

Mr. C.L.G. MALLABY

Mr. C.K. CURWEN

Mr. P.M.W. FRANCIS

United States of America:

Mr. A. FISHER

Mr. C. FLOWERREE

Mr. A. AKALOVSKY

Mr. R. HAGENGRUBER

Ms. BLAIR L. MURRAY

Mr. M.L. SANCHES

Mr. A. YARMOLINSKY

Venezuela:

Mr. R. CARLO CASTILLO

Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT

Mr. H. ARTEAGA

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. PESIV
Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC
Mr. D. DJOKIV

Zaire:

Mr. BUKETI-BUKAYI
Mr. M. ESUK

Assistant Secretary-General:

Mr. R. BJORNERSTEDT

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic): The Geneva Committee on Disarmament is convening this year with an enlarged membership.

In accordance with the desire expressed by an overwhelming majority of States at the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, the enlargement of the membership of the Geneva Committee on Disarmament is to improve the conditions for making significant progress towards the cessation of the arms race and disarmament.

On behalf of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic, I congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, as representative of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, on assuming the chairmanship of the Committee, and I am sure that under your guidance the Committee will make great efforts, so that a good foundation will be laid already in the early phase of the spring session for further productive work.

We welcome the delegations of those States which participate for the first time in the work of the Committee: the delegations of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, Australia, the Kingdom of Belgium, the Republic of Cuba, the French Republic, the Republic of Indonesia, the Republic of Kenya, the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka and the Republic of Venezuela.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic has noted with satisfaction the statements made by the delegations of the new members, which reflect the willingness of their States to co-operate in the solution of the tasks facing the Committee.

As for the German Democratic Republic, we are ready, as we were before, to work together with all delegations in the interest of our common concern.

Only a few days ago the general position of my country to contribute its own efforts to those of other States for the cessation of the arms race and for disarmament, found expression in the Joint Statement which was signed on the occasion of the official visit to the Republic of India by Mr. Erich Honecker, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, and Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic.

The Statement reads, inter alia:

"The two sides called for an end to the arms race and took note of the various talks and negotiations under way towards this end. They expressed the hope that these would come to a speedy conclusion, thereby

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

contributing to the process of détente and disarmament. ~~The~~ resources and energies released through the process of disarmament should be rechannelled into the all-round development efforts of nations, particularly among the developing countries."

The results of the tenth special session and of the thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly strongly reflect the striving of peoples for détente and security which can be only achieved if the arms race is halted through effective measures and if sweeping progress is made in the field of disarmament.

This is all the more necessary and urgent as there are forces which have been attempting not just to halt the process of détente and disarmament but to reverse it. They adopted the long-term programme of NATO and measures for its implementation.

This also concerns the series of important military manoeuvres which are being held year after year by NATO all along the western State frontier of the German Democratic Republic. As to their extent, the number of participating forces and the duration, these manoeuvres have become the biggest ones after World War Two. These measures are in fact not appropriate to strengthen mutual confidence between the States and to lay the foundation for dissolving military blocs.

It is obvious that the German Democratic Republic **cannot** be indifferent to what military activities go on near its frontiers. Experiences of history confirm the correctness of the assessment made by the tenth special session that the arms race poses an incalculable threat to peace.

From this arises the pressing need, as the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty stressed in their Declaration of 23 November 1978, to bring about an early and decisive breakthrough in the talks on stopping the arms race and on disarmament as the most important task of international politics under present conditions. The Declaration contains a programme which, based on realities and requirements, sets out long-term and short-term tasks for arms limitation and disarmament. The Programme centres on concrete measures of nuclear disarmament, attaching to them priority importance.

It should be particularly noted that the socialist States are ready to negotiate on any type of weapon, among them on those which are a source of concern for each of the sides.

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

To the German Democratic Republic, a socialist State situated at the boundary line between the world's two most powerful military alliances, disarmament and the strengthening of international security are fundamental objectives to which it has been unswervingly committed throughout the thirty years of its existence.

The Government of the German Democratic Republic, in full accordance with the world public, attaches great importance to the early conclusion of an agreement on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons. The signing and ratification of that agreement would undoubtedly promote the achievement of further progress in understanding on the most pressing measures to be taken in the fields of limitation of armaments and détente.

This Committee will now have to translate the recommendations and decisions which the United Nations General Assembly adopted at its tenth special session and at its thirty-third regular session into practical measures. My delegation expects that the greatest attention in the Committee's work will be given to substantive matters right from the beginning. The responsibility which the Committee bears in this respect is a very great one, since it is the only multilateral negotiating body for global measures of disarmament.

In accordance with the interests of an overwhelming majority of States, the Committee should also in its future activities primarily concentrate on the elaboration of agreements on the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction, particularly of nuclear weapons.

In this connexion we attach great importance to the initiation of negotiations on nuclear disarmament among all the five nuclear-weapon States, which has been urged by the thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 33/71 H. Considering that the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, stated that measures of nuclear disarmament have the highest priority, such negotiations constitute an important step towards this goal, provided that all nuclear-weapon States live up to their high responsibility and co-operate in a constructive spirit. A successful course of such negotiations would, no doubt, have favourable repercussions on the consideration of the problems facing the Committee now.

The conclusion of an agreement on the comprehensive prohibition of nuclear-arms tests which has been for some years now the subject of negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament would be an important step towards the limitation of the

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

arms race in nuclear weapons. As you know, the USSR had submitted a number of concrete proposals on that subject which made it possible to find comprehension between differing views during trilateral negotiations and to reach important progress in the elaboration of a joint draft agreement. We hold the early conclusion of such an agreement to be an essential contribution to strengthen the régime of non-proliferation of nuclear arms, to halt the arms race in weapons of mass destruction and to deepen international security.

Besides continued efforts to achieve a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests as soon as possible, any other measures which might diminish the danger of nuclear war should also take a central place in the Committee's work.

The German Democratic Republic considers that the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States is one of those important measures.

International legal guarantees safeguarding the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons would enhance the security of such States and meet their legitimate interests.

They constitute a genuine confidence-building measure and will have a beneficial effect on the development of international relations between the nuclear-weapon States and the non-nuclear-weapon States. The German Democratic Republic is interested to see the Committee consider, in pursuance of resolution 33/72 A and at the earliest possible date, the drafts for an international convention that were submitted to the thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly, as well as all proposals on effective political and legal measures at the international level to that end. We deem the draft international convention submitted by the USSR to be a suitable basis for such deliberations.

In the view of the German Democratic Republic, continued efforts to reach a prohibition of the development and production of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction are another point of priority importance. The discussions at the thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly have again demonstrated the urgency of measures against the arms race with new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. The insistence of the socialist States on the conclusion of an agreement on the general and complete prohibition of such weapons which will prevent the development of new dangerous weapons of mass destruction is meeting with ever broader approval. My delegation believes that

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

the work the Committee has done so far in this respect has contributed to settling a number of complex issues in this connexion. There exist all the necessary prerequisites for the Committee actively to continue its work in that direction.

Since the Committee's summer session of 1978, world-wide protests against the production of the neutron weapon have grown further. This movement and the strong demands made at the thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly for effective measures against that weapon should be reason enough not to delay any longer the elaboration of a convention on the prohibition of the production and use of the neutron nuclear weapon. The Committee should promptly start negotiating on the basis of the draft for an international convention on the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, stationing and use of nuclear neutron weapons submitted by eight socialist States.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic welcomes the fact that the bilateral talks between the USSR and the United States in Geneva on a joint initiative with regard to the prohibition of chemical weapons are being continued. We consider the measure of results achieved in this respect to be a good foundation for agreeing on still outstanding problems. The negotiations should be continued so that such an initiative can be presented shortly. This would enable the Committee to deliberate in the near future on an appropriate draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction.

Being the only multilateral and independent negotiating organ on global disarmament matters, the Committee has a long record of thorough experience in this field. Its enlargement has made it even more representative.

In the opinion of the German Democratic Republic, there exist all preconditions for reaching tangible progress in settling a number of questions on its agenda in the foreseeable future. The decisive factors in this respect are the political will and the readiness of all those involved. These factors given, it will be possible to reach understanding also on the most difficult details.

The peoples expect the Committee to live up to its high responsibility, and its activities to find expression in the preparation of appropriate draft agreements on the cessation of the arms race. At the side of the other States of the socialist community, the German Democratic Republic will also in the future make its contribution to the successful work of the Committee.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): It gives me great pleasure, on behalf of the Netherlands Government to join previous speakers in expressing our satisfaction that this inaugural session of the Committee on Disarmament in its new composition is chaired by one of the new members, Algeria. We have particularly appreciated the fact that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria has found time to join us in this inaugural session and take upon himself the burden of presiding over the first two meetings.

I also should like to welcome the new members of this new Committee. We are looking forward to working with them, and we await eagerly their contribution to disarmament and arms control in this negotiating body.

In this first statement in the CD on behalf of the Netherlands Government, I intend to limit myself to only a few general remarks of a technical nature concerning the disarmament process, with particular reference to the role entrusted to this negotiating body.

I do not therefore intend to follow the challenging example of so many eminent speakers who preceded me, and I shall not attempt to cover in depth the broad political implications and ramifications of the arms race to which we are supposed to put an end. On all those broader aspects, the Netherlands has in the recent past, at the special session on disarmament, and at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly and in the CCD, expressed views in extenso and in numerous interventions, and we feel we have more or less exhausted the subject as far as general statements of intent are concerned. We would now like to get down to business.

Allow me therefore, after some introductory remarks, to go straight to the specifics of what we consider to be our task in the coming months.

The special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament not only clarified again the vital need of disarmament for the future of our planet, but underlined at the same time the complexities of the disarmament process -- no simple measure, no single structure can solve this global problem. What is required is a rational and logical diversification of our efforts in the disarmament field, to tackle the complexity of the issues involved. The special session recognized this problem and took some measures in the right direction.

First of all, a greater need for background information on the armaments and disarmament field was identified; objective information directed towards the public to enable the people to become conscious of the problems involved, but also certain well defined studies which can help us to find ways and means to accelerate the disarmament process. Besides studies by governmental experts, a significant role can also be reserved for non-governmental institutions in this field.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

Secondly, we need of course machinery for deliberations on a world-wide basis in order to allow all States to express their views on vital security and disarmament questions, including agreements worked out in the negotiating process. The General Assembly took particular action on this question, first of all by convening a special session devoted to disarmament and secondly by complementing the First Committee through the re-establishment of the United Nations Disarmament Commission composed of all Member States. My Government welcomes this development, although one may wonder -- I do so from my personal experience last year -- whether we are not deliberating too much and negotiating too little.

I come now to the third component of the disarmament process, and that is the one with which we here are most concerned, viz. the fora for negotiations.

A variety of fora are needed, and indeed do exist, to work out particular agreements on areas of arms control and disarmament which have become ripe for specific negotiations. Fora which are adapted to the military situation, the weapon-systems, the countries involved. One such forum must be a multilateral disarmament body to work out treaties and principles which find potentially world-wide application. To be able to work out such viable agreements, the body must have a representative character and must include in any case the major military Powers, and of course the nuclear-weapon States. As we all know, this last requirement was not fully met in the CCD, and the present membership of the Committee -- in particular when all seats are filled -- is therefore already an improvement. We welcome the presence of France and we look forward to the future co-operation of China.

The Committee on Disarmament is an essential element in the disarmament structure, but we should of course not pretend that it can solve all problems. In our future discussions on the agenda -- and I shall return to this specific subject in a moment -- we must realize that only certain issues lend themselves for world-wide agreements. Bilateral talks -- like SALT -- and regional ones -- like the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction talks in Vienna -- are other vital parts of the world-wide arms control and disarmament effort. For example, it is clear that the CD could not involve itself in any detailed negotiations on conventional arms control in a specific region, although it could perhaps work out some principles for regional talks in general, and stimulate such talks.

As in the past, the multilateral negotiating body, this CD, could be particularly involved in banning the development and/or deployment of complete weapon systems or means of warfare; in banning the deployment of specific weapons in areas outside national jurisdiction; in giving general guidelines for the disarmament process, etc. In the past, the CCD concentrated on weapons of mass

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

destruction, which can be separated more easily from specific regional security problems than conventional weapons. However, in our opinion the CD must not confine itself to weapons of mass destruction, but evolve its expertise in other fields. Especially since this body has now a more representative character, we should not shy away from accepting more diversified subjects than in the past. It is clear that for such a broader task, the Committee needs suitably flexible working procedures.

Of course, we shall have to consider very carefully which subjects lend themselves best for bilateral talks, which for regional approaches and which for the multilateral level. This question is not irrelevant to our work, taking into account certain procedures followed in the CCD. I refer in particular to the role of the two super-Powers in the negotiating process.

It is self-evident that any substantial multilateral arms-control and disarmament agreement cannot be negotiated without the active participation of the two largest military Powers in the world. It was and is therefore of the highest importance that these two countries, between them, try to settle questions which stand in the way of an agreement. Indeed, never before in history have two Powers been involved in such a broad range of disarmament talks as today. The question is, however, how far should they go on their own with respect to issues of a more or less multilateral nature. Let me give some examples.

My Government accepts the logic of, and welcomes, the fact that on a nuclear-test ban detailed negotiations take place between the three nuclear Powers who so far have expressed the will to achieve such an agreement. After all, the nuclear Powers are in the first place affected by such an agreement. We anxiously await the day when the other two nuclear-weapon Powers will join in these negotiations and agreements. The trilateral talks -- which hopefully will bear fruit in the near future --- could lay the basis for a widely acceptable CTBT as a very important step to stop the technological arms race and as an element in our fight against proliferation. This does not mean, of course, that the Committee on Disarmament does or would not have a role to play in the negotiations. On the contrary: to achieve a widely acceptable CTB, the Committee as a whole would have to be involved. This is all the more important since a world-wide seismic verification system is required, to which the Seismic Group of the Committee has already contributed substantially. However, in our view the Committee had better wait with its negotiations in detail on the whole CTB treaty until the trilateral talks have been concluded successfully.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

However, the logic of such a procedure -- I mean a more or less wait-and-see attitude -- is less evident in other cases. One may wonder, for example, why it is necessary to settle questions like the environmental modification convention or the radiological weapons question completely on a bilateral basis before the Committee on Disarmament is given the opportunity to take them up. Even more important for our future work is the chemical weapons issue. Although rather creative work was in fact done by several members of the CCD, serious discussions were avoided during the last years of the CCD because of ongoing bilateral talks. Now, speedy conclusive results of these bilateral talks would of course be helpful to the multilateral negotiations, but further delay in those bilateral talks could also lead to even further delay in our consideration of the question. Those exclusive bilateral talks could also lead to an agreement which does not sufficiently take into account possible preoccupations of other countries.

The CW issue is not of a specifically bilateral nature. Several countries may possess chemical weapons, and all industrial States will eventually have to accept rather intrusive verification procedures in their national chemical industry. The present procedure could, in the end, lead to an agreement which is perhaps not as widely accepted as required. More open negotiations, in this Committee, could lead to better results in the end.

In concluding my remarks on the third component of the disarmament process, the negotiating body and especially this Committee on Disarmament, I should like to add a few words on the agenda for this year, remarks which follow from what I have just said. The agenda for our work in the coming period must, of course, take into account the relevant recommendations of the General Assembly, the proposals made by member States and also the question whether an issue is indeed ripe for negotiations.

First of all we must be prepared to take up the work on a comprehensive test-ban treaty as soon as possible. We are happy to hear from the representative of the United Kingdom that the main stumbling-blocks in the trilateral talks seem to have been solved. While waiting for the outcome of these talks, we must strongly support the work of the Seismic Group, since a multitude of technical questions has still to be solved. Secondly, we must further concentrate on a chemical-weapons ban. These negotiations will probably take more time than a CTB, since the practical verification problems are complex. This year we could concentrate on definition and verification problems. With respect to the last question, we sincerely welcome the invitations by the Federal Republic of Germany

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

and the United Kingdom to attend chemical workshops which will contribute much to our understanding of how to solve on-site inspection questions. In the meantime, we could also start negotiating a radiological-weapons ban.

We could have serious and exploratory discussions on: a cut-off in the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes, security guarantees, guidelines for conventional-arms-control talks and the comprehensive disarmament programme. We could have preliminary discussions on measures to restrict the technological arms race. I doubt, however, whether it is useful to continue our discussions on new weapons of mass destruction on the same basis as in the past. An arms race in space would threaten world stability. I wonder, however, whether the time is ripe for discussions on this matter in this multilateral forum. We would like to stay informed about progress in bilateral talks on this matter. My delegation listened with great attention to other suggestions for the agenda and we will study these carefully.

I will not dwell further on this question of the agenda. There will be ample opportunity to discuss our future work programme in the coming weeks.

I would like to conclude by touching briefly on the fourth element of the disarmament process, viz. the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements.

As is well known, the Netherlands has proposed that the desirability of the establishment of an International Disarmament Organization as a servicing agency, to assist in the implementation of disarmament treaties, be looked into. Other, more or less related, proposals have been made by other members last year. In view of the expertise combined in the Committee on Disarmament, as well as the role it can play in the multilateral disarmament process, we consider the Committee to be the right forum to discuss implementation machinery. We intend to return to this question in more depth later in the year. We consider it a highly important matter.

One final word. We are looking forward with great interest to the appointment of a Secretary of this Committee, who will also, as the representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, maintain a link between this Committee and the United Nations system.

A lot of work has to be done. Let us settle our procedural and organizational matters efficiently in the coming weeks, without looking for problems where there are in fact none, thus allowing us to start our substantial work as soon as possible.

Mr. BUKETI-BUKAYI (Zaire) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, the delegation of Zaire feels keen satisfaction and genuine pride at seeing the Algerian delegation presiding over the debates of this first session of the Committee on Disarmament.

This legitimate pride is based on the fact that Algeria and Zaire, African and non-aligned countries, share the same ideals and are exposed to the same difficulties. You can rest assured, therefore, of the complete collaboration of my delegation in the accomplishment of your task.

The Zairian delegation welcomes the new members who have come to enlarge the membership of the Committee, and is convinced that their contribution will add a new dynamism to the work of the Committee, so that it can live up to the immense hopes of the international community and the trust the General Assembly has placed in us.

More particularly, my country welcomes the presence of France, a nuclear-weapon country and a permanent member of the Security Council, whose contribution will strengthen the results of our deliberations, for disarmament cannot, in the view of my delegation, be achieved without the assistance of all the nuclear-weapon States. In this context, my country earnestly hopes that the People's Republic of China will join us in the very near future to take its rightful place and bring its stone, too, to help in building a new world delivered from the fear of nuclear destruction.

Six months have passed since the end of the tenth special session, devoted to disarmament.

At the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, there was a long discussion on implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the tenth special session.

We are meeting here today in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 120 of the Final Document establishing the Committee on Disarmament as a negotiating body instead and in place of the former CCD.

In accordance with the wishes of the General Assembly, the better structured, more representative and more democratic Committee on Disarmament must meet the legitimate aspirations of the international community, which is haunted by the fear of overarmament and destruction.

(Mr. Buketi-Bukayi, Zaire)

This means that we at this meeting are starting a new, historic page in the long and difficult march towards disarmament.

We all agree that there should be disarmament, but how are we to disarm?

This is the question to which the new machinery established by the General Assembly at its tenth special session is expected to provide an answer. In face of the complexity of the equation, every unit of this machinery has a clearly defined role to play so that the sum of the results achieved will lead us to the ultimate solution, namely, general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

In paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the tenth special session, the General Assembly traced the blue-print we should follow in our approach to the objectives we have set ourselves.

It is clear from the statements made so far that every delegation is determined to make its contribution.

Let us, therefore, break with the past, its methods and its principles to the extent that they impeded our action and let us take advantage of the experience of the past in order better to succeed.

This Committee must fully discharge its task with the assistance of all States composing it. The nuclear Powers have a particular responsibility in the progress of our work. They must, therefore, make an extra effort to come out of their ivory tower and, through frank and sincere collaboration, enable the non-nuclear-weapon members to participate actively in the negotiations. They must take account of the views expressed by non-nuclear-weapon countries so that the latter will not, as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka so aptly said, be reduced to mere observers in the Committee.

Paragraph 45 of the Final Document of the tenth special session defined the order of priorities for disarmament negotiations. Nuclear weapons, the existing arsenals of which are capable of destroying our planet several times over, are our first concern. In this context, the General Assembly at its thirty-third session assigned to the Committee on Disarmament the task of negotiating, as a matter of priority, a treaty on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, an instrument for prohibiting the development and production of chemical weapons and a convention on the cessation and prohibition of production of fissionable materials for weapons and other nuclear explosive devices. Lastly, the Committee is to continue its efforts with a view to reaching agreement on the prevention of the emergence of new weapons of mass destruction.

(Mr. Buketi-Bukayi, Zaire)

If the nuclear Powers consider that nuclear weapons form an integral part of the security of a certain number of States, how can the excessive accumulation of their arsenals be justified when at present only a few bombs are needed to wipe out humanity? Hence, the search for new nuclear delivery vehicle systems is unjustifiable.

In the opinion of my delegation, conclusion of a treaty banning nuclear testing so as to put an end to the arms race should not meet with major objections on the part of the nuclear States.

The confinement of their defensive capacity to a level no higher than that required for guaranteeing their security and that of their allies is the only condition which, in an initial stage, justifies their possession of nuclear weapons.

For we must be realistic in our search for ways and means of achieving disarmament. At the present stage, it would be utopian to speak of general and complete disarmament. That will only occur at the final stage of our work.

Even Stone Age man had his spear and axe for hunting and fishing, to feed and, if necessary, defend himself.

We have certainly not chosen this example to justify overarmament; quite the reverse, pursuant to the principle of the right of every State to security, we also acknowledge the right of every State to equip itself with appropriate means for its defence.

Overarmament is therefore to be condemned. The most adequate means of curbing this overarmament race lies in the complete cessation of all nuclear tests and the verified destruction of other types of weapon.

The mere fact that the majority of States of the globe have voluntarily come out in favour of a non-proliferation régime must be seen as proof of their political will to work for peace and live in peaceful co-existence in accordance with the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

The non-nuclear-weapon States expect the nuclear-weapon States to show the same political will. To this end, they must, first and foremost, create a climate of mutual confidence and help the community of States to eliminate trouble spots where power struggles are often played out to the detriment of the population concerned. By this process, another phase of our task, that of limiting conventional weapons, the importance of which has increased in recent

(Mr. Duketi-Bukayi, Zaire)

years, will be accomplished. All local wars have been fed by this type of weapon. My country, which has suffered so much in local conflicts, fully appreciates the importance of limiting and prohibiting certain conventional weapons which may be considered to have excessive or indiscriminate effects.

We hope that the efforts we undertake in this context in the course of the year will be crowned with success.

It is not the intention of the Zairian delegation to waste time, at the present stage of our debate, on redefining its position on all disarmament questions; that position has, moreover, been expressed on several occasions and is perfectly consistent with the views of the non-aligned movement on the question.

My delegation wishes to confine its comments to the manner in which our Committee should conduct its work so as to obtain the best chances of success.

- (1) The Committee should first, on an annual basis, draw up a precise programme of work, observing the order of priorities established by the tenth special session and the relevant resolutions of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly.
- (2) It should avoid sterile discussions in its negotiations, so as to address itself to the real problems to be solved.
- (3) It should maintain the cohesion of its members by displaying moderation, a spirit of compromise and even tolerance.
- (4) It should reject a systematic cleavage which would induce its members to adopt rigid positions and make it difficult to achieve consensus. We must not forget that, through the General Assembly, we represent the peoples of our planet, which are ardently yearning for peace and security.

Let us not make ourselves responsible before history for having failed in our undertaking, when all the conditions for its success seem to have been assembled.

- (5) The Committee is entitled to expect the nuclear-weapon Powers to keep it regularly informed, and even to associate it with, discussions relating to their bilateral or regional talks.

In this connexion, my delegation recalls that the tenth special session upheld the principle of the universality of efforts leading to disarmament, which means that solutions to this grave problem must be found by all States Members of the United Nations.

(Mr. Buketi-Bukayi, Zaire)

(6) Lastly, no matter how important they may be, the procedural questions we shall encounter must not impede the progress of our work.

We must provide our Committee with simple and flexible rules of procedure that can be adapted to the development of our work.

Zaire, for its part, is determined to spare no effort to ensure its constructive participation in the work of the Committee and to make its modest contribution thereto as it did for three years within the CCD.

Zaire, a peace-loving and freedom-loving country situated in the heart of Africa, has always regarded disarmament as a very important question.

My country is determined to make its modest contribution. In practice, this is reflected in the support the Zairian delegation gives to various constructive initiatives taken by States of all ideological tendencies within the framework of disarmament. In this context, at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, my delegation supported 43 of the 45 draft resolutions adopted by the First Committee of the General Assembly, and joined the sponsors of 12 draft resolutions.

This modest balance testifies to the interest my country obviously takes in the thorny problem of disarmament.

Lastly, in conclusion, it is impossible sufficiently to stress the close links existing between disarmament and development. We must liberate the immense resources squandered on military purposes so that they can be used for combating misery, poverty, disease and inequalities of all sorts. Let us spare human society sufferings which it is constantly having to endure. We are thinking particularly of the populations of developing countries.

Let us build a new world in which co-operation based on confidence, equality and dialogue will reign.

Let us turn the principles of the Charter into facts.

The road is of course long, but the task is sublime, for we shall have been of some use to mankind.

Mr. MWAMZANDI (Kenya): It is an honour and a privilege for me to lead the Kenya delegation to this inaugural meeting of the new Committee on Disarmament. My delegation attaches great importance to the work of this Committee. We know many peoples in the world look to this body with hope and a sense of urgency. We know the task before the Committee is complicated and difficult, but we are confident that the will of the people expressed in the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament will continue to inspire the work of this Committee.

Mr. Chairman, under your distinguished diplomatic skills the Committee has been launched. This augurs well, and we are confident, too, that before this session is over the Committee will have taken the decisions on its procedures and priorities of its work to enable it to address itself to the challenging substantive tasks ahead. May I also say thank you to all those who have graciously welcomed my delegation to the ranks of this Committee. My delegation reciprocates all the good wishes expressed and looks forward to strengthening the warm relations that already exist among the members of this Committee which we believe will have a lot to contribute to the success of the tasks entrusted to this new body.

The special session on disarmament was a unique event in many respects and, if the spirit it had generated is maintained, it might represent a turning point in the history of disarmament. The main achievement of the special session in our view was the establishment of new disarmament machinery, both to conduct negotiations on concrete issues and to deliberate on disarmament questions.

We are happy that the Committee on Disarmament has replaced the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), which has, in effect, eliminated the system of co-chairmanship and has instituted a monthly rotation of chairmen. Eight additional members have now seats in this Committee, including, for the first time, my country, Kenya. We are glad to see that France has agreed to participate in the work of the new body. We are also hopeful that China would find it possible to take its seat in the Committee in the near future. It is our belief that this Committee, because of the wider participation of nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States, will be a more effective negotiating body than its predecessor, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD). And since this is our first time to participate in the work of this Committee, I would like to assure you, Mr. Chairman, and all members of this Committee, of my delegation's fullest and positive co-operation.

My delegation notes with satisfaction that in so far as disarmament machinery is concerned, the provisions of the Final Document of the special session had so far been faithfully implemented. It is our hope that the work of this Committee, unlike

(Mr. Mwamzandi, Kenya)

the CCD, will not be paralysed at times when the nuclear Powers were unable to agree on disarmament questions. The task and responsibility before us are enormous. We must join our minds and hands together towards a common goal of eliminating once and for all the cloud of destruction that hovers over mankind.

The special session adopted a balanced approach to controlling armaments in various regions of the world by upholding the right of each State to preserve its security, and for both recipients and suppliers of arms to bear in mind the necessity of maintaining a numerical and technological balance of armaments in various regions of tension and conflict.

At present, as in the past, the military competition continues to act as the driving force for the wider dissemination of sophisticated conventional arms throughout the world. For economic, political, as well as military reasons, the supplier countries have actively promoted exports of the newest generation of weapons to other countries, mainly to developing countries. It is not surprising, therefore, that the military expenditures in developing countries registered some spectacular increases in the period 1960 to 1976. As the available studies show, some of the biggest increases in military programmes occurred in nations at the lowest end of the income scale. Furthermore, for the poorest 20 per cent of the world population, this meant that the military share of GNP rose from 1.9 per cent in 1960 to 3.2 per cent in 1976, a burden out of all proportion for a population with yearly incomes averaging \$124.

While the donor nations concentrated their efforts in a massive arms race, their aid efforts failed to achieve the goals to which they had agreed in the United Nations. Between 1960 and 1976, almost twenty times as much money went into military expansion as into aid for development. The average contribution of all donor nations for which records are available amounted to 0.3 per cent of their combined GNP, while their military expenditures took 6.2 per cent of GNP during those same years. It is quite clear then that the arms race is the single major obstacle to development. It affects not only the world's rate of economic growth but also the distribution of the growth that does occur. At the same time it contributes to the widening gap between rich and poor countries, a focus of increasing world tension and concern which has raised the debate on the new international economic order.

Let me now turn to another item to which my country attaches great importance. I refer to the question of the banning of chemical and bacteriological (biological)

(Mr. Mvumzandi, Kenya)

weapons. Kenya is a party to both the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction. We have co-sponsored several draft resolutions on the item that have come before the First Committee in the past several years, and we plan to continue to give our support both in this Committee and in the General Assembly.

While my delegation appreciates the complex nature of the issues involved, we, nevertheless, feel that this Committee is charged with a task of negotiating an agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their destruction. This is not the first time that the question has come up before a Committee like this one. It has been before the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on several occasions and each time the principal problems appear to be (a) the scope of the prohibition, that is, whether it should be of a comprehensive or a gradual nature; (b) the activities that should be banned and the agents that would be subject to a prohibition, and (c) the way in which compliance with the convention should be verified.

On the question of scope of prohibition, my delegation would support those proposals calling for a convention that is comprehensive in its approach, which means its prohibition will extend to all chemical means of warfare. There has been considerable discussion concerning the activities that should be banned and the agents that would be subject to a prohibition, and there seems to be a consensus that it is highly important to agree on criteria that would determine which activities and substances should come under the scope of a prohibition. Several such criteria have been proposed. For example, one such criterion is that of purpose or intention, which means that a lethal chemical agent that has no peaceful use should be banned. Other proposals suggest that substances produced in amounts having no justification for peaceful purposes should come under the prohibition. Yet other proposals refer to certain properties which would make chemical substances warfare agents. While these criteria and proposals are essential in our negotiations, my delegation favours a convention that takes a comprehensive approach in connexion with both the chemical agents and the activities to be banned.

We must now direct our efforts towards finding a solution to the differences which still exist with respect to the question of verification. A convention such as the one we are hoping for will not be effective unless it contains some international verification measures to give assurances to the parties to an agreement

(Mfr. Mwamzandi, Kenya)

that its provisions will be observed. While we believe that a verification system based on national means is essential, we also feel that, given the international political climate and mistrust that exists between States, it is necessary that the national verification system be supplemented by some agreed international verification measures.

Year after year delegations have stressed, both during the general debate as well as in the First Committee, the importance of an early cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests as a necessary first step towards nuclear disarmament and towards fulfilling the commitments contained in the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963, as well as in the non-proliferation Treaty. Many of us have expressed the belief that a comprehensive ban of nuclear-weapon tests would provide an impetus for further progress in other disarmament negotiations, such as the United States - Soviet Union Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT). We had also hoped that a nuclear test-ban could be negotiated before the beginning of the special session on disarmament. In fact, the General Assembly was so hopeful of a nuclear-test ban that in operative paragraph 5 of its resolution 32/78 it requested the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to take up the agreed text which, the Assembly had hoped, would result from the three nuclear-weapon States' negotiations, with a view to the submission of a draft treaty to the General Assembly at its special session devoted to disarmament. As it stands now, we have neither a nuclear-test ban, nor a SALT II agreement. My delegation is hopeful that this Committee will be able to come up with an acceptable draft treaty on a nuclear-test ban before the end of the session. We are equally optimistic that the two nuclear super-Powers will soon be able to reach agreement in the SALT II negotiations.

For an agreement on a comprehensive nuclear-weapon-test ban to be successful, it is necessary that all nuclear Powers adhere to it. But at the same time the two leading nuclear Powers must demonstrate their will to lead other nuclear Powers towards a comprehensive test ban and to ensure that there will be no violations once the treaty goes into effect.

Arguments have been made to the effect that nuclear-weapon tests and peaceful nuclear explosions were indistinguishable, and that it should be covered under a comprehensive test ban. While we strongly support all non-proliferation measures, we feel that the question of peaceful nuclear tests should not come under the nuclear-weapon-test-ban treaty. Kenya is prepared to support a moratorium on peaceful nuclear tests, but we are opposed to any suggestion that peaceful nuclear programmes be abandoned entirely. Any action of this kind would, no doubt, attempt

(Mr. Mwanzandi, Kenya)

to frustrate the intentions and purposes of paragraphs 68 and 69 of the Final Document of the special session, as well as article IV of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which recognizes the inalienable right of all parties to the Treaty to acquire nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.

This Committee is also requested to pursue its examination of the question of the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, with a view to reaching agreement on the prevention of the emergence of new weapons based on new scientific principles and achievements. Since 1975, when the item was included on the agenda of the thirtieth session of the General Assembly at the request of the Soviet Union, various approaches to the question have evolved. One approach calls for an all-encompassing agreement to prevent the emergence of such weapons in advance. The other approach opposes such a general agreement and advocates the conclusion of conventions regarding specific weapons as and when they emerge.

The CCD report, outlining the discussion on the item indicates that there seems to be general agreement regarding the need for some action by the international community in regard to new weapons of mass destruction. But at the same time serious differences still exist making it rather difficult to achieve consensus in this matter. Our efforts should therefore be directed towards narrowing these differences.

Finally, Kenya strongly believes that the continued growth of trust, as well as political, economic and cultural co-operation among States, is a basic factor of the efforts to strengthen international security. My country attaches great importance to the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other States. This principle guarantees every State the fundamental right to conduct its affairs without hindrance and in accordance with the wishes of its people. Current international efforts at establishing a new international economic order, to ensure equitable and fair international economic relationships between the developed industrialized countries and the developing, poor world could, with political will, augur well for the promotion of international security.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman and delegates, for your attention.

Mr. FARTASH (Iran): Mr. Chairman, may I begin by adding the congratulations of my delegation to those already extended to you and your eminent Foreign Minister as the first Chairmen of this Committee. It is fortuitous indeed that this duty should have fallen on a country which has already taken so many important international initiatives.

As we meet here to inaugurate the Committee on Disarmament I wish to express the optimism and satisfaction with which my delegation takes its place in this new forum. I am sure that my colleagues share our sense of renewed spirit and strengthened resolve as we enter this new phase of our work. We have already had the honour of hearing many distinguished Ministers launch their Governments' participation in this Committee, and we have been encouraged by the positive tone of all the statements made so far. Our expectations thus remain high that the deliberations of this negotiating body will substantially enhance the possibilities of concluding disarmament agreements.

Although we are all new to this Committee, allow me nevertheless to welcome the States which have not previously participated in the multilateral disarmament talks here in Geneva. We realize, of course that they are all well acquainted with the subject. We have listened to them attentively at the General Assembly debates as well as at other disarmament meetings. One of the fundamental intentions of the tenth special session was to democratize the process of the negotiations carried out in this delicate field. Consequently it was in this spirit that the Committee on Disarmament was established, and without doubt the active participation of eight additional States in disarmament negotiations within the framework of such a representative body will contribute to both these objectives.

We are, of course, especially gratified by the presence of the Government of France in our midst. We have listened with great interest to the statement of the distinguished Foreign Minister Jean François-Poncet and look forward to a resumption of the outstanding French tradition in disarmament negotiations. The importance of the participation of the nuclear Powers cannot be overemphasized, and we hope in this respect that all the nuclear-weapon States will be able to participate in our deliberations in the near future.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

My delegation hopes, as do many others, that the initiation of this new Committee heralds a new era in disarmament and that some breakthroughs will become possible. We have behind us a particularly fruitful year, which should provide a solid foundation for our work. The special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament undertook a broad attack on all the problems of disarmament. And at the General Assembly's thirty-third session the resolutions adopted in this field reflected this wide-ranging approach. They cover every possible area, from negotiated agreements to national restraint, to studies, information programmes and publicity. Everything is to be attempted, and the large packet of recommendations contained in document CD/1 is evidence of the expanded interest and intensity of the disarmament effort. It is up to our Committee as one of the important forums of negotiation to retain the global attention which the special session managed to arouse by maintaining this momentum.

Despite our new Committee and a new beginning, we remain faced, however, with familiar problems. Time has not made these problems easier to handle. One need only read the newspapers to note the increasing number of military-related items. Conflict and hostilities abound, and weapons developments are reported with spreading headlines. It is our job to seek to reverse this trend, to make the limitation of armaments a working policy of all Governments.

Before indulging in a short examination of the matters before this Committee, I would like to express the satisfaction of our delegation with the progress reported in the SALT negotiations. Although we shared the general disappointment when agreement was not possible in December of last year, we are nevertheless encouraged by the reports that differences have indeed narrowed and that we can still expect success within the coming months. There is no purpose in lamenting the many years it has taken to conclude this negotiation. We would at this point welcome the agreement wholeheartedly as a first step, and we await its accomplishment. Our foremost objective is to reduce nuclear weapons, and it is only through these bilateral talks for the time being that progress in this direction can be made. SALT II must be agreed in order to clear the way for SALT III to begin.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

In the Committee on Disarmament, our first discussions will be devoted to the organization of our work, agreement on the rules of procedure and on the agenda. We trust that these organizational matters can be efficiently dealt with so that we will be able to concentrate on the substantive items. Some of these tasks have in fact already been done for us. In accordance with the action programme of the tenth special session, General Assembly resolution A/33/71H recommends that the priority items for this Committee be the achievement of a comprehensive test-ban agreement and a ban on chemical weapons.

The comprehensive test ban remains our primary objective. Despite all our efforts, and despite repeated appeals for the cessation of nuclear testing, agreement has not been reached and nuclear-weapons tests continue. The rationale for this behaviour is not easy to grasp, for the nuclear Powers themselves favour a test cessation, and have certainly concluded for their own satisfaction that continued testing will not provide them with any additional security. Yet up till now it has not been possible for them to take action in accordance with the desires of the vast majority of States.

As far as this Committee is concerned, its role should not be reduced to hoping that the trilateral negotiations undertaken on this subject two years ago will now bear fruit. Little information has been made available on these talks, even though the draft treaty which eventually emerges will be submitted to this Committee for further negotiation. The subject will then require our immediate and continual attention until the approved draft is ready for presentation to the General Assembly.

Under these circumstances, it seems unfortunate that we have little information to date. It is after all in the interests of all States that the test-ban treaty which finally is presented to the General Assembly be a carefully prepared and well studied document. After many long years of discussion there would be no excuse for anything less.

I have emphasized the test-ban issue because it is the vital one for our Committee. It is perhaps the only item which is likely to result in an agreement this year. The reputation and strength of this forum may depend on our action in this area. In order to maintain the dynamism of this group, let us make it a point to accomplish a test-ban treaty this year.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

On the question of a ban on chemical weapons, this Committee should continue the work started by the CCD in this field. While the United States and the Soviet Union are pursuing their bilateral discussions to achieve a joint initiative, this Committee must undertake its own research and its own exchange of ideas. As we have had occasion to explain in previous statements, this issue is not limited to the nuclear Powers. While admittedly nothing can be done without their participation, neither can a ban on chemical weapons work without the co-operation of all the important military and industrial countries of the world. Thus, there is much that can be done without awaiting the results of the bilateral talks. And the time is ripe, if not over-ripe, for a CW prohibition now. Already reports in the Press of growing budgets for chemical weapons foretell that our task will become increasingly complicated.

Another major issue which will confront our Committee as a result of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly is the question of strengthening security assurances for the non-nuclear-weapon States. This measure, necessitated by the absence of any real nuclear disarmament, directly affects all non-nuclear countries. It is imperative that action be taken to safeguard the security of States which renounce nuclear weapons. They have a right to expect more explicit assurances that nuclear weapons will not be used against them. Many States, including my own, have already made a commitment by adhering to the spirit and the letter of the non-proliferation Treaty. Another route is through the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We welcome therefore the unilateral statements made in this regard at the special session by the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and China. We also welcome the recognition by these nuclear-weapon States of the need to respect and guarantee the status of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We believe, however, that more can be achieved in this direction and that more can be expected of the nuclear-weapon States. A useful discussion of this item in our Committee would be an important contribution to the nuclear disarmament debate.

We will also be considering this year the prohibition of the development of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction as well as the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. Both of these

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

items touch on essential aspects of nuclear disarmament. Neither are easy subjects, the first because of the problems of finding satisfactory definitions acceptable to all, the second because of verification complexities. Nevertheless we hope that the Committee will give serious consideration to both items and that some headway can be made in these areas.

Although the items I have enumerated will be the major ones before us, there are many other disarmament subjects which will continue to concern us and which we will surely discuss in this gathering. They have not necessarily been referred to our Committee for action. Two developments to follow will be the work of the Preparatory Committees, which will begin meeting this year for the second review conference of the non-proliferation Treaty and for the first review conference of the Convention on Biological Weapons. Many delegations here present will be serving on one or both of these committees, and all will be cognizant of the need to preserve and enhance these agreements, which have already been reached. These review conferences are also a good sign that some arms-control agreements have become part of the fabric of international law. They represent the foundation for our future work, and all must be done to support their objectives.

My delegation has a special interest in the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones, in particular in resolution A/33/64 endorsing such a zone in the Middle-East. As one of the sponsors of this resolution, we are especially sensitive to the nearly universal support for our initiative. However, the efforts to create a denuclearized area in the Middle East have not realized much progress to date. The problems of the Region still present formidable obstacles. Under the present circumstances we cannot yet hope for a conventional approach and thus we hope that through the United Nations Secretary-General and through the Security Council some initial steps towards our goal can be taken. We continue to support all efforts for the creation of similar zones in other areas of the world.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

Because of Iran's participation in the Preparatory Conference for the Prohibition or Restriction of the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons with Excessively Injurious or Indiscriminate Effects, we have followed this item closely. We look forward to a useful and effective meeting of the Preparatory Committee this spring to ensure a successful conference later this year.

My delegation also has a great interest in the work of the Expert Group to study the relationship between disarmament and development. We consider this to be one of the most vital undertakings to promote disarmament as well as to assure progress towards global social and economic goals. When the problems of the arms race are seen in isolation, the dangers of increasingly destructive weapons and of growing military budgets are already frightening enough. When viewed in comparison to the needs of development, however, these enormous amounts take on additional significance and acquire a decidedly social meaning with relevance to all countries. It will be of the utmost importance to study and bring to public attention the resources that are expended for military purposes every year. But the discussion about arms expenditures is inextricably linked to the question of national security. We cannot disregard the fact that as long as it remains impossible to establish viable international security arrangements through the United Nations, nations cannot be prevented from taking into consideration the requirements of their national security. Perhaps the most effective way of making States focus on the need for disarmament is to highlight the economic drainage which their individual defence efforts represent.

We expect to have an active and productive session of this Committee, and my delegation plans to contribute to the utmost of its ability. It is evident that a new forum can only provide the framework which makes progress possible. It is up to the member Governments to supply the proposals and the perseverance necessary to prove that agreements can and will be reached.

Mr. SANI (Indonesia): My delegation is most happy to see the distinguished representative of Algeria, a country which has always been in the forefront of the struggle for a new, more just and more equitable world order, presiding over the first meetings of our Committee. I would also like to express the particular appreciation of my delegation that it has been possible for the eminent Foreign Minister of Algeria, H.E. Mr. Bouteflika, President of the twenty-ninth session of the United Nations General Assembly and one of the most prominent and dynamic leaders of the non-aligned movement, to come to Geneva to preside over the opening of the first session of the Committee on Disarmament.

Being the last speaker, my delegation had the opportunity to listen with great interest to the delegations who have spoken before us and all previous speakers who have, without exception, expressed their hope and commitments as we begin with our task in the Committee on Disarmament. My delegation shares to a very large extent the views stated by representatives of non-aligned and developing countries on the difficult and complex issues related to disarmament.

My delegation does not intend to elaborate on those points, but wishes mainly to make a few general remarks on the role of the Committee on Disarmament, as we perceive it, within the framework of decisions and resolutions adopted by the special session on Disarmament and the thirty-third session of the General Assembly.

The tenth special session, on Disarmament, was an important event. The Final Document, arrived at by consensus, laid down the basic principles of disarmament and formulated a programme of action to achieve genuine disarmament leading to general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Also, the machinery necessary for its implementation was established. The United Nations Disarmament Commission, consisting of the entire membership of the United Nations, was revived as the forum for the deliberations, while the Committee on Disarmament was restructured, its procedure democratized, opening the possibility for participation by States non-members of the Committee. My delegation is especially happy that France has decided to participate, and hopes that China will soon be able to join the work of the Committee, so that all nuclear-weapons States will participate in our negotiations. The tenth special session has re-affirmed the central role the United Nations should play in the efforts to achieve disarmament.

Indonesia considers decision-making by consensus of great importance to the Committee in view of the nature of the problems which we are trying to solve.

(Mr. Sani, Indonesia)

Consensus is the most appropriate process to arrive at decisions, if we expect them to be respected and implemented by the international community.

The thirty-third session of the General Assembly has entrusted the Committee to undertake, on a priority basis, negotiations on a treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests and a treaty on the prohibition of chemical weapons. Additionally, it has been requested to consider issues relating to an international convention on the question of measures to strengthen the security of non-nuclear States, to examine the question of the prevention of the emergence of new weapons of mass destruction and the text of an instrument on the prohibition of new types of weapons. These are some of the issues to be considered, and our agenda will clearly be heavy for the coming years.

It is now our responsibility to follow up on the resolutions adopted by the special session and the General Assembly. We must try to narrow our differences and reach agreement on the steps we must take to implement them. Thus, we can fulfil the hope that the Committee will generate the needed momentum for international negotiations, and in this way carry out its responsibilities in accordance with the high expectations of the international community. As disarmament is a complex and sensitive matter, and its solution has eluded our efforts for so many years, my delegation is realistic enough not to be surprised if the Committee on Disarmament, restructured though it may be, would not be able to achieve disarmament easily in a short time. This does not mean that we should not persevere in our endeavours.

It has been said repeatedly that for our efforts to succeed the existence of a political will among the parties is essential. The adoption by consensus of the Final Document presupposes the existence of such political will, but that alone is not sufficient. We need to translate the political will, emanating from a strong moral commitment to peace of which disarmament is an inseparable component, into deeds. We should be able to carry out agreements in the form of concrete and effective actions leading to disarmament. We must remember that the political will is continuously influenced by the prevailing political atmosphere and vice versa, by the evaluation of the country concerned of its national interests, especially its national-security interests, which are directly related to the state of international peace and security. Disarmament negotiations cannot be viewed separate from international developments as they affect international peace and security. In this connexion, my delegation would like to underline the

(Mr. Sani, Indonesia)

view expressed by the President of the French Republic during the special session, when he said that "progress cannot be made towards disarmament unless further progress is also made towards improving international relations."

When we talk about disarmament, we are not exactly addressing ourselves to countries like Indonesia, but in the first place to the big Powers, especially the two super-Powers, whose arsenals are overflowing with arms, nuclear as well as conventional.

My delegation takes note of the optimistic assessment made by the distinguished delegate of the United States on the prospect of an early completion of the SALT II agreement. We hope that it would be possible for the two super-Powers to finalize and sign the agreement soon.

It is now generally recognized that nuclear disarmament is the issue of the highest priority facing the Committee as it poses the greatest peril to the very survival of mankind. My delegation wishes to emphasize that maximum efforts should be exerted to achieve this very important objective. Responsibility for progress in this respect belongs in the first place to nuclear Powers, in particular the two super-Powers. The present stockpiles are unquestionably already far beyond their security requirements. The international community expects the nuclear Powers to fulfil their obligations which they have undertaken with regard to nuclear disarmament. That is why priority should be given to efforts leading to the ban of nuclear tests in all environments and to the effective and substantial reduction of existing nuclear arsenals.

This Committee has been asked by the General Assembly to undertake on a priority basis negotiations on a treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests which have continued unabated. A comprehensive test ban will bring to a halt the production of more sophisticated nuclear arms with increased capability for mass destruction. For a number of years there has been no meaningful results from the negotiations on a comprehensive test ban, despite several United Nations resolutions. It is of overriding importance that a treaty prohibiting the conduct of nuclear-weapons tests come into force as soon as possible.

My delegation hopes that the ongoing negotiations among the three nuclear Powers concerned will soon lead to a successful conclusion.

Another priority item is the negotiation on banning chemical weapons. Achievement of an international agreement would be a major contribution, in

(Mr. Sani, Indonesia)

view of their destructive effect on human beings on a massive scale. Attention should also be given to conventional arms, which because of their increased sophistication have achieved a capability for mass destruction which is not far behind that of nuclear weapons.

I would like to emphasize the commitment of the Government of Indonesia to disarmament. We consider disarmament as indispensable if we are to achieve international peace and security. It is within this framework, that the ASEAN countries are pursuing the establishment of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in the region of South-East Asia as a contribution towards global peace and security. Likewise, my delegation would like to reiterate Indonesia's determination to co-operate with the littoral and hinterland States for the establishment of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. We hope that the negotiations between the super-Powers to reduce their military presence in the area of the Indian Ocean will soon lead to a successful conclusion. Such an agreement will substantially contribute to the realization of the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

It is well known that the arms race consumes billions of dollars annually. If the international community can agree on effective disarmament measures, certainly part of the enormous human and material resources now being spent for destructive purposes can be used for development purposes to meet the economic and social challenges of our times. Disarmament, when achieved, will be able to exert a positive influence on economic and social development in the third world, and to contribute to the enhancement of world prosperity.

Joining for the first time in the Committee's work, my delegation would like to give its assurance that it will endeavour to play an active and constructive role in close co-operation with other members and interested States. We would like to thank all those who have welcomed us to membership of the Committee. It is our hope that the restructured Committee will be able to contribute effectively to achieve the ultimate goals of disarmament under effective international control, bringing mankind closer to the realization of the purpose of the United Nations: to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I thank the distinguished representative of Indonesia.

Following the important contribution of the last speakers, this afternoon, and of the speakers at the first five plenary meetings, the Committee on Disarmament as a whole is now informed of a series of approaches which reflect the determination of member States to give new impetus to the efforts of the international community, with a view to achieving the objective of disarmament and thereby meeting the legitimate aspirations of the peoples to live in permanent peace and security.

The Algerian delegation has been loaded with honour, friendship and sympathy, and with many expressions of fraternal consideration for our Minister, Mr. Bouteflika, and through him for our country and the Algerian people, who will find further satisfaction in these ties of friendship with nations which share a common ideal, the just and peaceful advancement of human society.

I have no more speakers on my list for this afternoon, and I therefore propose to suspend this meeting and reconvene an informal meeting.

If I see no objections, I shall declare the meeting suspended.

The informal meeting which is to follow is open only to representatives of the member countries of the Committee on Disarmament. May I therefore request everyone else kindly to leave the room, and the security service to make sure that the gallery is empty and to close its doors.

The meeting was suspended at 5.20 p.m. and reconvened at 6.15 p.m.

I declare the sixth plenary meeting reconvened after a brief interruption.

I shall read each draft decision that the Committee wishes to take, and we shall adopt them one by one, if this procedure is acceptable to all. I ask the indulgence of delegations who use working languages other than French. I see no objection, and I shall now read out the text of the first decision slowly. It concerns the rotation of the chairmanship.

"At its sixth plenary meeting, the Committee on Disarmament, in accordance with the agreement referred to in paragraph 120 (d) of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to Disarmament, decides that the chairmanship of the Committee shall be rotated among all its members on a monthly basis, i.e. by the calendar month. Thus, the representative of Argentina will take over the chairmanship on 1 February 1979, following Algeria, which will have held it from 24 to 31 January 1979. The Committee postpones consideration of all other matters concerning the rotation of the chairmanship to a later date."

(The Chairman)

The observations of the various delegations which have spoken on this item will of course be taken into account.

I have to make a comment on the translation: "l'accord visé au paragraphe 120 (d)" should be translated in English by "the agreement referred to in paragraph 120 (d)". I do not know whether the English translation has taken this into account, but it will do so.

May I take it that the Committee adopts the text that I have just read out to you?

It was so decided.

I now turn to the second item. This is a text on attendance at meetings by representatives of countries not members of the Committee on Disarmament.

I shall read the paragraph.

"At its sixth plenary meeting, the Committee on Disarmament decided to admit representatives of non-member countries to plenary meetings in the Council Chamber where they may occupy the seats marked 'government representatives' which will be reserved for them. Any question relating to the application of the agreement referred to in paragraph 120 (g) and (h) of the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament may be discussed at a later date."

May I consider that the Committee adopts the text that I have just read out to you?

It was so decided.

Now here is the text concerning the date of the next plenary meeting.

"At its sixth plenary meeting, the Committee on Disarmament decided that the next plenary meeting will be held in the Council Chamber on Thursday, 1 February 1979, at 10.30 a.m."

May I take it that the Committee adopts this text which I have just read out to you?

It was so decided.

We have now completed the inaugural part of the work of the Committee on Disarmament. Without wishing to refer to matters which are foreign to its vocation and present structure, I think I may say that there is new breath, a more deeply felt concern and the expression of a clearly affirmed will to intensify and accelerate efforts to achieve substantial progress on the road to disarmament.

Allow me to say now in my turn that while this part of the first session of the Committee on Disarmament seems to have got off to the start that was wished

(The Chairman)

for by each member of the Committee, this is mainly due to the effort to achieve mutual understanding which was apparent at the preparatory phase and is still being maintained among us here in the Committee on Disarmament.

I would like to express my delegations thanks for the valuable support and co-operation shown to it by all delegations. It should also be said, and I would like to stress this point, that the Secretariat, particularly through its eminent representatives at our side, has brought a special dimension to the quality of our work. If there are no further speakers, I declare the sixth plenary meeting closed until Thursday, 1 February 1979.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

CD/PV.7
1 February 1979
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SEVENTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 1 February 1979, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. D. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas (Argentina)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria:

Mr. A. FASLA
Mr. A. BENSMAIL
Mr. N. KERROUM

Argentina:

Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS
Mr. F.J. DAVILA
Mr. A.N. MOLTENI

Australia:

Mr. A.J. BEHM
Ms. M.S. WICKES

Belgium:

Mr. P. NOTERDAEME
Mr. P. BERG
Mr. G.V. DUYSE

Brazil:

Mr. L.P. LINDERBERG SETTE
Mr. A.C. DE OURO PRETO
Mr. C.S. MAGALHAES

Bulgaria:

Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. I. SOTIROV

Burma:

U SAW HLAING
U THEIN AUNG
U THAUNG HTUN

Canada:

Mr. G.A.H. PEARSON
Mr. R. HARRY JAY
Mr. J.T. SIMARD

Cuba:

Mr. L.S. VILA
Mrs. V.B. JACKIEWICH
Mr. C.P. BECEIRO
Mr. R. VALIENTE
Mr. R.L. GARCIA

Czechoslovakia:

Dr. M. RUZEK
Mr. V. TYLNER
Mr. J. JIRUSEK

Egypt:

Mr. O. EL-SHAFEI

Mr. N. FAHMY

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. TERREFE

Mr. B. DERESSA

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. G. HERDER

Mr. S. KAHN

Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. G. PFEIFFER

Mr. J. POHLMANN

Mr. H. MULLER

Hungary:

Mr. M. DOMOKOS

Mr. C. GYORFFY

Mr. A. LAKATOS

France:

Mr. F. DE LA GORCE

Mr. J.C. PARAVY

India:

Mr. C.R. GHAREKHAN

Mr. S.T. DEVARE

Mr. S. SABHARWAL

Indonesia:

Mr. A. KAMIL

Mr. M. SIDIK

Mr. I. DAMANIK

Iran:

Mr. M. FARTASH

Mr. D. CHILATY

Mr. D. AMERI

Italy:

Mr. N. DI BERNARDO

Mr. M. MORENO

Mr. C. FRATESCHI

Mr. F. DE LUCA

Japan:
Mr. M. OGISO
Mr. T. NONOYAMA
Mr. T. IWANAMI
Mr. Y. NAKAMURA

Kenya:
Mr. K. MWAMZANDI
Mr. C. GATERE MAINA

Mexico:
Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES
Miss A. CABRERA

Mongolia:
Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
Mr. L. BAYART

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

Netherlands:
Mr. R.H. FEIN
Mr. A.J. MEERBURG

Nigeria:
Mr. K. AHMED
Mr. T.O. OLUMOKO
Mr. B.C.M. IHEKUNA

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

Peru:
Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO

Poland:
Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. H. PAC
Mr. S. KONIK
Mr. M. KRUCZYK

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

Sri Lanka:
Mrs. M.L. NAGANATHAN

Sweden:

Mr. C. LIDGARD

Mr. L. NORBERG

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. V.L. ISSRAELIAN

Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN

Mr. A.M. VAVILOV

Mr. E.D. ZAITSEV

Mr. A.I. TIOURENKOV

Mr. Y.V. KOSTENKO

Mr. M.G. ANTIUKHIN

United Kingdom:

Mr. N.H. MARSHALL

Mr. C.K. CURWEN

Mr. P.M.W. FRANCIS

United States of America:

Mr. A.S. FISHER

Mr. C. FLOWERREE

Mr. A. AKALOVSKY

Mr. R. HAGENGRUBER

Ms. B.L. MURRAY

Mr. M.L. SANCHES

Mr. T. WATSON

Mr. A. YARMOLINSKY

Mr. W. JACKSON

Venezuela:

Mr. R.C. CASTILLO

Mr. H. ARTEAGA

Miss D. SZOKOLOCZI

Mrs. R.L. DE NECER

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC

Mr. D. DJOKIC

Zaire:

Mr. BUKETI-BUKAYI

Mr. M. ESUK

Assistant Secretary-General for
Disarmament:

Mr. R. BJORNSTEDT

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): On assuming the chairmanship of the Committee on Disarmament for the month of February, and speaking on behalf of all its members, I would like first to express our sincere homage and warmest gratitude to the delegation of Algeria, which had the delicate task of getting our work started.

In particular, the expression of our joint gratitude goes to His Excellency, Mr. Abdelaziz Bouteflika, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, whose presence at the inaugural session and whose wise direction of the debate significantly enhanced the splendour of a singularly important event. The same sentiments are extended to His Excellency Ambassador Raouf Boudjakdji, of whose efficient guidance and constant courtesy we had ample proof during the difficult initial stages of our Committee's work. The performance of these two and of the other members of the Algerian delegation provides an instructive example, which I for my part, aware as I am of my limitations, shall try to imitate, so that the intensive work which awaits us can be carried out in the same positive fashion that characterized our first week's efforts.

I am certain that for that purpose I can also rely on resolute co-operation and indulgence from all of you. I shall have constant need of both as I dedicate myself completely, and with all my strength to continuing with you, in harmony, a task so well begun.

Mr. RUZEK (Czechoslovakia): May I be permitted, in connexion with the resumption of the work of the newly reconstructed Committee on Disarmament, to extend sincere greetings to all the delegates present here and to express, on behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation, our determination to co-operate constructively with all members of the Committee in the elaboration of concrete measures in the field of disarmament.

Particularly, I would like to welcome the new members of our Committee -- the representatives of Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Kenya, Cuba, Sri Lanka, Indonesia and Venezuela. We highly appreciate the great interest shown by these countries in the work in the field of disarmament, and are convinced that their participation in the Committee will be an important contribution to the success of its deliberations.

We welcome also the presence of the French Republic at the negotiating table of this Committee. We firmly believe that the participation of France not only increases the authority and weight of the Committee in international life, but contributes to the strengthening of its effectiveness also. However, the interests of the strengthening of peace and security in the world urgently require that a constructive attitude to disarmament negotiations and measures be taken also by the only remaining nuclear Power which, as is known, has not so far taken part in such negotiations.

(Mr. Ruzek, Czechoslovakia)

We express the hope that our activity within this Committee will build on the positive experiences of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. We would at the same time wish -- and we shall do our utmost to that end -- that it will represent a new, qualitatively higher stage as far as its concrete results are concerned.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that under your chairmanship, and thanks to your experience and skill, our Committee will solve successfully the organizational and procedural questions of the initial stage of its work, and that it will soon begin to deal with the urgent subject matter of the negotiations.

The Committee is gathering at a time when the questions of disarmament are in the focus of attention. The year 1978 was a witness of one of the most important events in this respect -- of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament. In spite of the fact that the session was not held in conditions which one could describe as optimal, one can evaluate its results positively. This is the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the States, as has been confirmed also by the thirty-third regular session of the General Assembly. The fact that the special session adopted, by consensus, the Final Document, which identifies the main objectives and the programme of disarmament negotiations, shows not only the interest of States in their success, but also proves that conditions for the creation of a general platform for concrete disarmament measures exist.

On the other hand, no one can underestimate certain phenomena of international life which point to the growing activity of enemies of the relaxation of international tension, to the attempts of influential circles in a number of States to instigate a new spiral of the feverish arms build-up. We cannot be indifferent to the long-term plans for increasing the military offensive strength of the NATO States, the continuing preparations for the production of nuclear neutron weapons, as well as to the disquieting developments in many other spheres. All these phenomena complicate the international atmosphere, lead to the escalation of tension in the military sphere and delay progress not only in the field of disarmament, but also in the solution of questions of economic and social development.

We are at the same time of the opinion that there exists a whole range of factors at the present time which can positively influence the work of the Committee on Disarmament. Thanks to the policy of relaxation, we can begin our deliberations in undoubtedly more favourable international political conditions than those which existed for the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament at the beginning of the sixties. We can build on a certain number of significant positive results achieved in the field of disarmament in the recent period.

It is now up to us to project these positive aspects into concrete results of our talks. To that end, we have a stronger and more diversified mechanism at our disposal.

(Mr. Ruzek, Czechoslovakia)

In addition to our Committee, as the main negotiating body, there exist also other consultative and study disarmament fora. Within a few years another special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament will take place. Of particular significance is the decision of the special session to hold, as early as possible, a world disarmament conference. Such a conference could lead, in view of its full powers and the binding character of its decisions, to a decisive turn in disarmament talks.

Nevertheless, we must continue to proceed from the fact that even the most perfect mechanism of negotiations can be effective only if the participants are determined to achieve agreement and show enough political will in this respect. On our part, such political will always existed, exists and will continue to exist.

No small effort has been developed in recent years for the relaxation of international tension and for the over-all improvement of the atmosphere in international relations. Significant success has been achieved in this respect.

This positive development is in full conformity with the innermost sense of the policy of the socialist countries, member States of the Warsaw Treaty, whose main foreign-policy objective is the elimination of the danger of war, the enforcement of the principles of peaceful coexistence and mutually advantageous co-operation. Today, when forces of international reaction step up their activity against this direction of the development of international relations, we consider it necessary to exert further efforts towards the strengthening of all positive trends achieved in international life. As follows from numerous statements of the leading representatives of the socialist countries, particularly from the Moscow Declaration of 23 November 1978, we are firmly determined to strengthen these trends in all spheres of mutual relations. But we regard it as the most important task of international activity in the present conditions, as was emphasized in the Moscow Declaration, to achieve a decisive breakthrough in negotiations on the termination of the arms race and on disarmament as soon as possible. This task becomes today all the more urgent due to the fact that the rapid development of military equipment, especially the possibility of creating new kinds and system of weapons of mass destruction, can complicate the achievement of practical solutions of disarmament questions much more.

Nuclear weapons are the main threat to international peace and security of nations. The socialist States have again emphasized their preparedness to start negotiations on the termination of the production of all kinds of nuclear weapons and on the gradual

(Mr. Ruzek, Czechoslovakia)

reduction of their stocks up to their full liquidation. Together with that, it is necessary to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons and renounce the use of force in mutual relations between States.

In the field of nuclear disarmament, the talks between the USSR and the United States on the limitation of offensive strategic arms are of special significance. We hope that the negotiations in the framework of SALT II will be successfully concluded. An early elaboration of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of tests of nuclear weapons would be an important contribution in this context. We believe that we shall be able to consider the draft of this treaty in our Committee soon. As indispensable we regard the strengthening of the regime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, while, at the same time, all States would have access, without any discrimination, to the use of nuclear energy and technology for peaceful purposes, under effective international control, in conformity with the standards of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The solution of the problem of nuclear weapons and other disarmament questions should proceed together with the strengthening of international security and confidence among States. The socialist States have expressed themselves firmly for the strict observance of the principle of the non-use of force and threat of force in relations between States, so that all disputes should be solved exclusively by peaceful means. In this respect, the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations would be a significant contribution.

We consider it important that the negotiations on general and complete nuclear disarmament, on the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons as well as on the non-use of force or threat of force, in which particularly all States possessing nuclear weapons would participate together with other countries, should begin as soon as possible.

A very useful step towards the strengthening of over-all international security would be the adoption of proposals of the Warsaw Treaty member States that all States participants in the All-European Conference on Security and Co-operation should undertake that they will not be the first to use nuclear weapons against each other, that the NATO and Warsaw Treaty States would not enlarge the membership of the two groupings, that the scope of military exercises of both sides will be reduced and that the confidence-building measures, agreed upon at the All-European Conference, will be extended also to the region of the Mediterranean Sea. Another urgent task is the solution of the problem of the security of States that do not possess nuclear weapons and do not have them on their territory. On this question, as on the question of non-deployment of nuclear weapons on the territory of States where they are not presently stationed, there were submitted by the USSR constructive proposals which,

(Mr. Ruzek, Czechoslovakia)

in our opinion, create a suitable basis for further negotiations on generally acceptable agreements in the Committee on Disarmament, as follows from the respective resolution of the thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly.

We have clearly indicated the procedure and priorities for the solution of the problem of nuclear and other kind of weapons in the Final Document of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament. Now it is urgently necessary to start the gradual realization of this plan. The Committee on Disarmament has before it a whole range of important tasks directly resulting from the Final Document of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly or from the resolutions of the thirty-third regular session.

A new important task of the Committee is the elaboration of the already-mentioned draft of an international convention on the strengthening of security safeguards of non-nuclear States. Then, the expected draft of the treaty on the general prohibition of tests of nuclear weapons to which all nuclear Powers should gradually accede.

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic participates actively in the work of the group of experts for international co-operation in the seismic field, and we continue to be prepared to contribute to the exchange of seismic data within the framework of the control of implementation of the treaty prohibiting tests of nuclear weapons.

As far as the question of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons is concerned, we are of the opinion that it is necessary to start negotiations with a view to working out a draft of the treaty. Wherever an agreement banning a new kind of weapons can be achieved it is to be welcomed. In this connexion the expected agreement on radiological weapons can be mentioned, but also -- as a matter of urgency -- the draft of an international treaty on the prohibition of the development, production and deployment of neutron nuclear weapons tabled in the CCD by the socialist countries last year.

On the agenda of the Committee is also the question of chemical weapons. In our view a combination of national and adequate international procedures would be a suitable basis for controlling the implementation of the respective treaty. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is prepared to take part in the work of the group of experts for the solution of this question also.

The solution of all problems to be dealt with within the Committee on Disarmament requires a constructive approach of all participants. On our part, we are firmly determined to do our best in assisting the Committee on Disarmament to solve questions included in its agenda in conformity with the provisions of the Final Document of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament.

Mr. SKALLI (Morocco) (translated from French): I address my first words to you, Mr. Chairman, to extend to you my congratulations and those of my delegation on your accession to the chairmanship. We all remember the eminently constructive role you played as Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament. We remember, too, the skill with which you guided the work of the Ad Hoc Committee of that important session. Thanks to your great experience and your qualities as a shrewd and discriminating negotiator, that work produced extensive and tangible results. What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that we are convinced that, thanks to you, this new-born Committee on Disarmament will get off to a happy and promising start.

Allow me to discharge the agreeable task of welcoming the honourable representatives of member States who have come to join us in our efforts to try to bring to a successful conclusion the task entrusted to us by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

There is no doubt that, together, we will be able to make substantial progress in our exalting task.

We are, of course extremely pleased to welcome the distinguished representatives of other non-aligned countries who come to strengthen our ranks for the benefit of all. The non-aligned countries do not want to be regarded as a group opposed to other groups, but as a nucleus, which, because it is not committed to either camp, is in an excellent position for trying to reconcile viewpoints, drawing attention in a calm and collected way to the objectives assigned to us by the General Assembly and striving in as objective a manner as possible, to attain them. Our aim is not to upset balances, for we know that everyone is anxious to preserve them, but to act in such a way that, through disarmament, the balances are no longer based on distrust and terror but on confidence and the desire to build a peaceful world founded on understanding and solidarity. This is of course a difficult goal, and the road leading to it is long and beset with pitfalls, but in the opinion of the non-aligned countries these are additional reasons for settling down to our task without delay.

In 1975, I stated before the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament that we should improve our working methods and see to it that the two nuclear Powers which were not yet participating in our work could join us in our common effort to promote disarmament.

(Mr. Skalli, Morocco)

We now have the pleasure of noting the participation of one of those two Powers. This is an event which gladdens us and which we welcome very sincerely. The representative of France can rest assured that his country's presence and contribution are greatly appreciated.

We hope that the Committee will also have the benefit of China's contribution, for we are convinced that the role this Power is in a position to play will greatly help to direct our negotiations along more positive and more constructive lines.

The special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which was actually called at the request of the non-aligned countries, was held just at the right time to assess progress on the road to general and complete disarmament and decide on measures for reaching this goal.

Everyone is aware of the complexities and difficulties of the problem of disarmament. It is a major problem, on the solution of which that of so many others depends.

The arms race is like a weed which has sprouted and spread in the soil of distrust and under the shadow of the cold war.

Thanks to efforts on both sides, we have emerged from the cold war. But the cold war, it has been said, has given way to the cold peace. The change in climate has not weakened this encroaching weed or made it less flourishing. On the contrary, it is preparing for fresh conquests, ever more terrifying and terrible. Man's imagination and his thirst for research and discovery know no bounds. The main thing is to make sure that research and discovery are applied for the well-being and progress of the human race.

More than 30 years after the Second World War, the world is muddling along in this armed peace, which subsists only thanks to the balance of terror.

The world thus lives in a state of relative and fragile peace. But it is still alive, and it is perhaps on that fact that we should build our portion of hope and optimism.

(Mr. Skalli, Morocco)

According to the most moderate estimates, the destructive capacity of the two super-Powers, in the nuclear field alone, is already such that it can wipe out the present population of our planet 25 times over. To measure the extent of the loss caused to humanity by military expenditure it is sufficient to recall that the amount devoted to such expenditure is of the order of \$400 billion a year, whereas the amount of public assistance accorded to developing countries barely exceeds \$20 billion.

This is the more significant since the General Assembly has often stressed the importance of the links between disarmament and development, recommending that the resources released by disarmament should be used for the economic and social development of the countries of the third world.

It seems to us, therefore, that disarmament can make an effective contribution towards the introduction of the new international economic order. It is consequently a means of achieving another type of relationship between States and peoples and provides a glimpse of a new world based on confidence and co-operation.

In this connexion, my delegation welcomes the speed with which the Secretary-General of the United Nations set up the group of governmental experts to initiate an expert study on the relationship between disarmament and development.

We are convinced that, under the chairmanship of Mrs. I. Thorsson, an eminent person who enjoys our respect and esteem, the group will provide the Secretary-General with all the help he needs in preparing the study. The fact that the group has already met twice, in September 1978 and January 1979, proves that it is determined to discharge its task as soon as possible.

We know that we still have a great deal to do, because -- and this must be stressed -- the results obtained so far are far from conclusive. On meeting in this new Committee we must be fully aware of the extent of the task awaiting us, for the most difficult problems have not yet been solved. I am referring in particular to the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and the prohibition of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Skalli, Morocco)

This means that we must show greater determination and political will in seeking adequate solutions to the problems that are still outstanding. Without a clearly defined political will, we cannot hope to arrive at tangible results. And this political will, let us be open about it, is expected first and foremost of the nuclear Powers. We ask them for their co-operation, and we assure them of our understanding.

However complex the questions to be settled, we must not think that the obstacles are insurmountable. The Committee is starting its work in favourable circumstances. The chances of gradually reaching tangible results seem to be greater than they have ever been. As a result of the ties binding it to the United Nations and, more particularly, to the deliberative body in the field of disarmament, our Committee has greater powers and more authority. The central role and primary responsibility of the Organization have been affirmed in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

The Moroccan delegation keenly hopes that our Committee, which is more representative, in which responsibilities are better shared and in which non-member States will have an opportunity to express their opinions, will be better able to deal successfully with the task that has fallen to it.

The questions on which it must concentrate as a matter of priority are set forth in the Programme of Action of the Final Document of the special session.

Paragraph 45 of that document reads as follows: "Priorities in disarmament negotiations shall be: nuclear weapons; other weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons; conventional weapons, including any which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects; and reduction of armed forces."

Need I reiterate that the lack of real results with respect to nuclear disarmament continues to pose a serious threat of insecurity to the world? Admittedly, partial measures have been taken in this field. The conclusion of the 1963 Moscow Treaty, the non-proliferation Treaty and the sea-bed Treaty are positive milestones. Nevertheless, the complete and definitive cessation of nuclear testing, which has been a subject of high priority for several years, is far from having been achieved.

(Mr. Skalli, Morocco)

In its resolution 33/71 H (IV), adopted at the thirty-third session, the General Assembly requested our Committee to undertake on a priority basis, at its first session, in January 1979, negotiations concerning

"(a) a treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests".

We hope that the negotiations on this subject between the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will result shortly in the preparation of a draft treaty, and that, in accordance with resolution 33/71 H (I), that draft will be submitted to our Committee at its current session.

Pending the conclusion of such a treaty, all nuclear-weapon States ought, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 33/71 C, to refrain from conducting any testing of nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices.

Our efforts ought also to be directed towards finding ways of strengthening the security of the non-nuclear States. It is absolutely essential to devise guarantees which will fully reassure those States. We think that a solemn undertaking on the part of the nuclear Powers not to use or to threaten to use nuclear weapons against those who do not have such weapons would appreciably help to strengthen those guarantees.

Our Committee has before it two draft conventions on this matter which were introduced by Pakistan and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly.

It is only fair to point out that it was on the initiative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that an item on the conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States was placed on the agenda of that session.

Furthermore, the non-nuclear-weapon States have the right to accede to the benefits of the peaceful use of nuclear energy. This right was reaffirmed in unequivocal terms in the Final Document of the Assembly's special session, as follows:

"Non-proliferation measures should not jeopardize the full exercise of the inalienable rights of all States to apply and develop their programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for economic and social development in conformity with their priorities, interests and needs. All States should also have access to and be free to acquire technology, equipment and materials for peaceful uses of nuclear energy, taking into account the particular needs of the developing countries."

(Mr. Skalli, Morocco)

We remain convinced that those two measures, among others, will contribute to the strengthening of the nuclear-weapons non-proliferation system.

Another question has been given high priority by the General Assembly over the last several years. I refer to the complete prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their destruction. It is true that a stage towards this was completed with the elaboration of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) Weapons and their destruction. None the less, we are far from having attained the final objective, which is the prohibition of all chemical weapons, and which, as the document of the special session reminds us, represents one of the most urgent measures of disarmament. We must, therefore, focus our efforts on the conclusion of a convention concerning this important question.

The prohibition of the development and production of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons is another major concern of the international community. Here again, our Committee must make its contribution.

Among the other priority tasks we shall have to consider are the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons and the reduction of military budgets. The importance of such measures is evident. If they were adopted, they might diminish tension in the world and create a climate propitious to security and the emergence of stability and confidence.

The CCD is no more. Nothing will be gained by seeking to vindicate it or by heaping it with abuse. It fulfilled its task and its destiny, as best it could. Let us say that it died of certain inadequacies ... Let us not seek to link it to the Committee whose birth we are celebrating today, but acknowledge its merit in having served as a springboard for the establishment of our Committee. As I have already said in another forum, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament was a closed and cosy club, where the sense of friendship among the members was as highly developed as the spirit of conclave. Let us hope that what our Committee has lost in intimacy, it will gain in efficiency.

(Mr. Skalli, Morocco)

The Assembly has given us a heavy task. In doing so, it has demonstrated its trust in our Committee to approach all problems pragmatically and with the responsibility and zeal needed for finding the most appropriate solutions.

Realists we must be, but let us guard against allowing our realism to come too close to defeatism and resignation. We must not yield to despair, for we have advantages today which we did not have before.

As I said before, the Committee on Disarmament, by virtue of the authority conferred upon it, its greater representativity and its new procedures, offers us an opportunity we must seize of fulfilling our mission, which is a very exalting one, however frustrating it may at times appear to be. We must measure up to the responsibility which is ours. So let us all proceed with resolution and goodwill, for without them our efforts would be vain.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I have no more speakers on my list. With your agreement, I would therefore like to draw attention to a few matters which, I feel, should be given consideration soon.

The Chairman has received a number of communications from non-governmental organizations. May I, on the Committee's behalf, ask the Secretariat to prepare a list of these communications to be circulated to the Committee, it being understood that the communications themselves would remain on file in the Secretariat to be consulted by delegations.

Are there any objections to this suggestion? I see none.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: As you are aware, the Secretariat, at the request of the Chairman of the Group of 21, prepared an informal paper on decisions taken by the ENDC and the CCD on procedural matters. Later, this informal paper was circulated in the English language. As I believe it might still be useful by way of background, and if the Committee has no objection, I would ask the Secretariat to have this paper translated into all our working languages and issued as an unofficial Committee document to be distributed to all its members. If there are no objections to this proposal I take it that it is accepted.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: If the Committee allows, I should now like to refer to a number of aspects connected with our work. I intend to convene a formal meeting of the Committee at 10.30 a.m. on Tuesday, 6 February, to enable delegations wishing to make statements on our work to speak. I would be grateful to those delegations wishing to make further statements to inform the Secretariat accordingly. If we had no speakers, on Tuesday, 6 February, we would use the available time for an informal meeting. Without prejudice to this, I should like to propose that at 3 p.m. this afternoon we hold an informal meeting to start an informal exchange of views on some questions relevant to our work. That exploratory meeting would be devoted to, inter alia, commencement of the consideration of the modalities it might be desirable to follow with a view to the elaboration and adoption of the Committee's rules of procedure. Some preliminary drafts have already been prepared, or are in process of preparation, either by delegations or by groups of delegations. We might, therefore, consider the method it would be desirable to adopt for comparing that work and arriving at a joint criterion, whether through an informal meeting or through contacts between the various groups and delegations concerned, or by any other alternative which may be proposed and adopted by the Committee. We could also hear comments concerning the programme of work of the Committee, on such matters as the frequency and nature of our plenary meetings and subjects to be dealt with by them. In other words, whether we should have formal meetings, what the periodicity should be, how many informal meetings we wish to hold and how frequently. Finally, and without prejudice to any other suggestion that members of the Committee may wish to make, we might tackle in a preliminary way the question of our agenda, especially the kind of agenda we should adopt and its content. The idea, as I said before, is to promote and stimulate a first informal discussion on this or any other subject that delegations may wish to suggest. Following some consultations I have had, and I must admit that I have not had occasion to meet with all thirty-nine delegations, it would appear that there is a very considerable trend in favour of not having any meeting tomorrow, Friday, or next Monday; this would allow delegations to pursue the very useful positive contacts which began a few days ago. Also, delegations could continue to work on the preparation of rules of procedure, especially in the light of any comments and remarks that may be made at this afternoon's informal meeting. I should like to ask delegations whether the procedure I am proposing concerning this afternoon's informal meeting and the official, formal meeting of Tuesday, and my suggestion not to meet at all on Friday and Monday, are acceptable to them.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, since this is the first time I am taking the floor under your chairmanship, I believe it would not be out of order for me to convey to you the sincere congratulations of my delegation and to say how gratified we are to see that at this session, which in some respects will be crucial for our Committee, the conduct of our work is in such able hands as yours.

As to the suggestion you have just made, my delegation agrees fully with the purpose of those informal meetings, and with the suggestion that we should not meet at all on Friday or Monday. The only change I would venture to suggest is that we do not meet this afternoon either, and that on Tuesday morning, if there are no speakers, we should immediately revert to an informal meeting and, if necessary, hold another informal meeting on Tuesday afternoon. The reason for this is that I believe we can make better use of our time this afternoon for those informal consultations among delegations to which you referred.

It therefore seems to me that by Tuesday we may perhaps have draft rules of procedure or preliminary draft rules, similar to the ones already prepared by the western group and the group of socialist countries. This would be a draft of the Group of 21, and our deliberations could thus be based on more precise texts than is the case at present.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I thank my distinguished friend, Ambassador García Robles of Mexico for his very kind words.

The Committee has heard his proposal to the effect that we should have no informal meeting this afternoon and that we transfer that meeting to Tuesday.

We already have one delegation on the list of speakers for the formal meeting on Tuesday morning. If, therefore, the proposal of the distinguished representative of Mexico is acceptable to the Committee, and with a view to employing our time usefully, we could meet punctually at 10.30 a.m. in a formal meeting to hear that delegation or any other delegation wishing to put its name on the list, and then, if we have sufficient time immediately after the formal meeting, we could go into informal meeting. That informal meeting would of course, if necessary, continue in the afternoon.

(The Chairman)

If I hear no objection, may I take it that the suggestion of the distinguished representative of Mexico, as just outlined by the Chair is acceptable. I hear no objection.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The next formal meeting of the Committee on Disarmament will be on Tuesday, 6 February, at 10.30 a.m. It will be followed immediately by an informal meeting. If there are no further comments, the meeting is adjourned.

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.

FINAL RECORD OF THE EIGHTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 6 February 1979, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria:

Mr. A. BENSMAIL

Mr. W. KERROUM

Argentina:

Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS

Mr. F. JIMENEZ DAVILA

Mr. A.N. HOLTEMI

Australia:

Mr. L.D. THOMSON

Ms. M.S. VICKES

Belgium:

Mr. P. NOTERDAEMTE

Mr. P. BERG

Mr. G. VAN DUYSSE

Brazil:

Mr. L.P. LINDENBERG SETTE

Mr. A. CELSO DE OURO PRETO

Bulgaria:

Mr. P. VOUTOV

Mr. I. PETROV

Mr. I. SOTIROV

Burma:

U SAW HLAING

U THEIN AUNG

U THAUNG HTUN

Canada:

Mr. R. HARRY JAY

Mr. J.T. SHIARD

Cuba:

Mr. P. TORRAS

Mr. L. SOLA VILA

Mrs. V.B. JACKIEWICH

Mr. C. PAZOS BECEIRO

Mr. R. VALIENTE

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. M. RUZEK

Mr. V. TYLNER

Mr. J. JIRUSEK

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

Ethiopia: Mr. T. TERREFE

France: Mr. F. DE LA GORCE
Mr. J.-C. PARAVY

German Democratic Republic: Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. S. KAHN
Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

Germany, Federal Republic of: Mr. G. PFEIFFER
Mr. J. POHLMANN
Mr. H. MÜLLER

Hungary: Mr. M. DOMOKOS
Mr. A. LAKATOS

India: Mr. C.R. GHAREKHAN
Mr. S.T. DEVARE
Mr. S. SABHARVAL

Indonesia: Mr. A. SANI
Mr. A. KAMIL
Mr. M. SIDIK
Mr. J. DAMANIK

Iran: Mr. D. CHILATY
Mr. D. AMERI

Italy: Mr. N. DI BERNARDO
Mr. M. ALESSI
Mr. M. MORENO
Mr. C. FRATESCHI

Japan: Mr. M. OGISO
Mr. T. NONOYAMA
Mr. T. IVANAMI

Kenya: Mr. C.G. MAINA
Mr. G.N. MUNIU

Mexico: Mr. A. GARCÍA ROBLES
Miss L.M. GARCIA

Mongolia: Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
Mr. L. BAYART

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

Netherlands: Mr. R.H. FEIN
Mr. A.J. MEERBURG

Nigeria: Mr. K. AHMED
Mr. T. OLUMOKO

Pakistan: Mr. M. AKRAM

Peru: Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO

Poland: Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. H. PAC
Mr. B. RUSSIN

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

Sri Lanka: Mr. A.C.S. HAMEED
Miss H.L. NAGANATHAN

Sweden: Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. L. NORBERG

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics: Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN
Mr. A.M. VAVILOV
Mr. E.D. ZAITSEV
Mr. A.I. TIOURENKOV
Mr. Y.V. KOSTENKO
Mr. M.G. ANTIUKHIN

United Kingdom:

Mr. N.H. MARSHALL

United States of America:

Mr. A. FISHER

Mr. C. FLOWEREE

Mr. A. AKALOVSKY

Mr. R. HAGENGRUBER

Ms. B.L. MURRAY

Mr. H.L. SANCHES

Mr. C. BAY

Mr. T. BARTHELEMY

Venezuela:

Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT

Mr. H. ARTEAGA

Ms. D. SZOKOLOCZI

Ms. R. LISBOA DE NECER

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIĆ

Mr. D. DJOKIĆ

Zaire:

Mr. M. ESUK

Assistant Secretary-General
for Disarmament:

Mr. R. BJÖRNERSTEDT

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): As this is the first time that the Soviet delegation has spoken this month, might I venture to extend my greetings to you, Mr. Chairman, and wish you success in your responsible role as Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament.

It is a particular pleasure for me to be able to extend my greetings to you, Ambassador, because I remember that I had the chance of extending my greetings to you as President of the Security Council. The same was true when you were Chairman of the First Committee of the General Assembly, it was also true when you were Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to Disarmament. It was also true when you were Chairman of the General Committee of the special session; and now, to my collection of greetings to you I can add my wishes as you have become Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament.

The success of any particular body will naturally depend on the delegations that participate in it, but the role of the Chairman is something that it is difficult to underestimate the importance of. To have such an experienced and esteemed Chairman as the Ambassador of Argentina, Mr. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas, means, I think, that we are justified in counting on the success of the work of the Committee.

Among the problems of disarmament which have been under discussion for many years in various international bodies, including the Committee on Disarmament, the question of halting and reversing the nuclear-arms race and achieving nuclear disarmament occupies the most important place. And the fact that it has a long history does not make this question any the less topical. On the contrary, the continuous growth and improvement of nuclear arsenals makes it increasingly acute and, we have to acknowledge, complicated. As was emphasized in the Final Document of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons are more than enough to destroy life on earth.

It is generally recognized that the nuclear-arms race creates the greatest danger for humanity. No one harbours any illusion but that a nuclear holocaust, should it be allowed to break out, will surpass, in its disastrous consequences, all the calamities and wars which mankind has ever known.

In order finally and completely to prevent the danger of nuclear warfare, it is absolutely necessary to start taking resolute action to curb competition in the military use of nuclear energy and carry out real measures of nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

It would be wrong to assert that measures relating to nuclear weapons are at present outside the framework of the disarmament negotiations. Irrespective, however, of their importance for preventing the danger of nuclear war, or for strengthening international security, such measures have often been of a marginal nature. The peoples of the world expect much more, and we have no right to ignore their demands.

That is why the task of starting negotiations on ending the production of nuclear weapons and destroying them is now coming to the fore. This task is reflected in the recommendations of the special session devoted to disarmament, in particular in paragraph 50 of its Final Document, and in the decisions of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly. Thus, resolution 33/71 H of that session contains a direct appeal to all nuclear States to start consultations regarding "an early initiation of urgent negotiations on the halting of the nuclear-arms race".

As for the Soviet Union, it urged the prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons on the very day the first atomic bombs appeared, and the Soviet Union has pursued this course throughout the post-war period. It is a course which was reaffirmed and developed in the statements delivered on 2 November 1977 and 25 April 1978 by Mr. L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. A number of other countries have come out in favour of starting, at an early date, negotiations on eliminating nuclear weapons from the arsenals of States. This appeal was also repeated at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the States members of the Warsaw Treaty at the end of November 1978.

May I be allowed to introduce, on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland and the USSR, for consideration by the Committee, a working paper concerning negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed (CD/4, of 1 February 1979).

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

We would like to express the hope that delegations have been able to acquaint themselves with this document, which was distributed several days ago. In this connexion, may I be permitted to dwell on just a few points.

Since it is impossible to achieve all at once the aim of the negotiations, which is to end the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reduce their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed, the implementation of appropriate measures should be carried out by stages on a mutually acceptable and agreed basis. The content of measures at each stage would be the subject of agreement between the participants in the negotiations.

For example, at a particular stage, consideration might be given to such questions as the cessation of the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons, cessation of the production of fissionable materials for military purposes, gradual reduction of the accumulated stockpiles of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles, etc. At the same time it will be necessary, in each particular case, to work out mutually acceptable verification measures as well.

The question arises, of course, as to where and how the negotiations on ending the production of nuclear weapons and destroying them should be prepared and conducted. As we see it, the Committee on Disarmament is quite a suitable forum for this purpose. On the one hand, it is open for the participation of all the nuclear Powers. In this connexion we welcome once more the fact that France has joined this body. We are also entitled to believe that the People's Republic of China, which has so far evaded concrete negotiations on disarmament, will at last realize that self-isolation from disarmament is in the interests neither of general peace nor of the Chinese State itself.

On the other hand, the Committee on Disarmament includes representatives of a considerable number of non-nuclear States which are vitally interested in the solution of nuclear-disarmament questions and which are of course prepared to present their proposals on these subjects. Moreover, the fact that the Committee has some experience of conducting negotiations on these questions is also of some importance. As we all know, the ENDC was actively engaged in discussing nuclear-disarmament questions as early as the 1960s, and these questions figured prominently in its agenda.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

To begin with, by way of preparation, consultations should be conducted within the framework of our Committee to determine the set of questions to be considered and decided, and to reach agreement on organizational aspects of the conduct of the negotiations. The preparatory consultations should be started at the current session of the Committee with a view to beginning negotiations on the substance of the problem in 1979.

We would like to point out that while suggesting that the Committee on Disarmament should be the forum for the preparation and conduct of the negotiations on nuclear disarmament, the Soviet delegation is prepared to consider alternative methods as well.

The Soviet delegation is convinced that for progress in the negotiations on nuclear disarmament the participation of all the nuclear Powers is essential. This idea is reflected, in particular, in the Final Document of the special session as well as in the above-mentioned resolution 33/71 H. The levels of the arsenals of the individual nuclear Powers are not the same, however, and it would be wrong to turn a blind eye to this. On the contrary, this should be taken into account, together with other factors, in determining the degree of participation of each of these States in the measures to be taken at any particular stage. The thing to be aimed at here is that the existing balance of nuclear strength should remain undisturbed at all stages, while its levels are constantly being reduced.

In other words, it is absolutely necessary, both at the negotiations and in the implementation of concrete measures, strictly to respect the principle of the inviolability of the security of States. Only in this way can agreements be reached on all the problems on disarmament, including the problems of nuclear disarmament.

A logical corollary of the need to provide any side with guarantees of the inviolability of its security is the need to strengthen the political guarantees of the security of States, and its guarantees under international law, parallel with, and in support of, the adoption of measures of nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

In deciding on the programme and the agenda for the negotiations on ending the production of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles, special attention should also be given to the question of correlating these negotiations with the efforts already being made to limit the nuclear-arms race. It may happen that during the negotiations we propose there may emerge points of contact with, let us say, the negotiations on strategic-arms limitation. It is important in our view to achieve a situation in which negotiations of greater scope will not be to the detriment of other, bilateral and multilateral, negotiations concerning particular, and narrower, areas of the problem. Nor should they impede the achievement of bilateral or multilateral agreements on the limitation, or even elimination, of any nuclear armaments on a mutually agreed basis.

These are the ideas regarding possible approaches to the solution of nuclear-disarmament problems which our delegation considered it expedient to state at this stage of our Committee's work. We are prepared to listen to any opinions and proposals which other delegations may have on this subject, and to discuss them in a constructive spirit, as the importance and urgency of the task of nuclear disarmament requires.

World public opinion awaits from the the Committee on Disarmament concrete decisions and actions which would lead to effective measures in the field of disarmament. The adoption by the Committee of decisions which should make it possible to start negotiations this year on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed would be in consonance with those expectations.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to thank Ambassador Issraelyan for the really very kind words he addressed to me when he enumerated the repeated occasions on which he expressed similar words to me. I think this highlights the many years we have been spending on this subject, and I really am grateful to him.

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): Mr. Chairman, I should like first to associate my delegation with the congratulations and good wishes expressed to you as Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament for the month of February. We are confident that the disarmament expertise and negotiating skill which you bring to your office will be major assets at this important stage of our deliberations.

In my statement a few days ago, I referred in rather general terms to the significance which Poland has consistently attached to early and meaningful progress towards effective nuclear disarmament, towards lessening and eventually pre-empting once and for all the menace of nuclear war. As we have just heard, precisely these subjects were addressed by the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union. While it might be difficult in this brief intervention to add something basically new to what Ambassador Issraelyan has already said in his able introduction of the working paper of the socialist countries, I would like to make some observations which I deem both relevant and necessary. In fact, I wish to refer to some considerations which led Poland and, indeed, other socialist States as well, to co-sponsor document CD/4 concerning negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed. In the view of my delegation, what is particularly noteworthy about that proposal is its timeliness and its timing.

As for its timeliness -- it comes promptly in the wake of the Moscow meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty and of the thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly. As we know, they both issued urgent calls to commence, without further delay, negotiations on the halting of the nuclear-arms race and on nuclear disarmament, with the participation of all nuclear-weapon Powers as well as other States.

As for its timing -- the proposal is made at a propitious moment, when for the first time a multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, the Committee on Disarmament, begins its work, with the participation, in principle, of all nuclear-weapon States and a geographically and politically representative group of non-nuclear-weapon States.

As is generally recognized, the nuclear arms race and the sustained expansion of nuclear arsenals pose a grave threat to the very survival of mankind. A secondary but unpardonable by-product of that process is the diversion of enormous resources and energy from peaceful economic and social pursuits to wasteful military purposes. Over the years, that unrelenting process has resulted in the stockpiling of more destructive power than can have any conceivable military purpose. Some years ago it was believed, for instance, that the world's

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

armouries hold stockpiles of nuclear weapons whose destructive power was equivalent to 15 tons of TNT for every person on earth, a figure which I presume must have considerably increased since then. In other words -- quite enough to annihilate many times over all trace of life.

In the hope that such an eventuality never comes to pass and that substantive progress would be made towards ending the nuclear-arms race and towards elimination of the vast stocks of weapons of mass destruction, above all nuclear weapons, the General Assembly was prompted to proclaim the 1970s a Disarmament Decade. We feel it is both important and significant that the suggestion of the socialist States to initiate practical preparations for radical and wide-ranging nuclear disarmament negotiations has been made before the end of the Decade of Disarmament, when there is still time left in which, assuming the existence of sufficient political will, we could meet the promise held out by the Decade of Disarmament.

The proposal introduced to-day on behalf of the seven socialist States closely corresponds to the sense of the recommendations adopted by the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. It responds in particular to that contained in paragraph 50 of the Final Document. In point of fact, the proposal and its perception of the objectives and modalities of effective nuclear disarmament coincide with those which the special session has embodied in the very first words of its Final Document. As will be recalled, the opening paragraph of the Document states, among other things, that "... the accumulation of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, to-day constitutes much more a threat than a protection for the future of mankind. The time has therefore come to put an end to this situation, to abandon the use of force in international relations and to seek security in disarmament, that is to say, through a gradual but effective process beginning with a reduction of the present level of armaments."

As we all know, it is frequently argued with greater or lesser justification that the endeavours of the international community to advance the cause of disarmament through measures of arms limitation have not succeeded in preventing an increase in armaments, and have not significantly slowed down the arms race. We believe that the initiative co-sponsored by Poland and other socialist States to start early consultations in order to prepare for substantive negotiations within the framework of the Committee on Disarmament, with the participation of all nuclear-weapon States, represents a basic departure from the concept of mere arms control towards genuine disarmament.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

It should be noted that the underlying premise of the proposal contained in the working paper is that the only alternative left at present is to seek security based on a lower level of nuclear arms. Such a level should be reached through gradual and balanced steps, with due respect for the principle of undiminished security of all parties. Given the basic equality between all the nuclear-weapon Powers, that implies the necessity of their joint negotiation. To suggest otherwise does not seem realistic.

The proposal of the socialist countries, the first substantive document tabled in the Committee on Disarmament at its current session, is wide in scope, constructive and realistic. My country is happy to be among its co-sponsors and extends its unreserved support for the course of action it outlines. We trust that in view of the far-reaching implications of document CD/4, the Committee on Disarmament will not fail to examine carefully its contents. Above all, we believe that it will lend its support for the call to start preparatory consultations at the earliest possible date with a view to beginning negotiations on genuine nuclear disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to thank the distinguished representative of Poland for the kind words of greeting which he extended to me.

U SAW HLAING (Burma): In this first statement of my delegation, may I express our pleasure in extending our sincere greetings to all the delegates present here, and to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on your assumption of duties as Chairman of the newly constituted Committee on Disarmament. I believe that under your chairmanship the Committee will be able to take decisions on its organizational and procedural questions and other substantive tasks lying ahead.

We welcome the presence of the distinguished representative of the French Republic and also the distinguished representatives of the new members of this Committee from Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Cuba, Indonesia, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Venezuela. My delegation looks forward to having close co-operation with them as well as with all other delegates present here, and is confident that their participation in the Committee will greatly contribute to the work of the Committee.

It is significant in the history of disarmament negotiations that the Final Document which was the expression of the views of the whole world on the objectives and priorities of arms control and disarmament was adopted by consensus at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and we attach great importance to this major achievement of the United Nations.

(U Saw Hlaing, Burma)

It is our fervent hope that with the basic principles of disarmament, the Programme of Action and the disarmament machinery necessary for its implementation laid down by the special session, the international community can look forward to a period of intensified co-ordination and more persevering efforts among all nations aimed at general and complete disarmament under effective international control. To attain the goal, what is essential is a rational and logical diversification in our efforts to tackle the complexity of the issue.

The world-wide disarmament machinery for deliberating and negotiating has been modified for maximum effectiveness, and, in accordance with the provisions, the negotiating body has been restructured. In compliance with the spirit of paragraph 120 and its subparagraphs of the Final Document, we feel that the Committee should make full use of them in order that those interested non-member States, should they so wish, may take part in the work of the Committee.

As we all know, in the restructured negotiating body, opening to participation by all the nuclear-weapon States is a more realistic attitude, and together with it the newly established democratic procedures of the multilateral negotiating body in which all the member States, both nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States, are equal partners, will, hopefully, increase the impact in the years ahead and broaden the scope of our common approach to collective effort.

My delegation, however, entirely agrees with earlier speakers in this Committee who said that the combined efforts of all members of the Committee are required to achieve substantive progress in our negotiations, and our negotiations must be governed by consensus and co-operation and not by confrontation.

Again, as we all know, the ending of the arms race and the achievement of real disarmament are tasks of primary importance, and yet the prospects for these are in large measure determined by the political and economic interests alone of the nations of the world. The fact remains that all these measures in the field of arms control and disarmament directly touch the sensitive part of the security of nations, regardless of size, and can be implemented only after it had gone through the necessary process of negotiation and political decision. If the nations still sought to maintain their security through the possession of nuclear arms, it will be hard to find at this stage such a congenial situation in which one can talk about reversing the arms race. It is therefore believed that for the world today there is no alternative but to build greater national and international security by developing co-operation and understanding between States and thereby creating a situation conducive to finding fair agreements and political will among the parties:

(U Saw Hlaing, Burma)

The Committee on Disarmament has been entrusted by the thirty-third session of the General Assembly to undertake, on a priority basis, negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty and a chemical-weapon treaty. In addition, we have the following substantive issues that are our common concern: prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction; the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for weapon purposes; the conclusion of an international convention on the question of measures to strengthen the security of non-nuclear States. These are issues of priority, and apart from this, we are aware that it may have to proceed with the elaboration of a comprehensive disarmament programme following the meeting of the Disarmament Commission in May. The resolution pertaining to the above-stated items adopted by the thirty-third session of the General Assembly are indeed the reflection of the wide-range approach to world security and disarmament laid down by the special session. In our view, it would be more effective to concentrate on specific issues at the start rather than to put all the issues together.

It is heartening at the outset of the new Committee to note the report that SALT II is very near to resolving the remaining issues that stand in the way. We would welcome the agreement as a first step to the objectives of reducing strategic arsenals and nuclear weapons. It is also an important basis for establishing a stable balance between East and West necessary for reducing international tension.

It is a recognized fact that nuclear disarmament is the gravest and most complex issue facing the international community today. As we have been convinced that the accumulation and development of such weapons constitute a threat more than a protection for mankind, it is, therefore, considered that to halt this trend the comprehensive test ban is an issue in the forefront and should be given the highest priority in this Committee. In the past it imposed the most difficult and challenging task for the CCD, the former negotiating body, in the situation that the CCD as a whole was undertaking to negotiate the treaty while the real negotiating parties responsible for progress in this respect could not transmit at all to the CCD what were to be negotiated there at certain stages, or at least in the first phase.

We also realize that there is no other way of taking up the issue more effectively than through the trilateral or nuclear-weapon States' negotiations on this subject. However, we should not, on the other hand, keep the Committee for long only with a hope that the negotiations will bear fruit one day. With every advance in the technological development of strategic weapons, the process

(U Saw Hlaing, Burma)

of negotiations becomes increasingly complex and difficult. If we are too late to achieve some early steps, at the very least, to halt the arms race, the objective of ensuring general and complete disarmament may prove elusive for ever.

Nevertheless, we appreciate that a multilateral treaty, banning nuclear tests in any environment together with verification provisions is heading to conclusion. My delegation would support a text which would effectively halt nuclear-weapons testing in all environments, with no discrimination in its effect, which would lead to the aim of ending the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear-weapon systems and which would prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

If early agreement is reached on a CTB treaty, it will be a marked advance in arms control and disarmament efforts and will put a barrier to further sophistication of nuclear weapons and the expansion of existing nuclear arsenals. It will also enhance understanding and confidence among States in all regions of the world. Nonetheless, we should not lose sight of the fact that this will be a prerequisite only to one of our objectives of nuclear disarmament.

The question of chemical weapons has been under consideration in the former negotiating body, particularly between the two big Powers, for some years, and, together with the CTB treaty, this is an immediate task for the Committee. Burma, as a party to the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention, expects an early agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and for the destruction of present stocks. We feel that this is an urgent matter which can be resolved at an early date soon after the verification problems and other technical aspects are thrashed out. We do not underestimate the difficulties and the extremely complex nature of negotiations, especially concerning the question with regard to the scope of the agreement and its verification. We hope that negotiations under the joint initiative will continue more intensively in order to achieve an agreed text on the convention in this Committee during the current year.

The Committee is entrusted with continuing its consideration of the question of new types of weapons of mass destruction. New advances in science and technology may have opened up new possibilities of developing certain new types of weapons of mass destruction, hitherto unknown to us. It would be sensible if consideration were given to the feasibility of formulating agreements on prohibition and limitation of new weapons as such, if they were identified. We would support all those fair and balanced measures which would prevent or limit armament.

(U Saw Hlaing, Burma)

The question of an adequately verified cessation and prohibition of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes is an important item to which my delegation hopes the Committee will give serious consideration as part of the measures to be taken in the field of nuclear-arms control.

The Committee is also to consider the question of strengthening guarantees of security of non-nuclear-weapon States. My delegation shares the view that the international legal guarantees safeguarding the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons would enhance the security of such States and develop better understanding between the nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States. We hope that the Committee will be able to find a solution in the search for international arrangements which would give more explicit assurances against the use of nuclear weapons on non-nuclear-weapon States.

We have clearly defined in the right direction the procedure and priorities for the goal of disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, in other words the goal for the survival of mankind and its civilization, in the Final Document of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament, and we have before this Committee a range of important tasks entrusted to it by the special session and by the thirty-third regular session. What we urgently need now is to begin such negotiations without undue delay and thereafter direct our efforts towards the gradual realization of the plan.

My delegation believes that this Committee, which has a more representative character than its preceding body, taking advantage of the past long experience of the same preceding body and having the existing preconditions for and some progress in settling some of the issues on its agenda, will prove its role most effective in achieving the objectives of arms control and disarmament, and we hope that the results of the Committee's elaborations will make further progress towards the ultimate goal through the process of nuclear disarmament.

The achievements on disarmament which we are striving for with all our efforts could be, in fact, already half way to within our reach if the mutual understanding and the climate of confidence among nations, particularly big-Power nations, find their political will in time. Never before has the world so desperately needed such achievements, with which is linked not only our very survival but also the future of our descendants. My delegation will dedicate its best efforts, together with all other participants in this Committee, to pursuing constructive approaches towards those achievements.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to thank the distinguished representative of Burma for his statement and the congratulations he was nice enough to address to the Chair.

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic): May I first be permitted to join previous speakers in congratulating you, Mr. Chairman, on your nomination as Chairman of the Committee for the month of February. We are convinced that given your long experience in dealing with disarmament matters as well as your personal abilities, the Committee will not fail to undertake great efforts from the very beginning of its work, with a view to reaching tangible progress.

The German Democratic Republic is one of the sponsors of document CD/4, concerning negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed, which has been today officially submitted by the representative of the USSR.

Our delegation is of the view that this proposal is in consonance with the request by many delegations, also expressed in our statement of 26 January 1979 to this Committee, to see to it that from the very beginning the Committee should focus its attention on matters of substance and, in doing so, should concentrate, above all, on the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons.

An early examination of this proposal by the Committee and the progress to be attained through its implementation represent a logical corollary flowing from the Final Document of the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, which states that at present the nuclear-arms race poses the greatest danger to the survival of mankind, and that for this reason effective measures to achieve nuclear disarmament and to prevent a nuclear war are of the greatest priority.

In accordance with this pressing corollary, the member States of the Warsaw Treaty underlined in the Declaration of 23 November 1978 their unreserved willingness "... to reach agreement without further delay on the beginning of talks on these questions, with the participation of all nuclear Powers, and not only of those Powers. The sooner a specific date is fixed for such talks the better."

What is, in the first place, the meaning of the proposal submitted in document CD/4, as we see it?

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

Firstly, the initiation of negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stock-piles until they have been completely destroyed would represent an important step towards a fundamental turn in the negotiations on the cessation of the arms race. This step would mark the transition from goodwill declarations to practical measures, which are indispensable for halting the nuclear-arms race.

Secondly, the implementation of the proposal would correspond to the requirement contained in article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which reads that "Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament ...". Thus, this would contribute to strengthening the regime of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Thirdly, successful negotiations on the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons would lead to the use of enormous energy resources exclusively for the purposes of peaceful development of mankind and not for its annihilation. This would meet our responsibility to guarantee henceforth the use of important primary materials for tackling the urgent economic tasks of the future.

The consistent commitment of the German Democratic Republic to reaching complete destruction of nuclear weapons becomes even more evident if one takes into account her political and geographical situation in the centre of Europe. As is well known, Europe has the greatest concentration of nuclear weapons. According to the information provided by different international institutes, a total of more than 10,000 nuclear weapons are said to exist in this area on both sides of the existing military alliances.

Is it not obvious under those circumstances that the cessation of the nuclear-arms race has become a question of death or life for the peoples and States in this region?

In large parts of Asia, too, nuclear weapons are increasingly stockpiled, and it is well known that a certain African State has been exerting for some years great efforts to take possession of those weapons.

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

Consequently, negotiations between all nuclear-weapon States on the complete destruction of all types of nuclear weapons have become a pressing need of the present time.

The advantages of the proposal submitted by seven socialist States on initiating negotiations on the cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons are obvious. The proposal is simple, clear and evident. It contains no preconditions. It does not impede in any way other negotiations held at present on different aspects of the limitation or reduction of nuclear armaments. Its purpose is to generate a process that would ultimately lead to the prohibition and destruction of all nuclear weapons. The flexible approach to the subject is to be underlined. This also concerns the degree of participation of individual nuclear-weapon States in the measures to be agreed upon at each stage of nuclear disarmament. Those measures should be based on the principle of undiminished security of all participants at a lower military level, as the final document of the tenth special session underlined expressively. The envisaged stage-by-stage nuclear disarmament will allow all nuclear-weapon Powers to participate from the very beginning in the proposed negotiations.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic is conscious of the complexity of reaching agreement on the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and their destruction. Great efforts and primarily political willingness of all those participating will be necessary.

It is encouraging that many States, among them nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States, members of military alliances and non-allied States, have underlined in the course of the exchange of views held in the Committee the urgent and topical need of introducing measures to halt the nuclear arms race. Thus, a good basis is laid for starting immediately discussion of the submitted proposal in the Committee.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic is confident that the proposal to initiate negotiations on the cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons will meet with a broad support. Our delegation expects the discussion on this problem to take its appropriate place in the future activity of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of the German Democratic Republic for the good wishes which he conveyed to me as Chairman.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): On behalf of the Netherlands delegation I should like to express our great satisfaction that you, Sir, will be guiding our work during the first full month of the CD. This will be a crucial month; and we have no doubt that your very able and experienced guidance will be decisive in making this first full month of the CD a success. You can count on the support of the Netherlands delegation.

With your permission, I should like to take this opportunity to introduce formally a working document from my delegation on chemical weapons. The paper contains some suggestions on how the Committee on Disarmament could actually start serious discussions on a treaty on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons, and on their destruction.

In the past, several methods were tried in order to come to grips with the complex CW-issue. Apart from numerous working documents-- mainly on specific problems-- the CCD held several informal meetings with the participation of experts. These meetings were helpful in clarifying particular issues, but it would seem that we have come to the end of the road with this kind of unstructured meetings, particularly in view of our experiences of last year.

Several delegations also introduced draft treaties, covering the whole CW-field. The advantage of considering a draft treaty as a whole was, of course, that one could interrelate the different issues involved, but the discussion also became more complex. Moreover, those drafts did not provide the basis for negotiations, because of pending or ongoing bilateral negotiations and because certain countries had problems with parts of those drafts.

During the last few years, the general approach has therefore been: let us wait for the announced initiative of the United States and the Soviet Union. We consider and we shall continue to consider such an initiative to be of paramount importance and we strongly hope that it will be realized reasonably soon. However, it is also clear that talks in this Committee on the CW question have been blocked for some time because of those ongoing bilateral talks.

We do not think that this is necessary. As explained in our paper, the Committee could well start work on the CW problem parallel to the bilateral efforts. In fact, we believe, the two parallel approaches could cross-fertilize each other. This is the more so since the CW problem is not a typical bilateral affair, as my delegation has remarked several times in the Committee.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

Although we realize that on certain important points different views exist in the Committee, we also have the impression that on many other questions views are not very apart or are even identical. However, the Committee never tried to identify the points of agreement. Our suggestion is to work out, methodologically, step by step, the framework for a basis for an agreement, which in the end would lead to a treaty on chemical weapons.

We could start our work in general terms. For example, the Committee could take up again a working paper introduced by a number of members of the Group of Fifteen of the CCD, document CCD/400 of 26 April 1973. In this paper some general principles for a CW treaty were expressed. The Committee could then decide to draft a new version of a paper, a paper which would stipulate the general principles for the treaty we are trying to achieve.

This first stage of writing a rather general paper could be finished at the end of our spring session. The Committee could then decide how to proceed. The Committee as a whole could try to refine the paper or it could set up different technical or non-technical working groups to settle certain issues in detail. Hopefully, a more refined paper could be agreed upon towards the end of the summer session, allowing us to present a substantial basis for the treaty to the United Nations General Assembly. At the General Assembly, all Members of the United Nations would have an opportunity to express their views on the outline of the agreement. Depending on the progress made, the Committee on Disarmament could decide when the time seems ripe to work out the treaty itself. The treaty text would probably follow easily from the detailed outline.

The advantage of such a procedure is that the Committee can build up, step by step, the basis for an agreement without losing sight of the different related issues involved. The procedure we suggest is, of course, in no way intended to interfere with other activities aimed at clarifying certain special problems, such as the most important "workshops" organized by the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom, an initiative that we have highly praised some days ago. On the contrary, those workshops will undoubtedly be of great help in clarifying some important problems.

We hope that the members of the Committee will give serious consideration to our suggestion, which is meant to help in tackling one of the disarmament areas which has been mentioned by many members of the Committee as urgent and important, in fact by the world community as a whole. I may refer to paragraph 75 of the Final Document of the special session on disarmament, which states: "The complete

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their destruction represent one of the most urgent measures of disarmament. Consequently, the conclusion of a convention to this end, on which negotiations have been going on for several years, is one of the most urgent tasks of multilateral negotiations."

At the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, a resolution was adopted, A/RES/33/59 A, on 14 December 1978, which, in operative paragraph 3, states: "Requests the Committee on Disarmament, as a matter of high priority, to undertake, at the beginning of its 1979 session, negotiations with a view to elaborating an agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and for their destruction, taking into account all existing proposals and future initiatives."

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of the Netherlands for the generous words he addressed to me.

Mr. TERREFFE (Ethiopia): Mr. Chairman, let me first of all associate myself with the previous speakers who directed to you expressions of gratitude for what you are trying to do here. I feel that the Ethiopian delegation is in a position to assure you the greatest support and co-operation in what you are doing, and has full confidence in your demonstrated capability and tact when dealing with disarmament questions.

The Ethiopian Delegation has given serious thought to the working document CD/4 and has listened carefully to the statements just made by a number of ambassadors who spoke before me. After the lucid introductory statement made by the distinguished ambassador of the USSR, there is hardly anything I can add as to the importance and timeliness of the document. Indeed, we are grateful to all the sponsors of the document, for we feel it justifiably draws the attention of the Committee on Disarmament to one of the most important decisions of the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

Paragraph 50 of the Final Document called for urgent negotiations for agreement in at least three areas: cessation of the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear-weapon systems; cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery; a comprehensive, phased programme with agreed time-frames, for progressive and balanced reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery.

(Mr. Terrefe, Ethiopia)

Resolution 33/71 H, which was adopted by an overwhelming majority of Members of the United Nations, including 32 member States of the Committee on Disarmament, has urged all nuclear-weapon States to proceed to consultations regarding an early initiation of urgent negotiations with a view to achieving the three objectives mentioned above.

The proposal of the Soviet Union and six other Socialist States that preparatory consultations should be held, within the framework of the Committee on Disarmament, for preparing negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they are completely destroyed, has a sound base. The proposal accurately reflects the desire of a large number of States, including Ethiopia, which both at the tenth special session of the General Assembly and the thirty-third regular session insisted that the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and their gradual elimination from the arsenals of war should be considered by the Committee on Disarmament at the earliest possible date and as a priority.

This move towards a concrete nuclear disarmament programme, in our view, is the kind of political will that most of the States referred to in their opening statements in this Committee. The Ethiopian delegation would like to express its strong desire that the Committee on Disarmament should consider at the earliest time the proposals contained in document CD/4. We on our part will give it, with other members of the Committee, the attention that it deserves, so that the proposed consultations and negotiations on the subject can take place early in 1979.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Ethiopia for his statement and for his very warm words of congratulation which he was kind enough to address to me.

Mr. TORRAS (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, as I take the floor for the first time under your chairmanship, I should like to devote my first words to telling you what store our delegation sets by your experience, which will be of great value to the work of the Committee, added to the fact that you are a representative of one of our Latin American countries.

I asked for the floor to express my delegation's support for the proposal introduced this morning by the representative of the Soviet Union, on behalf of the socialist countries. I shall not repeat the arguments as to its timeliness and value, for they have already been rehearsed and they are self-evident, since the proposal represents an attempt to set on foot the negotiations relating to the

(Mr. Torras, Cuba)

objectives to which priority was assigned by the tenth special general session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament and by its thirty-third regular session, those objectives being to put an end to the testing and manufacture of nuclear weapons and finally to ensure their destruction. To the importance of such a step for the maintenance of world peace is added, for the developing countries, the possibility that the astronomic funds thus freed might be devoted to development assistance.

In addition to this general observation, I wish to refer to two features of the proposal which are very important to my country as to many other countries.

The first relates to the statement that: "Agreement on this important problem can be reached only provided there is strict observance of the principle of the inviolability of the security of States and the interests of peace throughout the world." For Cuba, which is still being subjected to a policy of aggression to which I have already referred, this principle is of great importance, because, however important disarmament measures may be for all countries, including my own, they cannot be realized without taking into account the security of States and establishing peace throughout the world -- which is in the interests of all nations.

The second feature to which I wish to refer is that the elaboration and implementation of measures in the field of nuclear disarmament should be accompanied by an extension of the guarantees of security for all States, or, in other words, that gradual progress towards nuclear disarmament should be combined with the progressive strengthening of security for all, without there being any need for the latter to wait until the former has been achieved.

For all these reasons, we believe that the Committee should discuss this proposal at the earliest opportunity.

This morning also, proposals were submitted relating to chemical weapons, proposals on which we cannot yet express any opinion since we have not had time to analyse them, but which deserve the Committee's attention on account of the importance of the subject.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to thank the distinguished Ambassador of Cuba for his statement and for his kind words extended to me.

We have had, this morning, the formal introduction of working documents CD/4, co-sponsored by Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and CD/6, sponsored by the delegation of the Netherlands. Working document CD/5, sponsored by Italy, was also circulated.

(The Chairman)

Members of the Committee will recall that, at our last meeting, we agreed that if time were available we might use it immediately after the formal meeting by holding an informal meeting in order to have a first preliminary exchange of views on the various aspects which relate to our work. It would appear that in view of the somewhat late hour this meeting could not be started and completed this morning. From certain consultations that I have had with various delegations it would appear that the other possibility, which was that of having an informal meeting this afternoon, or even perhaps tomorrow morning, will not be suitable as there are groups of delegations which are putting their time to good use in order to complete certain drafts on our rules of procedure. Under these circumstances, I think that experience has shown in the past that time could be better used if these delegations were to have this afternoon and tomorrow morning available to complete their work and therefore be in a better position to hold the exchange of views to which I referred. If there were no objections to this from members of the Committee, I would therefore suggest that we have our next formal meeting on Thursday, 8 February, at 10.30 a.m. As was the case envisaged for today, if we were to have time immediately after the formal meeting, then we would convert our meeting into an informal meeting in order to hold the said first preliminary exchange of views. Otherwise, if necessary, we could either continue the informal meeting, or start it Thursday afternoon. If there are no objections I will presume that the suggestion of the Chair meets with the approval of the members of the Committee.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: At the same time, I would like to urge delegations that are working actively and intensively on the preparation of drafts to carry out the task as rapidly as possible so that we may fulfil the programme of work that I have submitted to the Committee. From a first examination of the various informal drafts that have been circulated, it would appear that there are no insurmountable differences among these texts; this would enable the Committee to adopt its rules of procedure promptly. What is of the utmost importance is that in these informal meetings we agree on the method that is to be followed for the treatment of the various documents and so that, as a consequence of this, we could find a unified

(The Chairman)

criterion and finally adopt our rules of procedure. I would therefore suggest that the useful contacts that have been made during the past few days should continue so that we will be able to rapidly complete our work in the informal meeting which will take place after the formal meeting on Thursday. If there are no other comments from delegations, I will adjourn the meeting.

Our meeting will take place on Thursday, 8 February, at 10.30 a.m. in this room. The meeting stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.

CD/PV.9
8 February 1979
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE NINTH MEETING
held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 8 February 1979, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. A. BENSMAIL
Mr. N. KERROULI

Argentina: Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS
Mr. F.J. DAVILA
Mr. A.H. HOLTEMI

Australia: Mr. L.D. THOMSON
Ms. M.S. WICKES

Belgium: Mr. P. NOTERDAEME
Mr. P. BERG
Mr. G. VAN DUYSE

Brazil: Mr. G.A. MACIEL
Mr. A. CELSO DE OURO PRETO

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. I. SOTIROV

Burma: U THEIN AUNG
U THAUNG HTUN

Canada: Mr. R. HARRY JAY
Mr. J.T. STIARD

Cuba: Mr. L. SOLA VILA
Mrs. V.B. JACKIEWICH

Czechoslovakia: Mr. H. RUZEK
Mr. V. TYLNER
Mr. J. JIRUSEK

Egypt: Mr. O. EL-SHAFEI
Mr. M. EL-BARADEI
Mr. H. FAHIY

Ethiopia: Mr. T. TERREFE

France: Mr. F. DE LA GORCE
Mr. B. D'ADCVILLE
Mr. J.-C. MARAVY

German Democratic Republic: Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. S. KAHN
Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

Germany, Federal Republic of: Mr. G. HEFFER
Mr. J. POHLMANN
Mr. H. MULLER

Hungary: Mr. M. DONOKOS
Mr. C. GYORFFY
Mr. A. LAKATOS

India: Mr. C.R. GHAREKHAN
Mr. S.T. DEVARE
Mr. S. SABHARWAL

Indonesia: Mr. A. KAMIL
Mr. M. SIDIK
Mr. I. DAMANIK

Iran: Mr. M. FARTASH
Mr. D. CHILATY
Mr. D. AMERI

Italy: Mr. N. DI BERNARDO
Mr. H. MORENO
Mr. C. FRATESCHI

Japan: Mr. H. OGISO
Mr. T. NONOYAMA
Mr. T. IWANAMI

Kenya: Mr. C. GATERE MAINA
Mr. G.N. MUNIU

Mexico: Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES
Miss A. CABRERA

Mongolia: Mr. D. ERDENBILEG
Mr. L. BAYART

Morocco: Mr. A. SKALLI
Mr. S.M. RAHHALI
Mr. A. BEN BOUCHTA
Mr. M. CHAIBI

Netherlands: Mr. R.H. FEIN
Mr. A.J. MEERBURG

Nigeria: Mr. T.O. OLUJOKO

Pakistan: Mr. H. AKRAH

Peru: Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO

Poland: Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. H. PAC
Mr. S. KONIK
Mr. M. KRUCZYK
Mr. B. RUSSIN

Romania: Mr. C. ENE
Mr. T. IIELESCANU

Sri Lanka: Mr. I.B. FONSEKA

Sweden: Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. S. STROMBACK

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Mr. V.L. ISSRAELIAN
Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN
Mr. A.M. VAVILOV
Mr. E.D. ZAITSEV
Mr. A.I. TIIOURENKOV
Mr. V.A. VERTOGRADOV
Mr. M.G. ANTIUKHIN

United Kingdom:

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

United States of America:

Mr. A.S. FISHER
Mr. C. FLOWEREE
Mr. A. AKALOVSKY
Mr. M.L. SANCHES
Mr. C. BAY

Venezuela:

Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT
Mr. H. ARTEAGA
Miss D. SZOKOLOCZI
Mrs. R. LISBOA DE NE CER

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. VRHUNEC
Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC
Mr. D. DJOKIC

Zaire:

Mr. M. ESUK

Assistant Secretary-General
for Disarmament:

Mr. R. BJORNERSTEDT

Mr. GHARUKHAN (India): Mr. Chairman, since this is the first time that I am taking the floor during the 1979 session of the Committee on Disarmament, I would like to extend to you, on behalf of my delegation, our congratulations on your assumption of the chairmanship of the Committee for this month. Being personally familiar with your skills in the art of diplomatic negotiations, as well as with your immense experience in the field of disarmament, I am convinced beyond any doubt that you will succeed in leading the Committee to a solution of the simple yet substantial issues which the Committee will be dealing with during the next few weeks. You can rest assured of the full co-operation of my delegation in your task.

I should also like to express the gratitude of my delegation to His Excellency Mr. Bouteflika, the distinguished Foreign Minister of Algeria, for his interest in our work, which he manifested by personally presiding over our inaugural session and for his inspiring opening address.

As we begin our work for the current year, I would like to extend our greetings to all the distinguished delegations in the Committee. It might not be inappropriate for me to extend a special word of welcome to the delegations of those countries which are taking part in multilateral disarmament negotiations for the first time. We are glad to see the French delegation seated with us at this table and look forward to concrete contributions from it in the achievement of our objectives. We hope that the Chinese delegation will also occupy its rightful place in the Committee at an early date.

My delegation is of the view that we should try to complete without undue delay the consideration of procedural matters. I realize, of course, that some of these subjects, for example the preparation of the agenda of the Committee, are not purely procedural; in fact, they have a fairly large substantive content. Nevertheless, we believe that we need not devote too much time to the elaboration and adoption of the rules of procedure or to the elaboration and adoption of the agenda. This is a negotiating body, and by negotiations my delegation does not have in mind negotiations on procedural matters. We would be more faithful to our mandate if we were to get down to negotiating substantive issues of disarmament at the earliest possible date. For this reason, my delegation will adopt a very flexible and co-operative attitude on the procedural questions before us.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

My delegation welcomes the businesslike atmosphere that has prevailed in the Committee since the start of our work this year. Despite the fact that we still do not have agreed rules of procedure or an agenda, discussion on substantive matters has already begun. We appreciate the contributions made by socialist delegations as well as by the delegations of Italy and the Netherlands, which have already introduced working papers on very important subjects.

As regards the agenda of the Committee, my delegation shares the views of those delegations, most of which have been expressed only informally so far, that the Committee might have two kinds of agenda-- one a general or comprehensive agenda which would define the terms of reference or competence or mandate of the Committee, and the other listing specific items which would be taken up during the course of our annual sessions. The annual agenda or programme of work would necessarily have to be prepared at the beginning of every year whereas the broad or comprehensive agenda would be valid for a longer period of time. Naturally, it would be fully within the competence of the Committee to make any changes in the comprehensive agenda any time it finds it necessary to do so. As regards the annual agenda, my delegation feels that we will have to take into consideration first of all the recommendations of the General Assembly. Any item which the General Assembly has specifically requested the Committee to examine and to report upon should be included in the annual agenda. In addition, other items could be included after consultations among members. In the light of what I have just stated, I would like to indicate the items, in order of their priority, which my delegation feels should be included in the agenda of the 1979 session.

The highest priority for this year should undeniably be accorded to the long-pending question of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Resolution 33/71 requests the Committee to undertake, at its first session, in January 1979, on a priority basis, negotiations on a treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. Resolution 33/60 imparts even greater urgency to this question and requests the Committee "to take up immediately the agreed text resulting from the negotiations referred to in paragraph 5 above with a view to the submission as soon as possible of a draft treaty, which will attract the widest possible adherence, to a resumed thirty-third session of the General Assembly." Distinguished members will recall that the General Assembly had expressed the hope at its thirty-second session, in 1977, that a draft treaty on CTB would be

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

finalized in time for the special session devoted to disarmament. Regrettably, nearly one year has elapsed since that deadline, and results of the trilateral negotiations appear to be nowhere in sight. My delegation expresses its deep disappointment at the slow pace of negotiations on this subject. We are of course aware that the issue is complex. However, we believe that the most important factor at the present stage of negotiations is what we all refer to as the political will of the negotiating parties. It is our hope that the remaining obstacles will be resolved before long, and the draft of a CTB treaty brought to the Committee for a thorough examination before we adjourn the first part of our session. If the remaining differences are really minor, even though important, my delegation is confident that the collective wisdom of all the other members of the Committee will show some concrete ways to overcome them. A joint statement on behalf of the three negotiating partners, explaining in detail the present situation, together with the nature of their difficulties, would greatly assist the Committee in carrying out its task under this very important item. We hope that such a statement will be forthcoming shortly.

While I am on the subject of CTB, I would like to remind the members of the Committee, particularly the nuclear-weapon States, of resolution 33/71 C, adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-third session, on a moratorium on nuclear-weapon testing. That resolution, which was co-sponsored by as many as 34 delegations and which was adopted with a majority of 130 delegations, has one simple operative paragraph, which reads: "Calls upon all States, in particular all the nuclear-weapon States, pending the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, to refrain from conducting any testing of nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices." We were very much encouraged that one of the most important nuclear-weapon States voted in favour of the resolution. The very fact that three nuclear-weapon States have been actively engaged in reaching agreement on a comprehensive test ban suggests that they have come to the conclusion that they do not need to carry out any more nuclear-weapon tests for their security. Under the circumstances, my delegation cannot understand what objection the countries concerned can have to a moratorium. Indeed, an immediate announcement by the nuclear-weapon States of a moratorium on their test programmes would act as a great encouragement to the work of our Committee. I should emphasize that the appeal of the General Assembly for a moratorium is addressed to all the nuclear-weapon States. The urgent appeal of the international community should be heeded.

(Mr. Charakhan, India)

The next item on our agenda for the current session should be the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and the destruction of their existing stockpiles. The General Assembly in its resolution 33/59 A has specifically requested the Committee, as a matter of high priority, to undertake negotiations on this subject at the beginning of the 1979 session and to report on the results of its negotiations to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session. This item has also been the subject of negotiations over the past several years. The expectations of the international community were aroused after the Vladivostok Agreement between the Heads of State of the United States and the Soviet Union, and particularly after the commencement of their bilateral negotiations in 1977. My delegation has the feeling, though we would be extremely happy if we were wrong, that the bilateral negotiations on chemical weapons have slowed down since about the middle of last year. We should redouble our efforts during the current year so that these horrible and inhuman weapons of mass destruction are eliminated for all time to come as soon as possible. The subject is exceedingly complex in view of the security as well as commercial interests involved. However, no issue can defy for too long human ingenuity. Here again, the other members of the Committee would certainly be in a position to help the negotiating States in finding ways and means of overcoming their existing differences. The delegations of the Netherlands and Italy have made very helpful contributions on this subject through their working papers, documents CD/6 and CD/5 respectively. We find that the two papers have some features in common, particularly the suggestion to prepare a "general paper" suggested by the Netherlands delegation or a "position paper" proposed by the Italian delegation.

The third item which we would suggest for inclusion in the agenda for 1979 is the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. Resolution No. 33/66 A of the General Assembly has specifically asked the Committee to pursue its examination of the subject, with any appropriate expert assistance, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session. Resolution No. 33/66 B of the General Assembly has also requested the Committee actively to continue negotiations on the subject and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session. It seems to us, therefore, that the Committee should include this item on its agenda for 1979. However, both these resolutions lay

(Mr. Gharakhan, India)

down that the Committee should continue negotiations on the subject "in the light of its existing priorities". It is for this reason that my delegation has mentioned this item after the items relating to CTB and CW.

There is yet another subject which the General Assembly has asked the Committee to take up during 1979 and to report on to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session, namely, conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. The General Assembly adopted two resolutions, specifically on this subject. However, there is another resolution which was co-sponsored by as many as 34 delegations, including 13 members of this Committee, and which was approved by an overwhelming majority. I refer to resolution No. 33/71 B, in which the Assembly declared that the use of nuclear weapons would be a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and a crime against humanity, and, therefore, the use of nuclear weapons should be prohibited pending nuclear disarmament. In that same resolution, the General Assembly has requested all States, particularly nuclear-weapon States, to submit to the Secretary-General before the thirty-fourth session proposals concerning non-use of nuclear weapons, avoidance of nuclear war and related matters in order that the question of an international convention or some other agreement on the subject may be discussed at that session. The subject of an international convention or some other agreement on the non-use of nuclear weapons is closely linked to the question of strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States since the only effective and lasting guarantee against nuclear weapons is an unconditional undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States not to use such weapons against any country under any circumstances. The distinguished representative of Czechoslovakia, Ambassador Ruzek, in his statement on 1 February, quite rightly stated that nuclear weapons are the main threat to international peace and security of nations and that, inter alia, it is necessary to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons. He added that negotiations on general and complete nuclear disarmament, on the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons as well as on the non-use of force or threat of force, should begin as soon as possible. An undertaking not to use nuclear weapons would have the additional merit of greatly facilitating early agreement on the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons, their gradual reduction and eventual elimination within agreed time-frames -- an objective which is shared by everybody, including, I believe, the nuclear-weapon States themselves.

(Mr. Gharakhan, India)

I have attempted in my statement so far to give an indication of the items, in the order of their priority, which we feel ought to be included in the agenda of the current session. Naturally, there are several other questions which are important in themselves which the Committee ought to take up for consideration. If time permits, and if one is to take an optimistic view of things, we could at a later date add some items to our agenda in addition to those suggested by me above. There might perhaps be some questions which are more ripe for negotiations than those mentioned above. For example, the bilateral negotiations on radiological weapons might result in an early draft agreement on the subject. If that were the case, my delegation for one would not object to its consideration by the Committee as and when such a draft became available. The General Assembly also adopted resolution 33/91 H on the initiative of Canada, in which it requested the Committee, at an appropriate stage of its pursuit of proposals contained in the Programme of Action adopted by the tenth special session, to consider urgently the question of an adequately verified cessation and prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes, and to keep the General Assembly informed of the progress of that consideration. Without going into the substance of the proposal at this stage, I would merely suggest that we keep it in mind for possible inclusion in the agenda of a future session of the Committee, depending on the quantum of our work and the priorities assigned by the General Assembly.

My delegation has studied with great interest the working paper contained in document CD/4 presented by the delegations of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland and the USSR, entitled "Negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed". We also listened attentively to the statement made by the distinguished representative of the USSR, Ambassador Issraelyan, on 6 February introducing this document. We welcome the categorical urgency and priority which the socialist delegations have thus emphasized for nuclear disarmament. I presume that the objective of the socialist delegations is to initiate the urgent negotiations referred to in paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the special session devoted to disarmament. If the subject of the negotiations is going to be the ending of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and the gradual reduction of their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed, my delegation suggests that the starting point of the negotiations should be an immediate cessation or freeze in the production of

(Mr. Gharakhan, India)

nuclear weapons. Document CD/4, as well as the introductory statement of Ambassador Issraelyan, have made references to the various stages in which the negotiations would be carried out. However, there is no reference to the agreed time-frames specifically mentioned in paragraph 50 of the Final Document. Perhaps this is an oversight and could be rectified. Ambassador Issraelyan also spoke in his statement about the different levels of arsenals of individual nuclear Powers. I would appreciate if some further explanation about the implications of the differences in the levels of nuclear arsenals were given to us. Is the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union suggesting that the nuclear-weapon States whose nuclear arsenals are smaller than those of the United States and Soviet Union need not be associated with the negotiations from the very beginning? My delegation agrees that the principle of undiminished security of States should be observed. However, it is precisely the practical application of this principle which has come in the way of nuclear disarmament so far. While not objectionable as an abstract principle, it has been used primarily to feed the nuclear-arms race so far, because it has been made synonymous with the other concept, namely, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence. It is our hope that all these factors would also be taken into account during further consideration of this proposal.

There are certain subjects which my delegation feels are not appropriate for inclusion in the agenda of the current session; indeed, we doubt whether they should be included in the agenda of the Committee at all. One such subject is the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. The subject has already been studied in great detail by an expert group of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in 1975, and the report of the expert group was taken note of and commended by the General Assembly at its thirtieth session. I would not take the time of the Committee by referring in detail to the views of my delegation on this question, since they were clearly and unambiguously expressed at the special session of the General Assembly last year, and subsequently at the thirty-third regular session.

In this statement, I have attempted to outline the general views of my delegation regarding the agenda for the 1979 session of the Committee, as also on some of the substantive matters involved. My delegation would naturally take the floor again as and when we consider it appropriate, to express our views on the substantive as well as the procedural questions that come up in the ensuing weeks. I would like to pledge, once again, the co-operation of the Indian delegation with all those delegations which are interested in ensuring that the Committee starts its substantive work without delay.

Mr. DOMOKOS (Hungary): In the course of the opening meetings of our Committee, numerous heads of delegations have explained the positions of their Governments on the timely and urgent tasks of disarmament. In my turn I would like to do the same, to take account of the tasks of the Committee and to explain how my delegation thinks of the ways of living up to the expectations towards our Committee.

Before doing so, it is my pleasant duty to start my first official statement in this session with welcoming the distinguished representatives of those States which recently joined our Committee, namely the representatives of Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Cuba, France, Indonesia, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Venezuela. We consider especially important the presence of France in the Committee and express our hope that membership will soon be complete as compared to the membership envisaged in paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. It would be desirable that the People's Republic of China should contribute to the success of disarmament negotiations in a constructive way.

I take this opportunity with pleasure to welcome you, Mr. Chairman, in the chair of this Committee. Your able and experienced chairmanship can be of pioneering significance in guiding the future work of the Committee.

Numerous political analyses examined the close and interdependent relations between disarmament and the shaping of the international situation during the recent years. It was duly emphasized by many of our colleagues in the opening phase of the proceedings of the CD that further deepening of détente is hampered by the lack of substantial advance in the field of disarmament, in halting the qualitative and quantitative arms race.

The awareness is more and more evident that disarmament has become a precondition to keeping up and broadening the co-operation among peoples and nations.

The Declaration issued by the latest session of the Political Consultative Committee of the State Members of the Warsaw Treaty states: "The greatest danger threatening peace and international security, détente, the independence, economic and social progress of peoples is the continuation of the arms race, the increase of its pace and dimensions".

Guided by the spirit of this Declaration, States members of the Warsaw Treaty have put forward numerous concrete proposals to solve substantive disarmament issues, to promote disarmament negotiations and to work out concrete

(Mr. Domokos, Hungary)

disarmament agreements. The proposals of the Moscow Declaration of 23 November 1978 are manifold. The most significant of them are those aimed at ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and reducing their stockpiles until their complete elimination. The common proposal by a number of socialist countries, put forward in working paper CD/4 of 1 February 1979, was conceived in this very spirit. Later in my statement, I would like to return to it in a more detailed manner.

There is a common understanding in United Nations circles, especially in our Committee, that the key-element of a more dynamic advance in the field of disarmament is the relations of the two greatest Powers, the USSR and the United States, particularly the results of their negotiations. The successful outcome of the negotiations on the limitation of strategic armaments, known as SALT II, are of decisive importance even within this relationship. That is why we follow with special interest the outcome of these negotiations, the successful accomplishment of which may be the starting-point of further negotiations of even greater importance, and it would beyond doubt have a fertile influence on negotiations being conducted in other fields, including our Committee.

After these few introductory remarks of a general character, I would like to turn to the concrete tasks and problems standing before our Committee, to express some of our views concerning certain issues of substance, avoiding to give a complete check-list of all the disarmament subjects.

The tasks of disarmament are immense. It is sufficient to refer to the great number of resolutions adopted by the latest session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in order to demonstrate the dimensions of the task. The weight of problems to be solved, together with their qualitative characteristics, should incite even greater efforts from the side of disarmament forums, including our Committee.

We should attend to all the subjects appearing on the heavy agenda of the disarmament negotiations, especially those which are ripe for solution and the settlement of which can facilitate advance in other fields of disarmament, either directly or by improving the atmosphere. Along with this it should be emphasized, too, that the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction should be kept in the centre of our work as a matter of high priority. These weapons remain to pose the greatest danger to mankind, they are the cause of the

(Mr. Domokos, Hungary)

continuation of the arms race, and deterioration of the international atmosphere. Nuclear weapons take a specific place among the weapons of mass destruction.

It is not by chance that paragraph 50 of the Programme of Action of the Final Document of the special session on disarmament calls for urgent negotiations on agreements in this field. It is my firm conviction that this subject should be the first to appear on the future agenda of the Committee, reflecting the complex character of nuclear disarmament, which concerns many other important areas.

Working paper CD/4 presented to the Committee on 1 February 1979, of which Hungary is a sponsor, intends to achieve the goal set forth in the above-mentioned paragraph of the Final Document as well as resolution 33/71 H adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-third session. The working paper is meant as an initiative which intends to go beyond the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, and in accordance with the requirements of substantive nuclear disarmament to prepare and start negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and the gradual reduction of their stockpiles until their complete elimination. I believe that working paper, supplemented by constructive ideas and suggestions from the side of the delegations of the CD concerning the subject, preparations and methods of conducting the negotiations, could significantly promote the attainment of a decisive instrument to curb and reverse the nuclear-arms race. We consider there is a better opportunity now in the CD to achieve this goal, since four of the five nuclear-weapon States are actively taking part in the negotiations, and there is a possibility of the fifth nuclear-weapon State, the People's Republic of China, joining the talks.

The motives and goals of the proposal have been fully explained in the statements made by our distinguished colleague, Ambassador Issraelyan, introducing the working paper at the plenary meeting of the CD on 6 February, and by several other representatives who supported this initiative. It is my earnest hope that, with the active co-operation of the delegations here, the CD will be able to commence negotiations on issues of substance connected with the proposal at its summer session later this year.

The complete prohibition of nuclear explosions is a key-element of nuclear disarmament. The continuing nuclear-weapon tests are conclusive proof of the qualitative and quantitative development of nuclear weapons, keeping them in

(Mr. Domokos, Hungary)

combat readiness and developing sophisticated new types of such weapons. Only a comprehensive test-ban treaty, with a universal adherence, can give us a guarantee of efficient nuclear disarmament without the risk of reversal.

Parallel with measures in the field of nuclear disarmament, there is a need and a good opportunity in the Committee on Disarmament to start negotiations of the most concrete nature on the conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States. Many of our colleagues in their statements have touched upon this subject either in its positive or in its negative aspect. The solemn, unilateral declarations given by the major nuclear-weapon States are an important first step and form a promising basis for negotiations. We admit it is not an easy task to fuse into one legally-binding international instrument the differently worded declarations which give assurances to different extents. However, the Committee on Disarmament could do a lot to fulfil the request included in resolution 33/72 of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly by starting negotiations on the basis of the draft submitted by the Soviet Union on this subject.

It is my firm conviction that a CTB treaty, together with an international arrangement on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States, would in their final effect considerably contribute to the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime to which my Government, like most States, attributes the greatest significance.

One of the instances of the qualitative development of nuclear weapons is the threatening possibility of the deployment of the neutron weapons. My delegation has condemned this cruel weapon and the inhumane conception taking shelter behind the plan of the use of that weapon on several occasions in this Committee as well as in the sessions of the General Assembly, and pointed out its dangers and senselessness from the military point of view as well. I would like to remind the Committee again this time of the draft treaty submitted by the socialist countries to the CCD, and I hope that the Committee will soon start to work out an international agreement to prohibit that weapon.

My delegation holds that the question of the prohibition of new types and weapons of mass destruction should be given appropriate attention and put on the agenda of the CD as an important question in the spirit of paragraph 77 of the Final Document of the special session. I regret to say that

(Mr. Domokos, Hungary)

resolution 33/66 A and B adopted by the thirty-third regular session of the General Assembly, like its predecessor, 32/84, lends itself to different interpretations as to how we should proceed with that subject.

It is our firm opinion that the technological arms race is the phenomenon of our days. This competition inevitably leads to the emergence of new weapons of mass destruction. The lack of an international instrument prohibiting the development and production of new types of weapons of mass destruction may lead to the implication that even if agreements were reached in the field of nuclear and chemical disarmament, the arms race could spread over to other areas unless an international treaty prevents the birth of new generations of weapons of mass destruction.

My delegation welcomes the bilateral negotiations to be resumed soon by the Soviet Union and the United States, and hopes that this Committee will soon be in a position to start negotiations on an agreement prohibiting radiological weapons.

The question of the prohibition of the production and stockpiling of chemical weapons has been dealt with in a great number of resolutions by the United Nations and by various disarmament forums, including ours. In our thinking, this type of weapon of mass destruction is especially apt to quick and easy proliferation, since any country with an adequately developed chemical industry is capable of producing it. We welcome the bilateral talks between the USSR and the United States to be resumed in the near future. We firmly believe that, in pursuance of the Geneva Convention of 1925 prohibiting their use, the production and the stockpiling of these weapons will be prohibited, too.

In connexion with the negotiations in progress and the obstacles standing stubbornly in their way, I would like to dwell shortly on the issue of verification. It is generally known and recognized that verification forms an organic and essential part of a disarmament convention or treaty, and all existing international instruments in this field contain adequate provisions for verification measures. This practice of verification has proved its efficiency beyond doubt, no instance of violation of disarmament agreement has been discovered or reported. Nevertheless, there has been recently a growing trend pressing for excessive on-site inspection, or to establish international

(Mr. Domokos, Hungary)

machinery for verification, which may easily start a life independent from the actual disarmament agreements. This excessive pressure for an absolute verification is good only to block the way of important negotiations. Pressing for excessive verification hails from suspicion and may raise suspicion on the other side. Methods of verification based on national means and supplemented by international arrangements in mutually acceptable form and attached to concrete disarmament instruments can become an efficient method of verification.

Finally I would like to make a few remarks concerning the principles of solving one of the most immediate tasks standing before the Committee, namely the elaboration of the rules of procedure. My delegation is of the opinion that the elaboration of the rules of procedure should help the Committee to conduct more successful work. At the same time we firmly represent the opinion that we should not attach excessive significance to this question, since no activity displayed in technical, organizational matters can be a substitute either for the commitment of Governments to the cause of disarmament or for concrete disarmament measures. Consequently we hold that the Committee should as soon as possible start and accomplish the elaboration of the rules of procedure to ensure that the Committee could commence without delay negotiations on substantive disarmament subjects.

Accomplishing that task quickly will be possible only if all the participants take into consideration to the maximum extent the consensus embodied in paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the special session devoted to disarmament and avoid altering it by unilateral interpretations. Another starting-point of my delegation is that we should avoid self-contained changes in the rules of procedures of the Committee and follow unchanged the methods which proved themselves efficient in our earlier practice. In this very spirit did we participate in the elaboration of the common draft of several socialist countries, and we will do our best to co-operate with all the delegations of the Committee in finalizing the draft as well as in the negotiations on substantive disarmament subjects.

Mr. DI BERNARDO (Italy) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, I should like first to associate myself with all those who have preceded me in welcoming your chairmanship of the work of our Committee. I have been personally acquainted for years with your capacity as an able and well-informed diplomat, which you once more displayed in full measure at the General Assembly's recent special session on disarmament, when you assumed responsibility in turn as Chairman of the Preparatory Committee and Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee.

My delegation is happy to have the opportunity of close collaboration with you in this particularly sensitive phase of the organization of our future work.

My purpose today is briefly to introduce to the members of the Committee the working document on the chemical disarmament negotiations which my delegation submitted on 6 February under the symbol CD/5.

My Government has on several occasions over the years stressed its concern, in the context of an effective disarmament process, for the complete prohibition of chemical weapons. We consider it an urgent and priority task. No one can ignore the fact that from every point of view, chemical weapons fall within the category of weapons of mass-destruction. Moreover, they are weapons which have been amply tested, actually exist in far from negligible quantities in the arsenals of certain Powers and are capable of further and highly disquieting development.

In contrast to other weapon systems, the manufacturing technology for chemical weapons is not confined to a limited number of powers. Many countries have both the knowledge and the materials necessary to acquire within a relatively short time weapons exploiting the effect of toxic agents, and there are, moreover, very many chemical substances which could be used for military purposes.

The obligation upon this Committee to enter promptly into further negotiations on the complete prohibition of the development, manufacture and stockpiling of all chemical weapons, and their destruction, comes to us from the following sources: the Biological Weapons Convention, which most of our countries have ratified, article IX of which requires us to continue negotiations in good faith with a view to reaching early agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and for their destruction; the recommendations in the Final Document of the General Assembly's special session, which take the view that the prohibition of such weapons and their destruction is among the most urgent of disarmament measures; and resolution 33/59 adopted by the United Nations General Assembly at its thirty-third session, which expressly requests the Committee on Disarmament, as a matter of high priority, to undertake,

(Mr. Di Bernardo, Italy)

at the beginning of its 1979 session, negotiations with a view to elaborating an agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and for their destruction, taking into account all existing proposals and future initiatives.

My Government has latterly followed with attention and in hope the progress of the negotiations undertaken between the Governments of the United States of America and the Soviet Union with a view to considering a joint initiative for the conclusion, as a first step, of an international convention on the most deadly and dangerous chemical weapons.

We know that some progress has been achieved. We are not unaware, however, that difficulties remain and that further efforts will be needed to overcome various obstacles. Without wishing to hamper the bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union, but rather in the hope of encouraging and facilitating them, my Government, having in mind the above-mentioned recommendations, considers that our Committee will not be carrying out its duty unless it undertakes, with the despatch requested, the multilateral negotiations which fall within its mandate with a view to identifying more clearly, with the co-operation of all the countries concerned, the difficulties which still stand in the way of a generally acceptable solution.

That is the aim of the proposals contained in our working paper.

My delegation considers that negotiations on the multilateral place should be resumed as soon as possible after the adoption of the agenda and the rules of procedure.

In this first phase, our Committee should resume its consideration of the proposals and options already placed before the CCD, many of which have only been superficially and hastily considered. That should, we think, make it possible, first, to identify spheres of agreement and disagreement and draw up an inventory of the questions and problems which require further study from both the technical and the legal standpoints.

At the same time it might be worth-while contemplating some informal meetings with the participation of experts with a view to evaluating, inter alia, the results of the "workshops" planned for next March in the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom on the problems of verification of the chemical-weapons ban.

The conclusions of this first phase of negotiations should be reflected in a report which the Committee would prepare before the end of the current session.

(Mr. Di Bernardo, Italy)

The next phase, which might take place at the beginning of the summer session, should include the establishment of an ad hoc working group, open to the participation of all the member States and, at their invitation, of other interested States, with a view to careful and detailed evaluation of the problems still unresolved and standing in the way of an agreement.

The terms of reference of the Group, which might have recourse to the assistance of qualified experts, should include in my delegation's view, the following:

- (a) Form and scope of the agreement;
- (b) Destruction, under appropriate supervision, of stocks of chemical weapons, and possible conversion of the research, production and stockpiling installations facilities;
- (c) Verification ---
Institutional structure and functions of an international system of verification,
co-ordination and interaction between international and national approaches to verification;
- (d) Possibility of adopting concerted international measures with a view to the early identification of agents which might be used for the purpose of chemical warfare.

That would be the second phase.

At a later stage, which we hope would not be too long delayed, the Committee might instruct the working group to proceed, taking into account all the material emerging from the multilateral negotiations and, we hope, from the bilateral negotiations, to the preparation of the basic elements of the agreement and then to the drafting of a universally acceptable draft convention.

In my delegation's view, the approach which I have just outlined, without compromising progress in the continuing discussions on a bilateral basis, would show the international community the determination of the new Committee on Disarmament to carry out its work with a fresh impulse and with the urgency it merits.

Those are the proposals of a procedural nature which my delegation wishes to formulate at this stage of our work, to try to resolve certain difficulties which might create a sense of frustration and impotence.

These are preliminary proposals which my delegation would be happy to discuss with the other members of the Committee.

In that connexion, I should like to remind the Committee that the delegation of the Netherlands on 6 February submitted a working paper on this subject containing proposals stemming from the same concerns and having the same aim. We are giving our full attention to those proposals.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I thank the distinguished representative of Italy, Ambassador Di Bernardo, for his statement, in which he has formally introduced working paper CD/5, sponsored by his delegation.

I would like to thank him, at the same time, for his kind words about me and for his assurances of the continued valuable co-operation of his delegation.

As there are no more speakers on the list, and if no delegation would like to take the floor, I would now like to make an announcement to the Committee. I have received a letter from the Secretariat in keeping with the terms of General Assembly resolution 32/71, which recommends that each body meeting in the United Nations should be informed at the beginning of each session of the facilities available for the meetings of that body. Since I believe that the content of this letter would be most useful to all members, I shall ask the Secretariat to circulate it to all members, in the various languages. I see no objection.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): As members will recall, we agreed at our last formal meeting that at the end of our formal business, we would convert to an informal meeting to exchange views about our further work.

I shall therefore now suspend the formal meeting, which will be resumed at the end of our informal meeting to decide upon the date of our next plenary meeting.

The meeting was suspended at 11.50 a.m. and resumed at 1.10 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): Following an informal exchange of views between members of the Committee, I would like to announce at this formal meeting that the Committee has decided to hold formal meetings on Tuesdays and Thursdays, beginning at 10.30 a.m., and that no formal announcements in this respect will be made to the Committee members.

Of course, it is understood that at any stage in its work the Committee may itself make changes in the frequency of its meetings.

If there is no objection, we will adjourn the formal meeting, and in accordance with what I have just said the next one will be held on Tuesday morning, 15 February, at 10.30 a.m.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

Erratum to CD/PV.9

After the first paragraph on page 21 of the English version of CD/PV.9, insert the following additional paragraph:-

"The establishment of such a working group was proposed by the Italian delegation already in 1977, and our proposal was at that time supported by several delegations."

This erratum should therefore be inserted at the appropriate place in the Final Record of the ninth meeting.

CD/PV.10
13 February 1979
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE TENTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 13 February 1979, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. D. CARLOS ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. A. BENSMAIL

Argentina: Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS
Mr. A.N. MOLteni

Australia: Mr. L.D. THOMPSON
Mr. A.J. BEHI
Ms. M.S. WICKES

Belgium: Mr. P. BERG

Brazil: Mr. A.C. DE OURO PRETO

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. I. SOTIROV

Burma: U SAW HLAING
U THEIN AUNG
U THAUNG HTUN

Canada: Mr. J.T. SIMARD

Cuba: Mr. L.S. VILA
Mrs. V.B. JACKIEWICH

Czechoslovakia: Mr. M. RUZEK
Mr. V. TYLNER

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

Ethiopia: Mr. T. TERREFE

German Democratic Republic: Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. S. KAHN
Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

<u>Germany, Federal Republic of</u>	Mr. G. PFEIFFER Mr. J. PÖHLMANN Mr. H. MÜLLER
<u>Hungary:</u>	Mr. C. GYORFFY
<u>France:</u>	Mr. F. DE LA GORCE Mr. B. D'ABOVILLE Mr. J.C. PARAVY
<u>India:</u>	Mr. S.T. DEVARE
<u>Indonesia:</u>	Mr. A. KAMIL Mr. M. SIDIK
<u>Iran:</u>	Mr. M. PARTASH Mr. D. CHILATY
<u>Italy:</u>	Mr. N. DI BERNARDO Mr. M. IORENO M. C. FRATESCHI
<u>Japan:</u>	Mr. M. OGISO Mr. T. NONOYAMA Mr. T. IWANAMI
<u>Kenya:</u>	Mr. C. GATERE MAINA Mr. G.N. MUNIU
<u>Mexico:</u>	Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES Miss A. CABRERA
<u>Mongolia:</u>	Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG Mr. L. BAYART
<u>Morocco:</u>	Mr. M. RAHHALI Mr. M. CHRAIBI
<u>Netherlands:</u>	Mr. R.H. FEIN Mr. A.J. MEERBURG

Nigeria: Mr. K. AHMED

Pakistan: Mr. M. AKRAM

Peru: Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO

Poland: Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. B. RUSSIN
Mr. H. PAC

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

Sri Lanka: Mr. I.B. FONSEKA

Sweden: Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. L. NORBERG
Mr. S. STRÖMBÄCK
Mr. U. REINIUS
Mr. U. ERICSSON

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN
Mr. N.V. PESTEREV
Mr. A.M. VAVILOV
Mr. E.D. ZAITSEV
Mr. A.I. TIOURENKOV
Mr. H.G. ANTIUKHIN
Mr. V.A. VERTOGRADOV

United Kingdom: Mr. N.H. MARSHALL
Mr. P.M.W. FRANCIS

United States of America: Mr. A.S. FISHER
Mr. C. FLOWERREE
Mr. A. AKALOVSKY
Mr. B.L. MURRAY
Mr. M.L. SANCHES
Mr. C. BAY

Venezuela:

Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT

Mr. H. ARTEAGA

Miss D. SZOKOLOCZI

Mrs. R.L. DE NECER

Yugoslavia:

Mr. D. DJOKIC

Zaire:

Mr. M. ESUK

Assistant Secretary-General
for Disarmament:

Mr. R. BJORNHEDT

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): There are no speakers on the list for today. I propose therefore to submit to the Committee a draft decision as a consequence of the agreement reached at the informal meeting yesterday. The text will be circulated to delegations shortly. It reads:

"As agreed in the informal exchange of views among its members, the Committee decides to establish an ad hoc working group, open to the participation of any Member State, to prepare draft rules of procedure for the Committee. For this purpose the ad hoc working group shall take account of the various drafts circulated informally, as well as of the views of delegations. The ad hoc working group shall hold its first meeting at the end of today's plenary meeting."

If there are no objections from delegations, I shall presume that this decision is approved.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.25 a.m.

CD/PV.11
15 February 1979
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE ELEVENTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 15 February 1979, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS

(Argentina)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. A. BENSMAIL

Argentina: Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS
Mr. A.N. NOLTENI

Australia: Mr. L.D. THOMSON
Ms. M.S. WICKES

Belgium: Mr. P. BERG
Mr. G. VAN DUYSSE

Brazil: Mr. A. CELSO DE OURO PRETO

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. I. PETROV
Mr. I. SOTIROV

Burma: U THAUNG HTUN

Canada: Mr. J.T. SHIARD

Cuba: Mr. L. SOLA VILA
Mrs. V.B. JACKIEWICH

Czechoslovakia: Mr. V. TYLNER

Egypt: Mr. M. EL-BARADEI
Mr. H. FAHMY

Ethiopia: Mr. T. TERREFE

German Democratic Republic: Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. S. KAHN
Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

Germany, Federal Republic of: Mr. G. PFEIFFER
Mr. J. PÖHLMANN
Mr. H. MÜLLER

Hungary: Mr. C. GYORFFY

France: Mr. F. DE LA GORCE
Mr. BENOIT D'ABOVILLE
Mr. J.-C. PARAVY

India: Mr. S.T. DEVARE

Indonesia: Mr. J. DAMANIK

Iran: Mr. M. FARTASH
Mr. D. CHILATY

Italy: Mr. N. DI BERNARDO
Mr. M. MORENO
Mr. C. FRATESCHI

Japan: Mr. H. OGISO
Mr. T. NONOYAMA
Mr. T. IWANAI

Kenya: Mr. C.G. MAINA
Mr. G.N. MUNIU

Mexico: Mr. A. GARCÍA ROBLES
Miss A. CABRERA

Mongolia: Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
Mr. L. BAYART

Morocco: Mr. M. RAHHALI

Netherlands: Mr. R.H. FEIN
Mr. A.J. HEERBURG

Nigeria: Mr. T. OLUJOKO

Pakistan: Mr. M. AKRAH

Peru: Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO

Poland: Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. H. PAĆ
Mr. B. RUSSIN

Romania: Mr. C. DNE

Sri Lanka: Mr. B. FONSLEKA

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

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics: Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. Y.K. MAZARKIN
Mr. A.I. VAVILOV
Mr. E.D. ZAITSEV
Mr. A.I. TIOURENKOV
Mr. Y.V. KOSTENKO
Mr. N.G. ANTIUKHIN

United Kingdom: Mr. N.H. MARSHALL
Mr. P.H.W. FRANCIS

United States of America: Mr. A. FISHER
Mr. C. FLOWERS
Mr. A. AKALOVSKY
Mr. R. HAGENGRUBER
Ms. B.L. MURRAY
Mr. H.L. SANCHES
Mr. T. BARTHELEMY

Venezuela: Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT
Ms. D. SZOKOLCZI

Yugoslavia: Mr. D. DJOKIĆ

Zaire: Mr. H. ESUK

Assistant Secretary-General
for Disarmament: Mr. R. BJÖRNERSTEDT

Mr. VOUTOV (Bulgaria): Mr. Chairman, first of all may I express my satisfaction at having the opportunity to make my first official statement at the current session of the Committee on Disarmament under your chairmanship. There are several reasons for this satisfaction: we know you as a distinguished friend of the Bulgarian people who, in your capacity as a diplomatic representative of Argentina in Bulgaria, contributed to the rapprochement between the two countries, and to the intensification of their mutual relations; we know very well your activities as one of the outstanding figures in the United Nations for the past two decades; we are convinced that under your able leadership the Committee will succeed in solving within this month the pending important organizational matters and will proceed to discussions and negotiations on the problems of disarmament which require immediate attention.

At the same time I wish to congratulate the new members of the Committee and their delegations -- namely, Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Cuba, France, Indonesia, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Venezuela. Their association with the disarmament negotiations gives rise to new hopes for more active and fruitful work by this Committee which is in the focus of attention of the international community, looking forward to finding solutions to the crucial problems of our time, that is, the halting of the arms race and definite movement along the road to disarmament.

Having in mind the unquestionable priority of nuclear disarmament among the problems facing this Committee, we attach particular importance to France's joining the disarmament negotiations. Bulgarian people have traditionally friendly ties with the French people, and we believe that the participation of France in the Committee on Disarmament will contribute to our work for achieving the lofty human goals entrusted to us.

I would like to congratulate as well the new leaders of two of the delegations in the multilateral disarmament negotiations -- namely, the head of the USSR delegation, Ambassador Victor Levonovitch Issraelyan, well-known to all of us as an outstanding figure in United Nations circles, and the leader of the delegation of Yugoslavia, Ambassador Marco Vrhunec -- and to ask them to convey our greetings to their predecessors with whom we had a fruitful co-operation.

It is well-known that the past year has been characterised by an overall intensification of the efforts for finding ways and methods for solving the problems of disarmament. For the first time in the history of the United Nations, a special session on disarmament was convened, in the preparation and the successful conclusion of which you, Mr. Chairman, made a valuable contribution, which has been noted in an eloquent manner by the majority of the preceding speakers.

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

The thirty-third session of the General Assembly accorded primary importance to the problems of disarmament, underlined by the adoption of more than 40 resolutions on its different aspects. The bilateral, trilateral and multilateral negotiations in Geneva, Vienna and elsewhere have been continued in the various fields of the many-sided complex -- armaments, disarmament and the security of international peace. We believe that this pace will be maintained in the days ahead, bringing about some meaningful results within the current year.

Adding to all this the 17-years experience gathered by this Committee during the several stages of its evolution, as well as the number of major international treaties and conventions elaborated by it, we have the right to maintain that a solid foundation exists for further energetic and well-aimed actions for reducing the danger to world peace and the danger of a nuclear war above all.

We share the view expressed here by many delegations that the development of the international situation concerning the problems of disarmament is at a very important stage. There are forces in the world led by their egoistic, ill-conceived interests or unsound ambitions and aspirations, which are trying to push their own countries and others along the deadly road to an even greater intensification of the arms race and to divert the peoples from the only sensible road which is the road to détente, and thus to hamper the efforts for finding solutions to global problems of a social, economic and humanitarian character.

In present-day international relations, reflected in the work of this Committee in the context of an escalating arms race, the role of what is known as the "political will factor" comes to the forefront with respect to both the States members of the Committee and to all non-members that participate in the arms race. Of course **this** has a most direct bearing on all nuclear States.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria and the other socialist countries members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization reiterated again clearly, through the Moscow Declaration of the Political Consultative Committee on 23 November 1978, their unequivocal attachment to the cause of détente as the only equitable alternative, confirming their sincere wish for a concrete and constructive approach towards disarmament. Let me quote the evaluation given by the President of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, who stated recently:

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

"Starting from the principle of equal security, a principle that today is the only basis for all further negotiations, the socialist States have once again proposed realistic ways for achieving a breakthrough in the field of disarmament, for deepening the process of détente in the name of saving our planet from a nuclear holocaust. Humanity should cross into the twenty-first century in conditions of broad international co-operation -- such is the comprehensive formula of peace proposed by the Moscow meeting."

Such is the constructive and realistic policy of my country and of all countries of the socialist community. It has always been such, it continues to be so at the present stage and it will remain the same in the future, for it is based on our ideological conceptions, on the necessity of peaceful coexistence among States. We believe that peace can be preserved and the progress of all nations carried further only through strengthening, deepening and expanding the process of détente, through the creation of an atmosphere of good-neighbourly relations and goodwill, an atmosphere of sincere readiness to follow the road to disarmament. The entire history of the socialist community since the creation of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries is a valid proof of our consistent policy of peace, international understanding and co-operation, a policy rejecting war as a method for solving disputed problems, a policy denouncing the arms race and favouring general and complete disarmament.

It is universally known that Lenin, the founder of the Soviet State, was the first to define the idea of peaceful coexistence; well known are the utmost efforts of the Soviet Union in the League of Nations, here in Geneva in the 1930s, to prevent the Second World War through building up a European collective security system in the face of the imminent nazi-fascist aggression. It is a fact of life that the Soviet Union, individually and in co-operation with other countries, has made in the years following the Second World War more than 100 proposals for the consolidation of peace, for the strengthening of international security, for the halting of the arms race, for genuine disarmament. The Soviet Union and the socialist countries were the main initiators of the convening of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. The initiative for the Vienna talks on reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe is also to their credit. There has been no session of the United Nations General Assembly or other international political forum at which the socialist countries have not made, individually or collectively, proposals in favour of peace, peaceful coexistence and disarmament.

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

Regrettably, however, we had to note that the lack of political will in certain influential circles in the West for further real steps in the disarmament field not only hampers serious negotiations, but pushes even higher the escalation of the arms race. The multilateral efforts to create an appropriate atmosphere and international conditions for a constructive approach to these vital problems are being constantly undermined. Many countries and nations received with surprise and discontent the long-term programme for feverish arming of the NATO countries, adopted in Washington, only 250 miles from New York, at the moment when the special session on disarmament was taking place. This defiance of the profound wishes of humanity for peace and disarmament stems from the unhealthy and unrealistic dreams of its authors to achieve military superiority, making efforts at the same time to cover them up by the myth, invented in collaboration with their Far-Eastern followers, that a threat allegedly exists from the Soviet Union and socialist countries, members of the defensive Warsaw Treaty. We are obliged to recall the fact that the Warsaw Treaty Organization was established six years after the challenge with the creation of NATO had appeared. More than once the Warsaw Treaty has expressed its readiness and desire for a simultaneous dissolution of the two military organizations. I do not think it is necessary to prove that, since the production of the first atom bomb, the socialist countries have been compelled to respond to the challenge of the West in respect to their defence and national security, that is the creation, perfection and production of modern weapons. For, as the leader of the Soviet State, Leonid Brezhnev, has declared, it is unthinkable that countries whose security is endangered by the hectic armament of others should sit idle, and nobody should expect them to.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria fully shares the opinion of the prevailing part of the world public that there is no time to lose in the field of disarmament, starting first of all by taking the necessary steps in relation to the most horrible weapons, nuclear weapons. It is time to give up the old conceptions of domination and military supremacy. As stated by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Petar Mladenov, at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly:

"It would be necessary to do away once and for all with the anachronistic pattern of thinking in respect of the questions of peace and security, as well as the out-moded stereotypes brought to life by the inertia of the past and based on the notion of military superiority. There can be no doubt of the fact that the policy of the position of strength does not correspond to the realities of the present-day world."

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

Taking all this into consideration, the Bulgarian delegation fully subscribes to the suggestion expressed here by a number of delegations to proceed as soon as possible to concrete matters starting from the most important and urgent questions. This would be fully in accordance with the Final Document of the Special Session which characterized the Committee on Disarmament as a "negotiating body".

We are faced by a number of significant organizational matters, as well -- the adoption of the agenda, the rules of procedure and the organization of our work. We believe that, with goodwill and mutual understanding, agreement on these matters could be reached very soon, as you, Mr. Chairman, have also noted.

Though important, organizational matters are still only an instrument for achieving our main objectives and tasks. They should not divert our attention for any considerable time. As to the agenda, we believe that it should be a comprehensive one, while at the same time we are to select the most pressing and important problems for discussion and solution within a certain period. On the basis of the agenda of the previous multilateral disarmament negotiations, the resolutions of the General Assembly and the proposals of the members of this Committee, we consider that a comprehensive agenda of the Committee may include the following main problems in the disarmament field:

- cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and gradual reduction of their stockpiles;
- general and complete cessation of nuclear weapon tests;
- strengthening of guarantees of the security of the non-nuclear States;
- prohibition of neutron weapons;
- prohibition of chemical weapons;
- prohibition of the development of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, including radiological weapons;
- reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces;
- reduction of military budgets;
- further measures aimed at preventing an arms race on the sea-bed and ocean floor and the subsoil thereof;
- prohibition or restriction of the use of specific conventional weapons;
- elaboration of a comprehensive programme for disarmament;
- general and complete disarmament.

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

I would like to dwell upon the concrete and immediate tasks confronting our Committee. As I have already mentioned, the greatest danger to peace is posed by nuclear weapons. Being a co-sponsor of the new initiative of the Soviet Union to begin negotiations on the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and the gradual reduction of their stockpiles (document CD/4), our delegation is deeply convinced that this is the most feasible way to curb drastically the nuclear arms race.

The essence and the practical significance of the idea have been so convincingly presented by the head of the Soviet delegation, the distinguished Ambassador Issraelyan, that I do not think it necessary to elaborate on them in detail. We believe that in accordance with the opinion expressed by the majority of the delegations, stressing the priority character of nuclear disarmament measures, the initiative of the socialist countries will be favourably received by the Committee and we could start its practical realization as soon as possible. Actually, we are asked to do so both in paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the Special Session and in General Assembly resolution 33/71 H, which urges the earliest possible beginning of consultations between all nuclear States with a view to putting an end to the arms race in this particular field.

The introduction of the working document of the socialist countries on problems of nuclear disarmament is a logical continuation of the ceaseless efforts of the socialist countries -- and the Soviet Union above all -- on this question, starting from the Gromyko Plan introduced in 1946 in the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission and leading up to the proposals put forward by Leonid Brezhnev on 2 November 1977 concerning the simultaneous cessation of production of nuclear weapons -- atomic, thermo-nuclear or neutron -- by all States.

In my capacity as Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of Bulgaria to the United Nations in New York for a number of years in the late 1950s, I had the opportunity of witnessing the negative and far-reaching consequences resulting from the unfavourable attitude of the West towards the Soviet proposals for a radical solution of the nuclear weapons problem. We should ask ourselves the question -- how would the world have looked today had nuclear weapons been nipped in the bud and had humanity been spared the economic, social and political impact of the nuclear arms race? Not to say anything of the atomic tragedy of the Japanese people!

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

That is why we must not give up. We should do everything possible to put a halt to the nuclear arms race and proceed to the gradual elimination of nuclear weapons, as soon as possible.

The Bulgarian delegation considers that document CD/4 is presented to the right addressee, that is the Committee on Disarmament. There are here all necessary conditions for negotiations, if all nuclear Powers are going to participate. At the same time there are other alternatives for negotiations as well as the readiness to hear other proposals. That is why our delegation is appealing for a most considerate attitude towards the consultations and the preparations for such negotiations, with a view to starting them as soon as possible while it is not too late.

In this connexion, our delegation would like to note that there are other urgent matters on which history teaches us not to drag our feet -- this applies for instance to nuclear neutron weapons. The socialist countries are proposing through their draft convention of 9 March last year to ban those weapons at this stage before they have entered military arsenals.

Another important and concrete task on which the Committee can and should begin work is the elaboration of the future international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States, on the basis of General Assembly resolution 33/72. Thus we would contribute to the confirmation of the principle of the non-use of force in international relations, and would make more meaningful the non-proliferation régime in the world. We fully share the opinion of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, contained in his important message to the Committee, that such a convention would be an important element of stability in international relations with beneficial effects upon other disarmament questions.

One extremely significant matter that the Committee faces is the question of the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. We are noting with satisfaction that the two Powers negotiating outside the Committee are soon to resume their negotiations on radiological weapons. However, I should not fail to reaffirm our conviction that this problem should be dealt with radically by concluding an all-embracing agreement. That is why the Bulgarian delegation is firmly on the side of the increasing number of States that favour the comprehensive approach.

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

We appreciate the difficulties and the complicated matters in the trilateral negotiations between the USSR, the United States of America and the United Kingdom in their effort to produce a joint draft agreement on the general and complete cessation of nuclear-weapon tests, and in the negotiations between the USSR and the United States of America on the draft convention to ban completely chemical weapons. Having in mind, however, that the solving of these problems is highly important, we would like to believe that the concerted efforts will bring positive results and the Committee will take up the discussion on the drafts in due time.

The Bulgarian people, together with the peoples of the whole world, awaits with great interest and hope the forthcoming conclusion of SALT II, which will be a boost and encouragement to negotiations in the other fields of disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I would like to express the hope for a quick solution to the organizational matters in the Committee and for the beginning of genuine negotiations on the problems of disarmament, vital to the future of humanity. May I assure you and all distinguished delegations that the Bulgarian delegation will make its contribution and will do everything possible for creative and constructive negotiations in this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): Now I should like to discuss another subject.

On 15 August 1978, the Ad Hoc Group of seismological experts submitted a sixth progress report (CCD/576). In the report, the Group suggested, inter alia, that a representative of WMO be invited by the Conference to participate informally in the work of the Group in relation to the transmission of data through the WMO communication network. The Group also established a draft agenda for its seventh and eighth sessions tentatively to be convened at the end of February and the end of April 1979, respectively. In particular, the Group suggested, subject to approval by the Conference, that its seventh session be held from 19 February to 2 March 1979. Subsequently, the Conference took note of the progress report; agreed that the work of the Group should be continued; decided to include the report in the Committee's report to the General Assembly at its thirty-third session; agreed to invite a representative of WMO to participate informally in the work of the Group; and expressed the hope that the above-mentioned arrangements would be continued under the Committee on Disarmament, the future negotiating body.

(The Chairman)

I have conducted informal consultations on the latter question and I found general agreement that these arrangements should be maintained. At the same time I also found general agreement that the Group, which is open to all members of the Committee on Disarmament, should remain open to States not members of the Committee. If there is no objection, we could then take note of those arrangements, as well as of the general feeling that wider participation in the Ad Hoc Group would be desirable.

If there is no objection, it is so decided.

It was so decided.

Mr. ESUK (Zaire) (translated from French): Excuse me for taking the floor in so impromptu a manner but, since many delegations will perhaps be leaving the conference room to deal with other tasks, I would like to inform the Group of 21 that a meeting of the working group will be held tomorrow, 16 February, at 10.30 a.m. in Conference Room I.

The meeting rose at 11.20 a.m.

FINAL RECORD OF THE TWELFTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 20 February 1979, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. D. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas (Argentina)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

<u>Algeria:</u>	Mr. L. BENSIAIL
<u>Argentina:</u>	Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS
<u>Australia:</u>	Mr. L.D. THOMSON Ms. H.S. WICKES
<u>Belgium:</u>	Mr. P. HOEDERDAEHE Mr. P. BERG
<u>Brazil:</u>	Mr. A.C. DE OURO PRETO
<u>Bulgaria:</u>	Mr. P. VOUTOV Mr. I. PETROV Mr. I. SOTIROV
<u>Burma:</u>	U THAUNG ETUIN
<u>Canada:</u>	Mr. R. HARRY JAY Mr. J.T. SIMARD
<u>Cuba:</u>	Mr. L.S. VILA Mrs. V.B. JACKIEWICH
<u>Czechoslovakia:</u>	Mr. H. RUZEK Mr. V. TYLLER
<u>Egypt:</u>	Mr. H. EL-BARADEI Mr. H. FAHEY
<u>Ethiopia:</u>	Mr. G. ALULA
<u>France:</u>	Mr. F. DE LA CORCE Mr. B. D'ABOVILLE Mr. J.C. PARAVY

<u>German Democratic Republic</u>	Mr. G. HERDER Mr. S. KAHN Mr. H. GRACZYNSKI
<u>Germany, Federal Republic of:</u>	Mr. G. FEJFETTER Mr. H. MULLER
<u>Hungary:</u>	Mr. M. DOIKOS Mr. C. GYORFFY
<u>India:</u>	Mr. S.T. DEVARE
<u>Indonesia:</u>	Mr. A. SANI Mr. A. KAMIL Mr. I. DAMANIK
<u>Iran:</u>	Mr. H. FARTASH Mr. D. CHILATY
<u>Italy:</u>	Mr. M. MORENO Mr. C. FRATESCHI Mr. G. VALDEVIT
<u>Japan:</u>	Mr. H. OGISO Mr. T. MONOYAMA Mr. T. IWANAMI
<u>Kenya:</u>	Mr. C. GATERE MAINA Mr. G.H. MUNITU
<u>Mexico:</u>	Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES Miss A. CABRERA
<u>Mongolia:</u>	Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG Mr. L. BAYART
<u>Morocco:</u>	Mr. N. RAHHALI

Netherlands: Mr. A.J. MEERBURG

Nigeria: Mr. T.O. OLUTOKO

Pakistan: Mr. J.K.A. MARKER

Peru:

Poland: Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. H. PAC
Mr. H. KRUCZYK
Mr. A. SKOWRONSKI

Romania: Mr. C. ENE

Sri Lanka: Mr. I.B. FOUSEKA

Sweden: Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. S. STROMBACK
Mr. J. PRAWITZ

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN
Mr. A.M. VAVILOV
Mr. Y.V. KOSTENKO
Mr. H.G. ANTIUKHIN

United Kingdom: Mr. N.H. MARSHALL
Mr. P.H. MOBERLY

United States of America: Mr. W.S. FISHER
Mr. C. FLOWERREE
Mr. A. AKALOVSKIY
Ms. B.L. MURRAY
Mr. T. BARTHELEMY
Ms. E. ARENSBURGER

Venezuela:

Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT

Mrs D. SZOKOLCZI

Mrs. R.L. DE LECER

Yugoslavia:

Mr. D. DJOKIC

Zaire:

Mr. E. MULONGANDUSU

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (translated from Russian): As this is the first time I am speaking at the present session of the Committee on Disarmament, which has resumed its work with a somewhat enlarged membership, I should like first of all to take this opportunity to associate myself with the words of welcome and good wishes addressed to the new members of the Committee - Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Cuba, Indonesia, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Venezuela. I should also like to note with satisfaction the participation of France in the Committee's work.

The Mongolian delegation expresses the hope that with its present more representative membership the Committee on Disarmament, as the only multilateral negotiating body, will successfully continue its activity, making a useful contribution to progress in the cause of disarmament.

Before stating our delegation's positions on the concrete issues on the Committee's agenda, I should like to make a few comments of a general nature.

There is no task in the world today of more overriding importance and urgency than the implementation of practical measures for halting the arms race and for disarmament.

The results of the special session on disarmament and of the thirty-third regular session of the General Assembly bear witness to this fact.

It should be emphasized that the principal documents adopted by the above-mentioned forums reflected once again the will and desire of the world community to work towards a substantial breakthrough in the matter of halting the arms race and adopting genuine measures in the disarmament sphere.

Together with other peace-loving States, the countries of the socialist community are actively pursuing their efforts towards the achievement of real disarmament, and are consistently coming forward with constructive proposals in this field.

The conclusions and proposals contained in the Moscow Declaration of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, adopted last November at a meeting of that organization's Political Consultative Committee and circulated as an official document of the United Nations, serve as fresh confirmation of the socialist countries' dedication to the ideas of détente and disarmament. This document, which is of great international political significance, puts forward new realistic ideas and major initiatives, which can, we are convinced, serve as a constructive basis for the solution of urgent international problems, particularly those of disarmament.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

I should like to single out from the set of proposals contained in the Moscow Declaration an appeal addressed to all States, namely, the appeal to press for early negotiations among the five nuclear Powers -- the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and China -- for the purpose of removing nuclear weapons of all types from the arsenals of States and converting nuclear energy to exclusively peaceful uses.

In the statement which its Government made on 4 December 1978, the Mongolian People's Republic warmly welcomed the Moscow Declaration of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty and expressed full support, evaluating the Declaration as a broad programme of international action and struggle for the extension of the process of détente, for halting the arms race and for genuine disarmament.

The Mongolian delegation would also like to state that it heard with great satisfaction the message of greetings sent by L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, to the expanded Committee on Disarmament in connexion with the beginning of its work. The message clearly expresses the Soviet Union's readiness actively and purposefully to continue its efforts to secure the attainment in the Committee on Disarmament of the practical results awaited by all the peoples of the world.

Under circumstances in which the nuclear factor has become the leading one in the military reality of our time, a special responsibility for nuclear disarmament rests upon the States possessing nuclear weapons. That is why it is essential that they should show political will and readiness in solving this imperative task of the modern age. Other States with a major military and economic potential also bear great responsibility in this matter.

The peoples of the world fully realize that in face of the accelerating arms race, which constitutes the main danger to general peace, it is necessary first of all to eliminate the threat of nuclear weapons, to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race until nuclear weapons and nuclear-weapon delivery systems have been completely eliminated, and to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

At the special session of the General Assembly devoted to ~~disarmament~~ the Soviet Union, as we know, came forward with a constructive proposal on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed, and on discussing the question of giving the appropriate negotiations a practical start. This timely initiative received

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

wide support and approval from the overwhelming majority of States and found reflection in the Final Document of the special session.

Moreover, at the end of last year, the General Assembly, in its resolution 33/71 H, expressed itself in favour of "an early initiation of urgent negotiations on the halting of the nuclear-arms race".

Guided by the sincere desire to strive for a decisive breakthrough in the matter of halting the nuclear-arms race, the delegations of the seven socialist States members of the Committee on Disarmament, including Mongolia, officially submitted a working paper for consideration by the Committee (CD/4, dated 1 February 1979). Its authors took this step bearing in mind the Committee's competence as the most suitable forum for the preparation and conduct of negotiations on nuclear disarmament, without at the same time excluding the possibility of considering an alternative approach.

This proposal, as we know, contains the concrete suggestion that preparatory consultations should be started in the course of the current session of the Committee with a view to beginning the negotiations on the substance of the problem this year.

I do not think there is any need to give a detailed explanation of the contents of this working paper, as the jointly held views were propounded in sufficient detail in statements by the head of the Soviet delegation and other co-sponsors. I should only like to confirm that strict observance of the principle of the inviolability of the security of all parties must be taken as a basis both for the conduct of negotiations and for the implementation of practical measures in this field.

The Mongolian delegation, like many others, deeply hopes that this joint proposal by the socialist States will be considered in the Committee in a businesslike manner. In our view, the interests of the cause call for a constructive approach with a view to proceeding as soon as possible to the discussion of this question, a positive solution of which would be conducive to concrete agreements and action towards the adoption of effective measures in the sphere of nuclear disarmament.

The peoples of the world are well aware that acceleration of the arms race means ever greater material preparation for war and increases the threat of a world nuclear catastrophe. According to some estimates, in the last 10 years alone stockpiles of nuclear weapons throughout the world increased more than threefold, which is quite sufficient to destroy life on our planet many times over. Under

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

such conditions, it is natural that all peoples should be profoundly disturbed and alarmed by the policy and actions of the military and industrial circles of the NATO countries and their old and new allies, who, together, openly take their stand against all progressive processes in the contemporary world. Taking no account of political reality as it exists today, these forces are fanning revanchist-supermilitary passions; with their aggressive expansionist aspirations and great-Power-hegemonistic ambitions, they oppose all constructive efforts of States aimed at the consolidation of peace and international détente and the attainment of practical measures of disarmament.

The concurrence of such circumstances gives us the right constantly to stress the overriding urgency of adopting effective measures towards nuclear disarmament and the removal of the threat of nuclear war. As we understand it, the Committee on Disarmament can and must play an important role in performing this imperative task.

As we have already said, the nuclear-weapon States bear the primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament, and, together with other States of major military significance, for halting and reversing the armaments race. Evasion of this responsibility by any of the nuclear-weapon or "near-nuclear-weapon" States would run counter both to their national interests and to the interests of consolidating international peace and security.

One would like to suppose that the place at the Committee's negotiating table set aside for China will not long remain empty. We must declare, however -- and I am sure this is the opinion of most States to which the cause of peace, disarmament and progress is dear -- that the policy of China's present leadership, which is aimed at open opposition to the cause of détente and disarmament, is completely incompatible with the special responsibility borne by that State under the United Nations Charter as a permanent member of the Security Council.

New evidence of this hostile policy and behaviour is provided by China's armed aggression against a sovereign State, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, in flagrant violation of the elementary principles of international relations and the Charter of the United Nations. Together with many other peace-loving States the people and Government of the Mongolian People's Republic, again expressing its fraternal solidarity and support for the righteous cause of the heroic Vietnamese people, angrily condemns this criminal act on the part of China and insistently demands its immediate cessation and the withdrawal of all Chinese troops from the territory of Viet Nam.

I should now like to set forth our position on particular items.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

From the very start, the Mongolian People's Republic has regarded the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as one of the effective international legal documents which substantially help to avert the threat of nuclear war, and it constantly supports the idea of that instrument's being made more effective and universal.

In our opinion, a likely means of narrowing the area of the geographical emplacement of nuclear weapons is the well-known Soviet proposal concerning the conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of the guarantees of the security of the non-nuclear-weapon States, and on the achievement of an international agreement on the non-emplacement of nuclear weapons in the territory of States which do not at present possess them.

In accordance with the recommendation contained in resolution 33/72 A of the United Nations General Assembly, the Committee on Disarmament should proceed as quickly as possible to the consideration of this question with a view to the elaboration of appropriate international agreements.

It may be added in this connexion that confirmation, as an absolute law of international relations, of the principle of the mutual renunciation of the use of force or of the threat of force with either nuclear weapons or conventional armaments would be a comprehensive political measure for the strengthening of confidence among States and for establishing guarantees of their security under international law.

Both in the Committee on Disarmament and in the General Assembly of the United Nations, many of the delegations speaking in favour of rapid agreement on urgent problems of disarmament rightly drew attention, in particular, to the importance of working out measures for the prohibition of weapons for the mass annihilation of people. In this connexion we would like to express the hope that the negotiations on a draft treaty concerning the comprehensive prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests will soon be successfully concluded. This applies equally to the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of their stockpiles. The conclusion of an appropriate international convention in this field will undoubtedly be a further real measure of disarmament. As we know, various working papers on chemical weapons have been submitted at this session of the Committee. In our opinion, the Committee should not give undue attention to the technical side of the matter, but should concentrate its attention and efforts on solution of the existing problems.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

Another important problem on the Committee's agenda is the consideration of measures to prohibit the development and production of new types of weapons of mass destruction, and of new systems of such weapons. The Committee has not yet been able to get down to practical negotiations on this question. Most States are in favour of their commencing as soon as possible. The discussion of this question by the Committee in recent years has revealed general agreement that unless the technological arms race is halted in time, it may lead to very dangerous consequences in the form of new and even more destructive means of mass annihilation.

I should like to recall in this connexion that, in its Final Document, the tenth special session of the General Assembly emphasizes the need for putting a stop to the development of new means of warfare, so that scientific and technological achievements might ultimately be used solely for peaceful purposes. In other words, there is universal agreement on the importance of erecting an effective barrier, through the conclusion of an appropriate international treaty, to the qualitative improvement of weapons of mass destruction. An appeal for this is to be found in resolution 33/66 B of the United Nations General Assembly.

We consider that the most practical course with regard to this matter at the present stage would be to set up in the Committee an ad hoc group of government experts to consider the scientific and technological possibilities of the creation of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction.

In advocating the prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction, the Mongolian delegation also has in view the conclusion in this context of special international agreements prohibiting particular types of such weapons, including radiological weapons, which, as we are aware, are at present the subject of bilateral Soviet-United States negotiations. We welcome the recent resumption of these negotiations in Geneva, and we hope that there will soon be positive results to show for them.

The position of principle of the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic on the question of the immediate prohibition of the neutron nuclear weapon, that particularly barbaric kind of weapon for the mass annihilation of people, is well-known and remains unchanged. The taking of further steps towards the production and development of this death-dealing weapon, even if only of its basic components, would give rise to a further dangerous round in the atomic

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

armaments race, thereby doing enormous damage to efforts directed towards armaments reduction and disarmament. In practice, this would nullify all the existing achievements in the sphere of disarmament and would paralyse the current negotiations on disarmament.

To prevent the development of precisely such a course of events, eight socialist countries last year proposed here in the Committee that an international convention on the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, development and use of the neutron nuclear weapon should be immediately worked out and concluded. We consider it necessary to pursue the practical consideration of this proposal in the Committee as a high-priority item with a view to the rapid preparation of an appropriate international agreement.

Having expressed this thought, I should like to refer to a decision of the recently held session of the World Peace Council. We attach great importance to that organization's Berlin Appeal, echoing with renewed emphasis the determined voice of world public opinion, as it calls for a more widespread manifestation of the vigorous movement for the cessation of the armaments race and for disarmament. Among other things, this document gives resolute expression to the general determination not to allow the further development of atomic weapons, and to bar the way to the appearance of new types of weapons of mass destruction, including the neutron weapon.

In stressing measures to restrict the armaments race and promote disarmament, we are fully aware of the decisive importance in this connexion of the current bilateral and multilateral negotiations on various questions of disarmament. We attach particular importance to the continuing strategic-arms limitation talks between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Together with others, the Mongolian delegation has great hopes for the successful conclusion of the Soviet/United States SALT II talks, a positive outcome of which will provide a good basis for agreement on subsequent measures in this field.

The Mongolian delegation fully shares the view that the negotiations on the restriction of the armaments race and on disarmament should be based on the principles of the inviolability of the security of all the sides, of the reciprocity and equivalence of the obligations assumed, of the inadmissibility of the obtaining of unilateral military advantages by anyone at all, and of non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

We consider that, besides the items we have already mentioned in this statement, the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament should include questions of

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

the reduction of military budgets, the full demilitarization of the sea-bed and also questions connected with the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces and the establishment of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

In our view, these vitally important questions of disarmament can and should be the subject also of careful consideration at a world disarmament conference, which, after proper preparation, should be convened at the earliest suitable moment.

I should like to say a few words about the organization of our Committee's work and its procedure.

We believe that the basic provisions of the rules of procedure of the Committee on Disarmament were agreed upon at the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and were laid down in the Final Document of that session.

We proceed from the position that the Committee on Disarmament is the only multilateral negotiating body with a restricted membership. Furthermore, a politically balanced representation of States must be strictly preserved in it. The Committee should maintain special relations with the United Nations, and lastly, and most important, all decisions in the Committee should be adopted by consensus.

It is precisely on these propositions that the ad hoc working group on the draft rules of procedure has in our opinion mainly relied, and consequently the Committee will be able officially to adopt its own rules of procedure.

The Mongolian delegation considers that the Committee should proceed without delay to the adoption of its agenda and agree on questions of the organization of its work. The Committee would thus be able to proceed immediately to the consideration of the items on its agenda.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the Mongolian delegation warmly welcomes you to the chairmanship of the Committee, and would like to assure you that it is prepared to continue its close collaboration in the Committee so as to promote the attainment of positive decisions in the sphere of disarmament.

The meeting rose at 11.20 a.m.

FINAL RECORD OF THE 13TH MEETING
held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva
on Thursday, 22 February 1979, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. D.C. Ortiz de Rozas

(Argentina)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. A. BENSMAIL

Argentina: Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS

Australia: Mr. L.D. THOMSON

Belgium: Mr. P. NOTERDAEME
Mr. G. VAN DUYSE

Brazil: Mr. A. CELSO DE OURO PRETO

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. I. SOTIROV

Burma: U THEIN AUNG
U THAUNG HTUN

Canada: Mr. R. HARRY JAY
Mr. J.T. SIMARD

Cuba: Mr. L. SOLA VILA
Mrs. V.B. JACKIEWICH

Czechoslovakia. Mr. V. TYLNER

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

Ethiopia: Mr. T. TERREFE

France: Mr. F. DE LA GORCE
Mr. B. D'ABOVILLE
Mr. J-C. PARAVY

German Democratic Republic: Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. S. KAHN
Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

Germany, Federal Republic of: Mr. G. PFEIFFER
Mr. H. MÜLLER

Hungary: Mr. M. DOMOKOS
Mr. C. GYÖRFFY
Mr. A. IAKATOS

India: Mr. S.T. DEVARE

Indonesia: Mr. A. SANI
Mr. J. DAMANIK

Iran: Mr. D. CHILATY

Italy: Mr. M. ALESSI
Mr. C. FRATESCHI

Japan: Mr. M. OGISO
Mr. T. NONOYAMA
Mr. T. IWANAMI

Kenya: Mr. G.N. MUNIU

Mexico: Mr. A. GARCÍA ROBLES
Miss A. CABRERA

Mongolia: Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
Mr. L. BAYART

Morocco: Mr. M. RAHHALI

Netherlands: Mr. A.J. MEERBURG

Nigeria: Mr. T. OLUMOKO

Pakistan: Mr. M. HUMAYUN KHAN
Mr. M. AKRAM

Peru: Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO

Poland:
Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. H. PAC
Mr. M. KRUCZYK
Mr. A. SKOWRONSKI

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

Sri Lanka:
Mr. B. FONSEKA

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

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:
Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. A.I. TIOURENKOV
Mr. M.G. ANTIUKHIN

United Kingdom:
~~Mr. P.H. MOBERLY~~
Mr. P.M.W. FRANCIS

United States of America:
Mr. A. FISHER
Mr. C. FLOWERREE
Mr. A. AKALOVSKY
Mr. T. BARTHELEMY

Venezuela:
Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT
Mrs. R. LISBOA DE NECER

Yugoslavia:
Mr. D. DJOKIĆ

Zaire:
Mr. E. MULONGANDUSU

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I declare open the thirteenth meeting of the Committee on Disarmament. There are no names on the list of speakers for this meeting and I should like to ask delegations whether any of them wishes to speak on this part of our work.

As no one wishes to do so, I would draw the Committee's attention to the following: at our eleventh meeting on Thursday, 15 February, the Committee adopted a decision relating to the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and to Identify Seismic Events. On the proposal of one delegation and as a result of informal consultations among delegations, there appears to be general agreement that this Committee should devote the week from 5 to 9 March to consideration of the report produced by those scientific experts. If the Committee has no objections, I will take it that the proposal I have just mentioned is approved.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): Consequently, the week from 5 to 9 March will be set aside for consideration of the report of that Group. Does any delegation wish to speak? As no one wishes to do so, we will close the formal meeting and proceed at once with the tasks of the Working Group of the Committee on Disarmament. I declare the formal meeting closed.

The meeting rose at 11.05 a.m.

CD/PV.14
27 February 1979
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FOURTEENTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 27 February 1979, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS

(Argentina)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. A. BENSMAIL

Argentina: Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS

Australia: Mr. L.D. THOMSON
Ms. M.S. WICKES

Belgium: Mr. P. BERG
Mr. G. VAN DUYSSE

Brazil: Mr. G.A. MACIEL
Mr. A. CELSO DE OURO PRETO

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. I. SOTIROV

Burma: U THEIN AUNG
U THAUNG HTUN

Canada: Mr. R. HARRY JAY
Mr. J.T. SIMARD

Cuba: Mr. L. SOLA VILA
Mrs. V.B. JACKIEWICH

Czechoslovakia: Mr. H. ^{OV}RUZEK
Mr. V. TYLNER

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

Ethiopia: Mr. G. ALULA

France: Mr. F. DE LA GORCE
Mr. BENOIT D'ABOVILLE
Mr. J-C. PARAVY

<u>German Democratic Republic:</u>	Mr. G. HERDER Mr. S. KAHN Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI
<u>Germany, Federal Republic of:</u>	Mr. G. PFEIFFER Mr. J. PÖHLMANN Mr. H. MÜLLER
<u>Hungary:</u>	Mr. M. DOMOKOS Mr. C. GYÖRFFY
<u>India:</u>	Mr. S.T. DEVARE
<u>Indonesia:</u>	Mr. M. SIDIK Mr. I. DAMANIK
<u>Iran:</u>	Mr. H. FARTASH Mr. D. CHIATY
<u>Italy:</u>	Mr. M. MORENO Mr. C. FRATESCHI
<u>Japan:</u>	Mr. H. OGISO Mr. T. NONOYAMA Mr. T. IWANAMI
<u>Kenya:</u>	Mr. G.N. MUNIU
<u>Mexico:</u>	Mr. A. GARCÍA ROBLES Miss A. CABRERA
<u>Mongolia:</u>	Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG Mr. L. BAYART
<u>Morocco:</u>	Mr. M. RAHHALI
<u>Netherlands:</u>	Mr. F.P.R. VAN MOUHOUS

Nigeria: Mr. K. AHMED
Mr. T. OLUMOKO

Pakistan: Mr. H. KHAN
Mr. M. AKRAM

Peru: Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO

Poland: Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. H. PAC
Mr. B. RUSSIN

Romania: Mr. C. ENE

Sri Lanka: Mr. B. FONSEKA

Sveden: Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. L. NORBERG
Mr. S. STRÖMBÄCK
Mr. S. ERICSON

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics: Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN
Mr. Y.V. KOSTENKO
Mr. N.G. ANTIUKHIN

United Kingdom: Mr. W. MARSHALL

United States of America: Mr. A. FISHER
Mr. A. AKALOVSKY
Ms. B.L. MURRAY
Mr. T. BARTHELEMY

Venezuela: Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT
Ms. D. SZOKOLCZI

Yugoslavia: Mr. B. BRANKOVIĆ

Zaire: Mr. E. MULONGANDUSU

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I declare open the fourteenth meeting of the Committee on Disarmament. There are no names on the list of speakers this morning, and I should like to ask delegations whether any of them wishes to speak on our work. As no one wishes to do so, I think I should draw the Committee's attention to the following: the open Working Group which is drawing up the draft rules of procedure is working intensively and may complete its task today. If so, the Committee on Disarmament could hold an afternoon meeting tomorrow to adopt the rules of procedure. In view of this possibility, the Committee would therefore convene tomorrow at 3 p.m. However, should the Working Group not complete its preparation of the rules of procedure, delegations members of the Committee on Disarmament would be notified and the meeting would be cancelled. But in principle I consider that we should envisage a meeting tomorrow at 3 p.m. Are there any comments? As there are none I shall close the meeting of the Committee, and the Working Group will meet immediately in this room to continue its deliberations. I declare the meeting closed.

The meeting rose at 11.05 a.m.

CD/PV.15
28 February 1979
ENGLISH

FINAL **RECORD** OF THE FIFTEENTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 23 February 1979, at 4.45 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. D. C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. A. BENSMAIL

Argentina: Mr. D. C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS
Mr. A. N. MOLteni

Australia: Mr. L. D. THOMSON
Ms. M. S. WICKES

Belgium: Mr. P. NOTERDAEME
Mr. P. BERG
Mr. G. VAN DUYSE

Brazil: Mr. A. CELSO DE OURO PRETO

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. I. SOTIROV

Burma: U SAW HLAING
U THEIN AUNG
U THAUNG HTUN

Canada: Mr. J. T. SIMARD

Cuba: Mrs. V. B. JACKIEWICH

Czechoslovakia: Mr. M. RŮŽEK
Mr. V. TYLNER

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

Ethiopia: Mr. T. TERREFE

France: Mr. F. DE LA GORCE
Mr. B. D'ABOVILLE

German Democratic Republic: Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. S. KAHN
Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

<u>Germany, Federal Republic of:</u>	Mr. J. PÖHLHANN
<u>Hungary:</u>	Mr. M. DOMOKOS Mr. C. CYORFFY
<u>India:</u>	Mr. S. T. DEVARE
<u>Indonesia:</u>	Mr. A. KAMIL Mr. H. SIDIK
<u>Iran:</u>	Mr. H. FARTASH Mr. D. CHILATY
<u>Italy:</u>	Mr. N. DI BERNARDO Mr. M. MORENO Mr. C. FRATESCHI
<u>Japan:</u>	Mr. T. NONOYAMA Mr. T. IWANAMI
<u>Kenya:</u>	Mr. G. N. MUNIU
<u>Mexico:</u>	Mr. A. GARCÍA ROBLES Miss A. CABRERA
<u>Mongolia:</u>	Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG Mr. L. BAYART
<u>Morocco:</u>	Mr. H. RAHHALI
<u>Netherlands:</u>	
<u>Nigeria:</u>	Mr. K. AHMED Mr. T. OLUMOKO
<u>Pakistan:</u>	Mr. M. HUMAYUN KHAN Mr. M. AKRAM
<u>Peru:</u>	Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO

Poland: Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. H. PAC
Mr. M. KRUCZYK
Mr. A. SKOWRONSKI

Romania: Mr. C. ENE

Sri Lanka: Mr. B. FONSEKA

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

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics: Mr. V. L. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. Y. K. NAZARKIN
Mr. M. G. ANTIUKHIN

United Kingdom: Mr. N. H. MARSHALL
Mr. P. M. W. FRANCIS

United States of America: Mr. A. S. FISHER
Mr. C. FLOWEREE
Mr. A. AKALOVSKY
Mr. T. BARTHELEMY

Venezuela: Mr. A. R. TAYLHARDAT
Mrs. R. LISBOA DE NECER

Yugoslavia: Mr. B. BRANKOVIĆ

Zaire: Mr. E. MULONGANDUSU

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I declare open the fifteenth meeting of the Committee on Disarmament. I should like to inform members of the Committee that the Working Group which was set up at our tenth meeting on 13 February 1979 has approved the draft rules of procedure contained in document CD/L.1 and corrigenda 1 and 2. I should also like to draw attention to two small changes which were approved by the Group but which do not appear in the corrigenda. The word "should" in the fifth line of paragraph 19 will be replaced by the word "shall", and the word "should" in the first line of paragraph 44, will also be replaced by the word "shall". I would further draw the Committee's attention to the fact that, as a result of the insertion of the new paragraph contained in corrigendum 1, the paragraphs of the final text of the draft will be renumbered as appropriate. I should also like to request delegations which wish to make changes of a grammatical or drafting nature with a view to bringing the text in their own languages into line with the original English text, on the basis of which we worked, to submit to the Secretariat the amendments which, in their opinion, are most in conformity with the basic text. In submitting the draft rules of procedure to the Committee for approval I should like to make the following statement: it is the understanding of the Chairman, following consultations with members of the Committee, that the rules set forth in paragraph 17, chapter VI, entitled "Conduct of Work and Adoption of Decisions" will also apply to any subsidiary organs the Committee may establish. If there are no objections, I shall take it that the draft rules of procedure contained in document CD/L.1, with corrigenda 1 and 2, and the changes I have just mentioned, are adopted. I see no objections.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): Some delegations have indicated that they wish to take the floor at this stage. I give the floor to the first speaker, the distinguished representative of Algeria.

Mr. BENSMAIL (Algeria) (translated from French): Thank you Mr. Chairman.

As this is the last time that I shall have the honour of taking the floor under your chairmanship, I should like to convey to you my delegation's congratulations on the manner in which you have guided the work of our Committee this month and to reiterate our gratitude for the efforts you have made to bring about the adoption of

(Mr. Bensmail, Algeria)

the rules of procedure of the Committee on Disarmament. This is another entry in the already long list of your successes in the United Nations, and confirms the confidence we have always had in you.

I should like to take this opportunity to give the Ambassador of Australia advance assurances of my delegation's full and entire co-operation in the task he will assume from next week.

In my capacity as Chairman, starting tomorrow, of the "Group of 21", I should like to inform members of that Group that a meeting will be held next Monday at 3 p.m. in this room. The purpose of the meeting is to examine the question of the agenda and programme of work of the Committee on Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I thank my distinguished friend the representative of Algeria for the very kind words he addressed to me. The distinguished representative of Zaire has the floor.

Mr. MULONGANDUSU (Zaire) (translated from French): On behalf of delegations members of the "Group of 21" and on behalf of my own delegation, allow me, Mr. Chairman, to express our gratitude for the work you have accomplished during the month of February. I think I am expressing the feelings of all delegations in stating that you have been Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament every minute, every hour and every day of this month.

For fear of repeating truisms I shall not revert to your well-known international qualities but shall merely confine myself to expressing our admiration of your constant availability in the cause of that peace which we seek through disarmament.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the hours of sleep and rest which, although well deserved, you sacrificed in the interest of the successful outcome of the work of our Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I also thank the distinguished representative of Zaire for his very moving words which I find very touching. The distinguished representative of the United States.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I would also like to join the two preceding Ambassadors who have expressed appreciation for your considerate and skilful work as Chairman of this Committee, that has resulted in us coming to a resolve which most of us did not think would be possible. We are all delighted that it was possible and we have you to thank for it.

I would also like to put on the record a statement with regard to rule 27 of the rules of procedure, which I made in the informal working group on procedures. That rule provides that the Committee will establish its programme of work "taking also into account the recommendations, proposals and decisions referred to in rule 26". Rule 26 provides for the establishment of the Committee's agenda, with the proviso that, in doing so, the Committee take into account the recommendations made to it by the General Assembly, the proposals presented by the members of the Committee and the Committee's decisions.

The final phrase of rule 27 enjoins the Committee to take into account the same recommendations referred to in rule 26. The United States has agreed to the text of rule 27, but wishes to make clear its view that the recommendations of the General Assembly would not be viewed in the same light when considering the programme of work as they would when formulating the Committee's agenda. In the view of the United States, since the agenda will already have taken into account these considerations, and since the programme of work is based on the agenda, the principal considerations which will affect the Committee's decisions on its work programme are its own judgements about which subjects on its agenda can be usefully addressed in a programme of work, taking into account the time available, and the ripeness of a particular subject under negotiation.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I thank the distinguished representative of the United States for the cordial words he addressed to me.

Mr. EL-BARADEI (Egypt): I would be failing in my duties Sir, if I did not express, on behalf of my delegation, our sincere thanks and profound admiration for the skills and abilities you have shown throughout our work. Your dedication, understanding, thorough knowledge and experience, and above all a sense of fairness and objectivity, have no doubt been an essential positive factor in the successful conclusion of our work. May I wish you all the best in your future role as the Ambassador of your country, when I am confident that your distinguished qualities will continue to be put to test for the benefit of our work.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I thank the distinguished representative of Egypt for the friendly and very generous words he has addressed to me.

Mr. AKRAH (Pakistan): I have been asked by the head of my delegation and on the authority of a very good friend of yours, in Islamabad, the Adviser on Foreign Affairs, to convey our deep appreciation for the manner in which you have succeeded in concluding the rules of procedure of this Committee in time. There may have been times, Mr. Chairman, when my delegation, in the discharge of its instructions, may have tested your patience, but as usual you have succeeded in reconciling all views and in bringing together these rules of procedure which reflect the highest common denominator of agreement in this Committee. I shall not comment on any of these rules, but merely state that the Pakistan delegation will abide strictly by these rules of procedure and we shall hopefully, early next month, begin on the first task of substance, that is, the agenda and programme of work.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I thank the distinguished representative of Pakistan and the head of his delegation, Ambassador Agha Shahi, for the very cordial words they were kind enough to address to me.

Mr. NOTERDAEME (Belgium) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, at the end of this first month of work by the Committee on Disarmament I simply wish to address to you a few words on behalf of my delegation, but in doing so I am sure that I am also reflecting the feelings of other delegations of the Western Group. On behalf of those delegations, I wish to say how much we have appreciated the zeal, devotion and, above all, skill, with which you have conducted our work. We are grateful to you and we already have one result of this work before us, namely, the rules of procedure. On behalf of all these delegations, Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you very sincerely.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I also thank the distinguished representative of Belgium for his very kind and cordial words, which I greatly appreciate.

Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, I asked for the floor to make a short statement which concerns Section IX of the rules of procedure which have just been adopted. Before I do so, I should like to join others in thanking you for your sterling work. I think that this Committee is very lucky to have had an early piece

(Mr. Marshall, United Kingdom)

of good fortune, that the random chance of the alphabet should have provided us with somebody so excellently qualified to have achieved what we have achieved and to have guided us throughout this month.

The point of substance is very brief; it is that, as a result of the wording finally agreed for paragraph 32, the rules do not contain any explicit statement that the Committee is free to invite any non-member State to take part in the work of a subsidiary body such as, for example, the seismic Group. There is authority for such an invitation set out in paragraph 34, but in view of the ambiguity of the reference to "the States referred to in rules 32 and 33", I am instructed to put the following on record: "It is the understanding of my delegation that rule 34, that is, rule 35 in the final version, shall not be interpreted as restricting the ability of the Committee to invite any State not a member of the Committee to take part in the work of subsidiary bodies."

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I also thank the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom for the cordial words he was kind enough to address to me.

Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, as I am aware of your modesty and, as I am not in favour of repetition, I am not going to repeat today what, on various occasions throughout the month in which we have been lucky enough to have you as Chairman of our work -- the last occasion was yesterday -- I have said. Allow me only to extend to you many thanks and sincere congratulations.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I very sincerely thank my dear friend Ambassador García Robles for the words of friendship he addressed to me.

Does any other delegation wish to take the floor?

Mr. DOMOKOS (Hungary) (translated from French): During the course of the work of the Committee, and more particularly of the Working Group, I had the privilege of expressing to you my personal admiration and congratulations on the work accomplished as a result of your unflagging initiative which has brought us to today's happy outcome, namely, the adoption of our Committee's rules of procedure.

Today I should like to reiterate these congratulations on behalf of the countries members of the socialist groups. Your competence and wealth of experience, coupled

(Mr. Domokos, Hungary)

with the spirit of understanding and co-operation of delegates were -- and I can say this without exaggeration -- the determining factor in our success. We can certainly hope that the Committee will be able to count on your assistance and rich experience in the future as well.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I thank the distinguished representative of Hungary, Ambassador Domokos, and through him the members of the Group of socialist countries, for his very moving words, which I greatly appreciate.

If no other delegations wish to take the floor we can conclude our work.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Today the Committee on Disarmament has adopted its rules of procedure. Allow me in this connexion to express thanks to all delegations for their constructive and businesslike approach to the solution of this important task.

I should like to express special thanks to Ambassador de Rozas, the distinguished representative of Argentina and Chairman of our Committee, who has shown a maximum of patience, great presence of mind and flexibility in concerting our efforts in connexion with the elaboration of the rules of procedure.

The work on the rules of procedure has demonstrated the spirit of co-operation present in the Committee. We hope that the same spirit of co-operation will be maintained in solving problems of substance. The Soviet delegation considers that the Committee should proceed as soon as possible to the consideration of problems of substance. We are concerned by the fact that one and a half months have already gone by since the Committee started its work, and yet not one question of substance has yet been examined. We are now to consider the annual agenda and programme of work. We think that the Committee could simultaneously begin the examination of problems of substance, i.e. disarmament problems. That is what the peoples and public opinion of the whole world expect from us.

As for the rules of procedure which have been adopted, all that the Committee still has to discuss is one minor question concerning annex I. We express the hope that the Committee will quickly succeed in adopting a decision on this matter as well.

In conclusion, allow me to express good wishes to the representative of Australia, who will occupy the post of Chairman during the next month.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of the Soviet Union, Ambassador Issraelyan, for his warm words of congratulation and encouragement.

Mr. DE LA GORCE (France) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, I, in turn, should like to pay you a tribute and a particularly warm and friendly tribute. Your claims to our gratitude go back much further than this period of our work and I wish here to remind you that the work you accomplished with so much ability and authority during the preparatory period for the special session were held in particularly high esteem by my country's highest authorities. You placed your talent, experience, judgement and very exceptional diplomatic gifts at the service of our work during this very difficult and important initial phase. In discharging your functions you constantly paid particular attention to the problems of each delegation. You did so with the greatest concern, with much imagination -- a particularly precious quality in diplomatic functions -- and also with much friendship, sensitivity and understanding of the needs of each of us.

Apart, therefore, from your gifts as a great diplomat, we have appreciated your human qualities which we have all held in such esteem and, on behalf of my delegation, I should like to join those who have expressed their profound gratitude to you. We extend very sincere and warm good wishes to you, Mr. Chairman, and we shall, of course, expect you to make a particularly valuable contribution to the work of this Committee which has the honour to count you -- and I hope for a long time to come -- as one of its members.

I wish, of course, to express my warmest wishes to our distinguished colleague from Australia who will succeed you as Chairman tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I thank the distinguished representative of France, Ambassador de la Gorce, for his very moving words which I must probably attribute to our long-standing friendship. Gentlemen, I should like, before closing the meeting, to thank you all very deeply and warmly not only for the over-generous words you have addressed to me and which I do not at all deserve although I should like to believe them, but also for your collaboration during the month of February when, as a result of the principle of geographic rotation, I had the honour of serving as Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament. It is this collaboration, on which I could always rely, that enabled us to bring our work to a successful conclusion. The congratulations you have so kindly extended to the Chair should in the final analysis be addressed to each and every one of you because it is thanks to a spirit of mutual understanding, flexibility and desire to reach compromise formulas that we have achieved a consensus on the rules of procedure that

(The Chairman)

the Committee has just adopted. . . I consider that this exercise and the experience we have gained during the month of February augur well for the work ahead of the Committee. We have shown, in practice, that it is possible to take decisions by consensus when there exists flexibility, a spirit of compromise, co-operation and, above all, understanding of mutual positions. To you all, therefore, my cordial and sincerest thanks. I should like to express similar thanks to all members of the Secretariat who have worked tirelessly -- often after working hours -- either to prepare our documents or to interpret the statements made by delegations in the Working Group. They deserve the collective gratitude of our Committee. Finally, I should like, on my own behalf and on behalf of all of you, to extend to Ambassador Thomson, the distinguished representative of Australia, our best wishes and the assurances of our collaboration so that under his chairmanship the work of the Committee on Disarmament will continue to advance.

The next meeting of the Committee will take place in this room on Tuesday, 6 March, at 10.30 a.m. under the chairmanship of Australia. I declare the meeting closed.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.

CD/PV.16
6 March 1979
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIXTEENTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 6 March 1979, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. L.D. THOMSON (Australia)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. A. BENSMAIL

Argentina: Mr. F.J. DÁVILA
Mr. A.N. MOLteni

Australia: Mr. L.D. THOMSON
Mr. A.J. BEHM
Ms. M.S. WICKES

Belgium: Mr. P. NOTERDAEME
Mr. P. BERG
Mr. G. VAN DUYSSE

Brazil: Mr. G.A. MACIEL
Mr. A. CELSO DE OURO PRETO

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. I. PETROV
Mr. I. SOTIROV

Burma: U SAW HLAING
U THAUNG HTUN

Canada: Mr. R. HARRY JAY
Mr. J.T. SIMARD

Cuba: Mr. L. SOLA VILA
Mrs. V.B. JACKIEWICH

Czechoslovakia: Mr. V. TYLNER
Mr. L. STAVINOHÁ

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

Ethiopia: Mr. T. TERREFE

France: Mr. F. DE LA GORCE
Mr. B. D'ARBOVILLE

German Democratic Republic: Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. S. KAHN
Mr. H. GRACZYNSKI

Germany, Federal Republic of: Mr. G. FELLIFER
Mr. J. POHLMANN
Mr. H. MULLER

Hungary: Mr. H. DOJOKOS
Mr. C. GYÖRFFY
Mr. A. LAKATOS

India: Mr. S.T. DEVARE

Indonesia: Mr. A. KAMIL
Mr. M. SIDIK

Iran: Mr. H. FARTASH
Mr. D. CHILATY

Italy: Mr. N. DI BERNARDO
Mr. M. MORENO
Mr. C. FRATESCHI

Japan: Mr. H. OGISO
Mr. T. NONOYAMA
Mr. T. IWANAMI
Mr. R. ISHII

Kenya: Mr. G.N. MUNIU

Mexico: Mr. A. GARCÍA ROBLES
Miss A. CABRERA

Mongolia: Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
Mr. L. BAYART

Morocco: Mr. H. RAHHALI

Netherlands:

Mr. R.H. FEIN
Mr. A.J. MEERBURG

Nigeria:

Mr. O. ADENIJI
Mr. T. OLUMOKO

Pakistan:

Mr. H. AKRAH

Peru:

Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO

Poland:

Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. H. PAC
Mr. M. KRUCZYK
Mr. A. SKOWRONSKI

Romania:

Mr. C. ENE
Mr. V. TUDOR
Mr. T. MELESCANU

Sri Lanka:

Mr. B. FONSEKA

Sweden:

Mrs. I. THORSSON
Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. S. STRÖMBÄCK
Mr. U. ERICSSON

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. A.M. VAVILOV
Mr. A.I. TIOURENKOV
Mr. Y.V. KOSTENKO
Mr. M.G. ANTIUKHIN
Mr. I.P. PASECHNIK
Mr. O.K. KEDROV

United Kingdom:

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

United States of America:

Mr. A. FISHER
Mr. C. FLOWERREE
Mr. A. AKILOVSKY
Mr. R. MIKULAK
Mr. I. FILSON
Mr. M.L. SANCHEZ
Mr. M. DALEY
Mr. B. KILLIAN

Venezuela:

Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT
Mrs. R. LISBOA DE NECER

Yugoslavia:

Mr. D. DJOKIĆ
Mr. B. BRANKOVIĆ

Zaire:

Mr. E. MULONGANDUSU
Mr. H. LOPOMBO
Mr. B. BASUMBA

Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden): As I understand it, this is the first plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament during the month of March and, consequently, with the distinguished representative of Australia in the chair. Being the first speaker this morning, I should like to extend to you, Mr. Chairman, my most sincere congratulations and my firm belief that, under your leadership the work of the Committee on Disarmament during this month will proceed efficiently and effectively.

Since this is the first time that I take the floor during the 1979 session of the Committee on Disarmament I would also like to extend my greetings to all distinguished delegations of the Committee. In doing so I wish to extend a special word of welcome to the delegations of those countries which are taking part in these multilateral disarmament negotiations for the first time.

The purpose of my intervention today is to express the views of the Swedish Government on the present status of the negotiations regarding a comprehensive test ban treaty. I will in that context discuss the progress report of the seventh session of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and to Identify Seismic Events. This report is presented to the CD today. Finally, I should like to make some general and preliminary remarks with regard to document CD/4 which contains views and suggestions on a possible approach in the CD to the question of nuclear disarmament.

The highest priority must be accorded by the Committee on Disarmament to the question of a comprehensive ban on all nuclear weapons tests. Although a test ban treaty does not, in our view, in itself constitute a disarmament measure it would be highly instrumental in the efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation.

The present status of the CTB question gives cause for grave concern on the part of the Swedish Government. Sweden, as a non-nuclear-weapon State, prepared a draft treaty text and submitted it to the CCD in March 1977. We later welcomed the announcement in mid-1977 that the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom were engaged in trilateral talks on the subject. The fact that at long last substantive negotiations had started inspired great expectations, and we placed much trust and confidence in the negotiating Powers. From reports that reached us we got the impression that the negotiations were progressing fast and we were led to believe that their conclusion could be attained within a relatively short period of time. Today it is regrettably clear that recent developments in the matter do not come up to earlier well-founded expectations.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

The Swedish Government is deeply disappointed at the lack of final results in the trilateral talks which has further delayed the multilateral CTB negotiations.

This, I believe, represents not only the view of the Swedish Government, but that of numerous other Governments, as well as hopes and aspirations all over the world. Suffice it to recall that the international community has at its highest political level -- the United Nations General Assembly -- repeatedly appealed to the three States to submit a draft treaty on a comprehensive test ban to the multilateral negotiating body. Particular importance was attached to resolution 32/78 of 12 December 1977 in which the General Assembly at its thirty-second session urged the three nuclear-weapon States to expedite their efforts as to enable the CCD to submit a draft CTB treaty to the United Nations special session devoted to disarmament. The support of the three nuclear-weapon States for this resolution constituted a clear expression of their political will and a commitment to initiate multilateral negotiations in advance of the special session.

Furthermore, in two different resolutions the General Assembly at its thirty-third session made urgent appeals to the three States to expedite their negotiations. Many Governments, including my own, have recently with increased emphasis made appeals in the same direction.

It is a matter of acute concern for the international community that, in spite of the great urgency of the matter, the three nuclear-weapon States have not concluded their CTB negotiations and that there is no firm indication as to when the results thereof can be expected.

We are all aware that certain extremely difficult problems in the negotiations have in fact been successfully resolved by the joint efforts of the three negotiating Powers. At the same time the importance of a successful conclusion of the negotiations has been underlined by recent developments. It is therefore reasonable to expect that the remaining difficulties can also be solved.

While the conclusion of a CTBT has been delayed, the testing of nuclear explosions, and thus the development of nuclear weapons, have continued unabated. Observations and analyses made at the Hagfors Observatory in Sweden showed that in all 48 nuclear explosions were conducted in 1978. Two out of three Chinese explosions were conducted in the atmosphere, spreading radioactive particles throughout the northern hemisphere. This addition of radioactivity -- although small -- to our environment is unacceptable.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

Ten nuclear explosions were observed to have taken place in the United States, while six French and two British explosions were recorded. Twenty-seven of the nuclear explosion tests during 1978 were carried out by the Soviet Union. To judge from the numbers, this is the most intense testing by the Soviet Union since the partial test ban treaty went into force in 1965. This significant increase in testing is evidence of the need for a rapid conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty.

In order to enable the CD to fulfil the task assigned to it by the United Nations General Assembly in respect of such a treaty, it is of crucial importance that it possesses a clear understanding of the present status of the trilateral negotiations. For that reason I reiterate the suggestion made in this Committee on 24 January by the Swedish Foreign Minister to the effect that the three Powers give the members of the Committee a full account of the remaining difficulties. That could be done in a closed meeting.

After these general remarks on the CTB matter, I will now turn to the progress report of the seismological expert group. The Swedish delegation finds the work of the expert group to be a most valuable contribution to efforts to establish a monitoring system acceptable to all. The progress report before you is the result of considerable work carried out by scientific experts from a number of countries around the world. The Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts was established to specify the characteristics of an international data exchange with the objective of multilateral co-operation in the verification of a CTBT. We had the satisfaction of seeing that a number of States outside the CD also took part in the Group: Austria, Denmark, Finland, New Zealand and Norway. We also very much welcome the participation of Mexican experts and the representatives of WMO.

The work of the Group concerns the verification of a test ban and is of vital importance for the whole CTBT question.

The experts provided us already in 1978 with a very solid report (CCD/558), in which they unanimously proposed a data exchange between some 50 stations around the globe, using WMO channels for data transmission and some special data centres for the handling and analysis of the data. In this way States would be provided with basic information for evaluating compliance with the CTBT. This proposal already in itself was a significant contribution to the solution of the verification problem.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

The experts are now in the process of preparing a second report which elaborates on the data exchange in technical detail and outlines experimental investigations.

In the progress report now before us it is suggested that a report on these matters should be given to the CD before the end of its session this summer.

I therefore formally propose that the CD takes note of the progress report and takes a decision on the dates of the next meeting.

I now want to say a few words on working paper CD/4, submitted by seven States members and introduced by Ambassador Issraelyan on 6 February.

My delegation has taken note with great interest of this working paper containing views and suggestions on a possible approach in the CD to the question of nuclear disarmament. The proposal of the seven socialist States to initiate consultations and negotiations on nuclear disarmament in this Committee addresses itself to the most urgent priority item in the programme of action adopted by the General Assembly's special session devoted to disarmament. That in itself makes it an important proposal. At the same time the working paper involves a number of very complex and delicate questions. Some of these were commented on by Ambassador Issraelyan in his statement on 6 February.

The Swedish Government is still in the process of considering various important aspects of the proposal, and I am therefore not prepared to make any detailed and precise comment on it today. I would, however, already at this stage like to make some remarks of a general and preliminary nature.

Concrete and substantial nuclear disarmament measures are necessary for many reasons, some of which are still more compelling today than they were only a few years ago. From many points of view disarmament negotiations, and particularly those relating to nuclear arms, are the concern of all nations. Global and regional security is profoundly affected by the ongoing arms race and conversely by any substantial measure of control and disarmament which can be achieved. When the leading military Powers decide to conduct negotiations on the basis of limited participation, as for instance in the case of the strategic arms limitation talks, these negotiations have a bearing on the ultimate security of other countries as well. All countries have a legitimate interest in their initiation, conduct and eventual results.

The CD was constituted as the principal forum for disarmament negotiations pursuant to the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly. The CD should in principle be fully utilized for the implementation of the programme

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

of action contained in that document. Against this background, the Swedish Government welcomes the multilateral approach to nuclear disarmament negotiations contained in the working paper. Paragraph 43 of the programme of action embodies another fact of principal importance with respect to nuclear disarmament which applies regardless of the method of negotiation. In accordance with this paragraph, nuclear-weapon States which possess the most important nuclear arsenals bear a special responsibility for achieving nuclear disarmament.

An important consequence of this principle is embodied in paragraph 52 stating that the USSR and the United States should conclude a SALT II agreement at the earliest possible date, and let it be followed promptly by further SALT negotiations between the two parties, leading to agreed significant reductions of and "qualitative limitations" in strategic arms. Urgent and vigorous pursuit, to a successful conclusion, of ongoing negotiations and urgent initiation of further negotiations among the nuclear-weapon States are subsequently called for in the Final Document.

To sum up, as I see it there are three important aspects which must be evaluated in relation to the working paper CD/4. The first aspect is the fact that the United States and the Soviet Union bear a special responsibility for the process towards nuclear disarmament. The second is the question of the substance of possible multilateral negotiations. The programme of action enumerates in paragraph 50 the specific sectors where agreement at appropriate stages and with adequate measures of verification are urgently required. In this context I would like to recall the Swedish working paper of 30 January 1978, in which we identified five stages by which nuclear disarmament would have to be attained. The third aspect is the method or complementary methods of negotiations chosen to achieve concrete results. We are, I repeat, aware of the fact that an undertaking along the lines of working paper CD/4 involves numerous extremely difficult political and technical problems. At this juncture I will merely state that the Swedish delegation will follow this issue with great attention and is prepared to take part in possible consultations. We intend to revert to the matter with more detailed comments at a later stage.

Mr. OGISO (Japan): First of all, on behalf of my delegation, I would like to congratulate your Excellency on your assumption of the high office of Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament. I am confident that, under your leadership and competent guidance, this Committee will prove to be most successful.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to His Excellency Ambassador Rozas, who guided this Committee for the month of February to a successful adoption of the rules of procedure.

As we start deliberations on the progress report of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts on seismic events, I should like to express the views of the Japanese Government on the question of a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty which has the highest priority in the negotiations of this Committee.

Needless to say, nuclear disarmament is the most urgent task in the field of disarmament, and the first step toward achieving the goal of nuclear disarmament is a comprehensive nuclear test ban. A comprehensive nuclear test ban will contribute to halting the endless nuclear arms race by preventing the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons, and enhancing nuclear non-proliferation by opening the comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty to non-nuclear-weapon States.

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is, in spite of its inherent inequality, the most important existing international legal framework for preventing nuclear proliferation and, as such, with a view to preventing nuclear proliferation, many non-nuclear-weapon States -- including Japan -- have acceded to the Treaty. The Treaty stipulates that the non-nuclear-weapon States must renounce nuclear armaments, but nuclear-weapon States, in their turn, undertake "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control". That is why the nuclear-weapon States have been strongly urged to realize a comprehensive nuclear test ban at the earliest opportunity.

The Government of Japan has stressed that it is the lack of political will on the part of the nuclear-weapon States that has hindered the realization of a comprehensive nuclear test ban. In this respect, it was considered a forward-looking political decision by the leaders of the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States when they started tripartite negotiations on CTB in March 1977.

It was an expression of the expectations of the world for the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty that the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament urged in paragraph 51 of its Final Document that the negotiations on "a treaty prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests, and a protocol covering nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, which would be an

(Mr. Ogiso, Japan)

integral part of the treaty" should be concluded urgently. It is particularly so in the light of the nature of this document which was adopted by consensus.

Responding to such expectations, the distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom in his capacity as a representative of the tripartite negotiating parties made two progress reports to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Namely, he stated on 16 March 1973 that "Substantial progress has been made towards agreement on the provisions of a treaty prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests and a protocol covering nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes which would be an integral part of the treaty. A number of important points have already been agreed; on some outstanding issues, the differences between the positions of the participants have narrowed", and he further stated on 8 August 1978 that "It can be reported with satisfaction that significant progress has been made in recent months in several areas of the negotiations. The delegations have proceeded beyond an exchange of views on their basic approaches and principles and are now addressing elements of agreement that have emerged as well as specific points that remain to be resolved".

Almost one year has passed since the distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom said in his report to the CCD that substantial progress had been made. I appreciate the serious negotiations continued by the three parties concerned during that period. But the Committee on Disarmament has not so far received any results from the tripartite negotiations. If the Committee on Disarmament, as a negotiating body, cannot start concrete negotiations on the urgent task of a comprehensive nuclear test ban when it has completed its work on organizational matters such as the rules of procedure and agenda because the results of the trilateral negotiations have not been submitted to it, it would be a most disappointing situation, not only for this negotiating body which was opened and blessed by high-ranking dignitaries including many foreign ministers, but also for world public opinion. Of course we do not totally ignore the arguments that elucidation of the details of the outstanding issues in the negotiations may complicate the efforts of the parties concerned. I would, however, like to remind the Committee that this explanation was made by the representative of the

(Mr. Ogiso, Japan)

negotiating parties almost one year ago, and that it is considered that general agreements have already been reached on important and basic points.

While expecting that the current tripartite negotiations will be concluded urgently and negotiations on a treaty text will be started expeditiously in this Committee, I should like to express the views of my delegation on some of the questions which are of particular interest to my country in formulating the draft treaty.

It may be inferred from the views expressed at the CCD by the States which are especially concerned that the main outstanding issues concerning a comprehensive test ban are the question of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes and the question of verification. As to the issue of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, my delegation has consistently taken the position, as I have repeatedly said in my past interventions, that no nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes should be conducted unless an agreement is reached on appropriate international arrangements for supervision and procedures to prevent loopholes. If the comprehensive test ban allows peaceful nuclear explosions, there would be a risk that non-nuclear-weapon States might acquire the techniques for nuclear explosions under the guise of peaceful purposes, and that nuclear-weapon States will find ways round the ban on nuclear-weapon testing.

We now assume that agreements, at least in principle, on the suspension on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, similar to those Japan has always maintained, have been reached, in the light of the progress report made by the distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom on 3 August last year in which it is stated that "The three negotiating parties are agreed that the treaty should establish a ban on any nuclear weapon test explosion in any environment and that the provisions of a protocol which would be an integral part of the treaty, would apply to nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes"; and this was confirmed by the United Kingdom delegate in his statement on 24 January this year at this Committee.

(Mr. Ogiso, Japan)

With respect to the question of verification, there are two issues: (1) on-site inspections, and (2) seismic data exchange. As regards on-site inspection, the Japanese delegation considers that in addition to verification by seismological methods, which I will touch on shortly, and other national means, it will require on-site inspection as a supplementary means to ascertain verification when there is any doubt. Nevertheless, if detailed agreements are reached facilitating seismological means of detection and verification by other national means, the need for on-site inspection may be somewhat less than if there is no such agreement. In this respect, there may remain the possibility of considering the method of "verification by challenge" as proposed by Sweden.

As my delegation proposed at the CCD on 3 March 1977, the establishment of an international system of seismic data exchange through which all seismic data can be collected without delay will be necessary in order to detect and identify underground nuclear tests. In this connexion, I should like to pay tribute to the work of the Ad Hoc Group of Experts on seismic events which has been making positive contributions under the auspices of the CCD and the CD since August 1976. In particular, my delegation welcomes the close co-operation between the Group of Experts and the World Meteorological Organization which has been worked out by the participation of the representatives of WHO at the seventh session of the Ad Hoc Group this year.

The distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom in his progress report on 16 March last year stated that "The USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States share the widely-held view that an international exchange of seismic data will play a major role in verification of compliance with the Treaty", and added that "They agree that the guidelines for setting up and running the international seismic exchange should be laid down in an annex to the treaty, and that the detailed organizational and procedural arrangements for implementing the international exchange should be worked out after the entry into force of the treaty, drawing on the recommendations contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Group". The experimental exercises of the seismic

(Mr. Ogiso, Japan)

data exchange system, as was proposed by the Group, will contribute to the drawing up of the "guidelines" to be provided in an annex to the CTB treaty. It will also make the prompt implementation of the provisions of the CTB treaty possible after its entry into force, since the experimental exercises will facilitate the formulation of what the United Kingdom progress report called the "detailed organizational and procedural arrangements" as soon as possible after the treaty enters into force or, as the case may be, they will make such arrangements come into effect concurrently with the entry into force of the treaty. From this point of view, it would be a significant contribution for progress towards the conclusion of the CTB treaty if the Committee, at an appropriate stage following the proposal of the Ad Hoc Group, decides to hold experimental exercises of the seismic data exchange system before the entry into force of the treaty.

It may also be necessary to consider the establishment of a standing committee of experts from which advice may be made available regarding the scientific and technical problems of verification, including the international data exchange system.

The verification system of the CTB treaty will be more effective and strengthened if, in addition to the international system of seismic data exchange, concrete agreements could be reached on facilitating verification by national means such as the setting up, on a reciprocal basis, of appropriate numbers of "black boxes" or tamper-proof automatic stations, and observation by satellites, as I stated on 17 August last year in the CCD.

In concluding my remarks, I should like to remind the distinguished delegates of resolution 33/71C adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-third session, and strongly appeal to all States, and in particular, all nuclear-weapon States, to refrain from conducting any testing of nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices pending the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty.

I should also like to urge France, which has joined this Committee, and China, which has not so far attended it, to participate actively in the negotiations on nuclear disarmament.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): Today I wish to make some remarks on the following issues. I wish to introduce a technical working paper in the field of seismology. I intend to make some observations on the last meeting of the Ac Hoc Group of seismological experts, and I shall touch upon our work during the spring session.

Scientists in the field of seismology have developed several methods of identifying seismic events, that is to say, of distinguishing between earthquakes and underground explosions. Most of these methods have been described in one or more of the numerous working papers of the CCD as well as in the first report of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and to Identify Seismic Events. Although several acceptable seismic identification methods exist nowadays, the search for other methods and the testing of existing methods continues. It is desirable to have a wider choice of independent and verified seismic identification methods to reinforce confidence in the identification of a particular event.

One of the methods discussed in the past is to make use of the fact that an explosion and an earthquake behave differently at the source. An explosion can be characterized by a sudden outward motion in which energy is radiated equally in all directions. With an earthquake this is not the case, the energy radiation depending upon the position of the plane along which shear motion occurs in the earthquake source. Theoretically, it would therefore be possible to distinguish between an earthquake and an explosion by measuring the motions, and especially the initial motions of the direct waves around the source of the seismic event.

The practical possibilities of using this particular identification method has now been studied by Netherlands experts, who came to the conclusion that the method can only be used under certain restricted circumstances. The study is described in working document CD/7 now being tabled. It is clear from the study that one cannot use the method altogether on its own with confidence for the identification of seismic events, but it can provide valuable additional support for the conclusions of other seismic identification methods. It is also shown that the effectiveness of the method depends very much on the location of the event with respect to the seismic stations of the monitoring network.

We in the Netherlands considered it worthwhile to present to you this study on an additional identification method which could be useful in a future international seismic network in the context of a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

During the last two weeks the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and to Identify Seismic Events held its seventh session. Quite some progress was made in the Group and in its sub-groups on a number of technical details of the international seismic system which will be needed in the context of a comprehensive test ban treaty. In its work, the Group based itself, of course, on the first report of the Group, CCD/558. As we can see in the latest progress report of the Group, a rather substantial delay is requested for the submission of its second report. Although there may be some valid technical reasons for this delay -- in particular to develop a number of technical annexes to the report -- my delegation wishes to express concern at the pace at which progress is being made. We are under the impression that other than technical reasons were also involved in requesting the delay.

My delegation would have hoped that the work of the Group could have been finished somewhat earlier, thus making it easier for countries to start the requested preparations and technical tests of elements of the future system. Such small-scale tests could be very helpful in obtaining a better idea of which resources a country needs to participate in the final system. The second report of the seismic Group, which should describe quite a number of regulations and instructions, would have been very helpful in assessing these aspects. Considering the fact that a draft CTB treaty could be presented to the CD within a few months -- I hope -- it must be clear that my delegation can only reluctantly agree to a postponement of the presentation of a second report to the summer. I also hope that the report will contain clear-cut recommendations.

Several members of this Committee have proposed the holding of a so-called "experimental exercise", that is, a test of the whole future seismic system to be used in the context of a CTB. In fact, the first report of the seismic Group recommends such an experimental exercise. This would be a complete test-run of a duration of about one year of the necessary seismic network -- data gathering, communications, analysis in data centres and at the national level, etc. -- to see whether the system works well, to ascertain what the problems are and what capabilities the system has to detect underground nuclear explosions under test ban conditions.

Now, the practical problems of having such a complete exercise are rather substantial. The seismic network exists only partly at the moment. Moreover, experts from one nuclear-weapon State have maintained that such an experimental exercise can only be held after the CTB treaty has entered into force, otherwise one would not know which countries would participate in the final system and one could not make a final assessment of the system.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

At first sight, there is some logic to that last argument; but only some. If one waits with an experimental exercise until the CTB treaty has entered into force, there will be no time for such an exercise. As soon as there is a treaty, one must possess the means to verify compliance with it. Therefore, the seismic system must be established immediately after the entry into force of the treaty. There is then no time left for experiments.

It is therefore clear that such an exercise is only useful before the entry into force of a CTB treaty. My Government still hopes that a multilateral CTB will be concluded and signed this year. This leaves very little time for preparations. It is more difficult to predict when the treaty will enter into force.

We have now three options: (a) We start the exercise now; (b) A full scale experimental exercise will never be held; (c) The decision to hold an exercise is taken as soon as the multilateral CTB treaty shapes up.

In principle my delegation prefers option (a). However, apart from the technical problems inherent in starting such a project very soon, there does not seem to be agreement at present on such a line of action. Since, on the other hand, all seem to agree that an experimental exercise would be useful, to follow option (b) would be a pity. We should therefore consider the possibilities of option (c). I could imagine that, after the submission of a trilateral draft CTB treaty to the Committee, it will soon become clear which countries do seriously plan to join the multilateral test ban treaty. Between that time and the entry into force of the treaty, quite some time will be left. It would really be regrettable if that period were not used for an experimental exercise or, perhaps, smaller-scale experiments. Such experiments would clearly help in establishing the final seismic network at the time of the treaty's entry into force. My delegation would certainly be interested in hearing the views of other delegations on this matter.

I would now like to make a few comments on our work during the remainder of this spring session.

We are all aware of the fact that the disarmament agenda in general -- I am not referring only to this Committee -- is heavily loaded for the coming years. Preparation of review conferences, the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the inhuman weapons question, etc. make it more and more difficult to spend sufficient time on particular CD subjects, certainly for smaller countries. However, we would

(Mr. Fain, Netherlands)

not be fulfilling our obligations in this Committee if we were to stop our work too easily during other conferences, except of course during the General Assembly and other very important meetings. We must not regard the CD as a stop-gap between other gatherings.

Even taking this into account, there is not much time left during the spring meetings. After time-consuming consultations on the rules of procedure, we are now starting the process of developing a substantive agenda. This is an important matter, and I would not be surprised if it took us quite some time. Then we have to agree on a programme of work. This could mean that not much time is left in the spring session for substantive discussions.

Normally speaking, we can only decide on our programme of work after the adoption of the agenda. Nevertheless, it is possible to reserve already now some periods in the spring for substantive discussions on matters we all agree must be tackled in any case. We are doing just that already this week, as we are concentrating on the report of the seismic Group.

In the past too we often spent a week on discussions, formal and informal, on one subject. For a preliminary exchange of views this could sometimes be sufficient. A serious discussion, however, would be impossible in such a short time frame. It would therefore be better to concentrate on one or two items during a longer period of several weeks.

Taking all this into account, I wish to suggest the following. As I said earlier in this Committee, it is perhaps better to delay negotiations on the nuclear test ban until the trilateral talks have produced results. However, in our view, the other item on the priority list of the Committee, the chemical weapons question, is ripe for serious discussion. A widespread feeling exists in this Committee that the CD must now start work on this issue. There is only a slight difference of opinion on how to handle the CW problem. Proposals have been made to establish an ad hoc working group. We have no objection to that idea, but we have the impression that not all countries are willing to take that step now. For my delegation, it is more important to start discussions on the substance of the chemical weapons problem than on the mandate of a possible working group. You will remember the Netherlands working paper CD/6 in which my delegation proposed substantial discussion on a general outline of an agreement on CW without the absolute necessity of setting up a working group. Indeed, we could also do our work in informal meetings of the Committee itself. It is clear, however, that we will need quite some time for such an exercise, and I would therefore like to suggest spending the period of 26 March to 12 April on the CW question.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation welcomed the decision taken by this Committee on 22 February this year to devote the week from 5 March to 9 March to the consideration of the progress report submitted by the Ad Hoc Group of seismic experts.

We learn from the report that the discussion of the various chapters of the final report achieved progress. My delegation hopes that, as a result of the in-depth discussion of the questions involved, the submission of the final report will be possible at the time envisaged by the experts.

The seventh session of the Ad Hoc Group which ended last week succeeded in clarifying additional items. It covered new ground and led to some progress.

A large part of the task entrusted by the CCD in May 1978 -- and confirmed by the CD on 15 February 1979 -- to the experts now seems to be accomplished. An additional number of detailed questions with regard to an international seismic data exchange system have been clarified.

In this context, the participation of two representatives of WMO was of particular value as they were able to give new information on the WMO communication network. They made it possible to arrive at a realistic assessment of the data transmission capabilities of the WMO system.

We welcome and support the offer of the Swedish Government to establish a temporary data centre which will deal with some new aspects of data analysis, in particular the analysis of identification parameters. We also appreciate the Swedish plan to organize a workshop in Stockholm to demonstrate the main functions to be performed by such a centre.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has on various occasions in the United Nations and in the CCD, as well as at the opening session of this Committee, declared its readiness to participate actively in the seismic verification of a CTB. The well-equipped Central Observatory at Graefenberg which has a digital broad-band array enables the Institute to support the Group with a working paper on optimum equipment for a global seismic system. This working paper will be submitted as soon as possible.

We think the short report introduced today shows that the seismic Group has indeed achieved further progress. We are looking forward to the eighth session of the experts to be held from 23 July to 3 August 1979, during which the remaining specific questions will be discussed and, as we hope, if necessary, clarified in smaller sub-working groups. My delegation hopes that the seismic experts will be able to conclude their task and that they will be in a position to submit their final report containing the necessary information and the actual procedure for a

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal Republic of Germany)

practical test run. The Federal Government will continue to support the work of the seismic Group by making the necessary arrangements for the continued participation of an expert from the Federal Republic of Germany.

It is our desire to have at hand a reliable and acceptable verification system at the time when the Disarmament Committee starts its deliberations and negotiations on a complete test ban treaty.

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic) (translated from Russian): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I wish to invite your attention, Sir, to the following.

Today the Secretariat circulated the text of the rules of procedure dated 1 March 1979 (CD/8), and that document also includes an annex I. The impression is, therefore, that the Committee has discussed and indeed adopted annex I as well but, as is known, the Committee did not have enough time to deal with annex I and that question has remained open. Accordingly, I and my delegation interpret the situation as meaning that after delegations have an opportunity to study this document, at least consultations should be held and the Committee should revert to this matter in order to adopt an appropriate decision in connexion with annex I as well.

The CHAIRMAN: It would be my intention that we resume the discussion of the progress report of the Ad Hoc Group of seismic experts on Thursday, when perhaps some further statements will be forthcoming.

We have, I think, this morning had four important statements and, in touching on the explicit subject matter, that is, the progress report of the Ad Hoc Group of seismic experts, delegations have also made a number of observations and indeed some proposals which will be very relevant to the next stage of our work. That is to say, the drafting of the agenda and the programme of work, a stage of our work which I am hopeful we may be able to take up fairly soon. We have one specific proposal before the Committee today, which I would like to refer to, and that is the proposal of the distinguished representative of Sweden, that the Committee should take note of the progress report of the Ad Hoc Group of seismic experts and take a decision on the dates of the next meeting of the Ad Hoc Group. It would be my intention, after appropriate consultations with delegations, to prepare a draft decision on the matter and submit it to the Committee at a later meeting. If there are no further observations, I would propose to adjourn the meeting and we would assemble again on Thursday morning, at 10.30 a.m. to resume discussion of the progress report.

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.

DOCUMENT IDENTIQUE A L'ORIGINAL

DOCUMENT IDENTICAL TO THE ORIGINAL