

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.317
2 July 1985
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND SEVENTEENTH PLENARY MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 2 July 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

President:

Mr. Bachir Ould-Rouis

(Algeria)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria:

Mr. B. OULD ROUIS
Mr. A. BELAID
Mr. L. MOUSSAOUI

Argentina:

Mr. J. CARASALES
Mr. R. GARCIA MORITAN

Australia

Mr. R. BUTLER
Mr. R. ROWE
Miss J. COURTNEY

Belgium:

Mr. M. DEPASSE
Mr. Ph. NIEUWENHUYS

Brazil:

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

Bulgaria:

Mr. K. TELLALOV
Mr. N. MIKHAILOV
Mr. K. STANKOV
Mr. P. POPTCHEV

Burma:

U MAUNG MAUNG GYI
U MYA THAN
U HLA MYINT

Canada:

Mr. J.A. BEESLEY
Mr. R. ROCHON

China:

Mr. QIAN JIADONG
Mr. WANG ZHIYUN
Mr. XIA YISHAN
Mr. JIANG ZHENXI
Ms. ZHOU YUNHUA

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Cuba:

Mr. C. LECHUGA
Mr. H. RIVERO
Mr. J.L. GARCIA

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. A. CIMA
Mr. J. BAJGAR

Egypt:

Mr. S. ALFARARGI
Mr. M. BADR
Mr. F. MONIB
Mr. A. ABBAS

Ethiopia:

Mr. F. YOHANNES

France:

Mr. J. JESSEL

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. H. ROSE
Mr. A. BRIE

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. H. WEGENER
Mr. F. ELBE
Mr. M. GERDTS
Mr. W.N. GERMANN

Hungary:

Mr. D. MEISZTER
Mr. F. GAJDA
Mr. T. TOTH

India:

Mr. S. KANT SHARMA

Indonesia:

Mr. S. SUTOWARDOYO
Mr. B. DARMOSUTANTO
Ms. R. TANZIL
Mr. A.M. AKBAR

Islamic Republic of Iran:

Mr. N. KAZEMI KAMYAB
Mr. F. SHAHABI-SIRJANI

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Italy:

Mr. M. ALESSI
Mr. F. PIAGGESI
Mr. G. ADORNI BRACCESI
Mr. M. PAVESE
Mr. R. DI CARLO

Japan:

Mr. R. IMAI
Mr. M. KONISHI
Mr. K. KUDO
Mr. M. SATO
Mr. T. ISHIGURI
Mr. T. OKADA

Kenya:

Mr. P.N. MWAURA

Mexico:

Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES
Mrs. Z. GONZALEZ Y REYNERO
Mr. P. MACEDO RIBA

Mongolia:

Mr. L. BAYART
Mr. S.O. BOLD

Morocco:

Mr. A. SKALLI
Mr. O. HILALE

Netherlands:

Mr. J. RAMAKER
Dr. A.J.J. OOMS

Nigeria:

Mr. C.V. UDEDIBIA

Pakistan:

Mr. K. NIAZ

Peru:

Mr. P. CANNOCK
Mr. J. GONZALES TERRONES
Mr. J. RUBIO

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

<u>Poland:</u>	Mr. S. TURBANSKI Mr. J. CIALOWICZ
<u>Romania:</u>	Mr. I. DATCU Mr. T. MELESCANU Mr. A. POPESCU Mr. V. FAUR
<u>Sri Lanka:</u>	Mr. A.C.S. HAMEED Mr. J. DHANAPALA Mr. P. KARIYAWASAM
<u>Sweden:</u>	Mr. R. EKEUS Mr. WINGREN
<u>Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:</u>	Mr. A.N. KASHIRIN Mr. M.E. KOKEYEV Mr. V.A. LEPLINSKY
<u>United Kingdom:</u>	Mr. R.I.T. CROMARTIE Mr. R.J. EDIS Mr. K. MALIN Mr. D.A. SLINN
<u>United States of America:</u>	Mr. D. LOWITZ Mr. D. DORN Mr. R. LEVINE Ms. M. WINSTON Mr. D. LAMBERT Mr. S. GARNETT Mr. P. GARDNER
<u>Venezuela:</u>	Mr. O. GARCIA GARCIA

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Yugoslavia:

Mr. K. VIDAS

Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC

Zaire:

Mr. A.N. BAGBENI

Mr. O. MONSHEMVULA

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

Mr. M. KOMATINA

Deputy Secretary-General of the
Conference on Disarmament:

Mr. V. BERASATEGUI

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I declare open the 317th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

First of all I should like to extend a very warm welcome to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka, His Excellency Shahul Hameed, who will address the Conference today. The Minister of Foreign Affairs is very well known to the Conference as an active participant in international affairs. This is not the first time he has honoured the Conference with his presence, as he addressed this multilateral negotiating body on its opening day, 24 January 1979. I thank him very much for his visit to the Conference and I am sure that members will hear his statement with special interest, particularly since Sri Lanka plays an important role in the Conference and in the sphere of disarmament.

I should like to pay tribute to the Ambassador of Zaire, Mr. Bagbeni, who presided in a dynamic and able manner over the work of the Conference during the month of June. I am sure that I am speaking for all members of the Conference in expressing our great appreciation for his praiseworthy efforts.

Before inviting the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka to take the floor, I should like to make a brief statement as President of the Conference for the month of July.

Nearly seven years ago, Algeria had the privilege of presiding over the first meeting of the Committee on Disarmament in this same chamber. Today, on behalf of my country it is my responsibility to direct the work of the Conference for this month. For me, to do so is a privilege, an honour and also a pleasure: I am well aware of the importance of the job, and of its difficulty. I may assure you that I shall spare neither time nor effort in the service of the Conference on Disarmament.

This, then, is the second time since the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament that Algeria has assumed the presidency of this multilateral disarmament body. This is, in my opinion, significant in two ways.

Firstly, it is the sign of a democratization of the discussions on the key issue of disarmament. This is a debate which has finally become the entire world's, because the problem of disarmament is so acute, vast and far-reaching that it affects the concerns and aspirations of all nations.

The fact that Algeria is called upon for the second time to preside over the work of the Conference also signifies that the latter has now concluded its first cycle of six and a half years, in other words about 40 months of meetings. When beginning a second cycle, one is inevitably tempted to look back over the results of these years of work; but if the balance-sheet may be drawn up quite quickly, inasmuch as no significant progress has crowned so much individual and collective effort, we must recognize that the problems remain before us, and have frequently become more pressing and acute. Our Conference is still faced with the same challenge, that of carrying on its work in accordance with the mandate given to it in 1978 by the United Nations General Assembly, namely, to negotiate disarmament agreements and thereby create a real disarmament process.

(The President)

If our work is today even more important, this is basically the result of a growing awareness, throughout the world, of a state of chronic crisis in which relations among nations continued to be dominated by power relationships, despite the solemn declarations and the collective creed of the United Nations concerning peace and co-operation.

At the same time, the arms race, in particular the nuclear arms race, has reached an alarming level, to the point that the danger of the obliteration of our species has become a major concern of world public opinion. About 1,000 billion United States dollars are earmarked for arms and military activities in the world this year alone. At the same time, scores of millions of human beings are subjected to tragic economic conditions or indeed, for many of them, simply faced with the problem of survival.

The arms race cannot be divorced from the profound crisis which affects the various areas of international relations, and it heightens tensions and fuels a more and more uncontrollable vicious circle.

Because of the interdependence which profoundly marks international life today, because of the scale and acuteness of the major contemporary problems -- disarmament, the self-determination of peoples, development and security -- our contribution, through the work of the Conference on Disarmament, is naturally and undeniably part of the broader work of establishing a system of genuine collective security, a system which should be based on the joint prosperity of nations and the shared security of peoples and of States.

From this standpoint, the Conference on Disarmament has an essential role to play by providing a special framework for negotiations and an irreplaceable instrument for continuing dialogue.

This Conference's status as the single multilateral negotiating body, and its renewal in 1978 in the direction of the democratization of the discussions and the wider representation of States and of concerns, together with the issues themselves, have enhanced the importance of the role of the Conference on Disarmament as much as the hopes placed in it by the international community.

The eyes of the world are therefore naturally turned towards us. The fact that our discussions are open to the public is more than symbolic of this contemporary reality.

Algeria has been taking part in the work of the Conference on Disarmament since 1979 to the best of its ability. It makes its modest contribution with faith in the irreplaceable virtues of dialogue and negotiation to settle problems and tackle the major challenges of our time.

Its activity is based on its faith that, for States today, genuine security cannot be validly ensured by force of arms, any more than they can ensure it at each other's expense.

With regard to vital issues -- disarmament and security -- we know that there are many obstacles in our path, some linked with the complexity of the subject, others with current developments, and still others with the very structure

(The President)

of contemporary international relations. But precisely because the endeavour is so complex, precisely because the international situation is so fraught with dangers, all our efforts should be harnessed to work relentlessly to achieve the essential aspirations of mankind as a whole: the right to life and freedom, the right to well-being and development, to the benefit of all peoples.

As States members of this Conference, we share the heavy responsibility of tackling one of the major challenges of our time: disarmament, and especially nuclear disarmament. We assume this responsibility not only with regard to our own peoples but also and above all with regard to mankind as such. We therefore believe that the prevention of nuclear war is of capital importance, and something to which we should collectively address ourselves with the necessary urgency.

To this end, it is necessary for the democratic negotiating machinery established by the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament to be put into practice, in other words, the Conference's negotiating function should be fully utilized. To this end, the political will of all States, and especially of the nuclear-weapon Powers, is of primary importance for the success of our work.

It is true that so far the Conference has not made any significant break-through in the negotiation and conclusion of agreements with a view to concrete disarmament measures. But it cannot be said that we have wasted our time. Any result, however slight, should be appreciated at its true value.

I see no need to carry out a detailed review here of the state of our work on the various agenda items of the Conference, for we all know the present state of affairs as regards the questions as a whole. I should like merely to express the wish that the efforts deployed and the results achieved may be consolidated and serve as a stimulus for further progress. For my part, in my capacity as President, I wish to confirm that I am entirely ready to work without respite to achieve the fruitful conclusion of the work of the Conference, in particular on priority issues.

In saying this, I know that it is the President's duty to be available and to exert every possible effort to advance the work of the Conference. But I shall do so also in the awareness that 1985, the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, is a year that is as symbolic as it is significant.

I should like to take this opportunity to express, on behalf of the Conference on Disarmament, our appreciation to the Government of Switzerland for the lavish manner in which it commemorated this anniversary yesterday, and for the warm hospitality extended to us, on this occasion, in the Canton of Neuchâtel.

For our part, our best contribution to the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations is obviously to submit a positive report containing tangible progress to the General Assembly at its next session. This would show the community of nations which gave us our mandate here that the hopes placed in us were not vain. Furthermore, we would thus certainly have worked to carry into practice one of the fundamental undertakings made by States members under the Charter of the United Nations, that of "saving future generations from the scourge of war".

(The President)

Before concluding this brief statement, I should like to welcome the new representative of France, Ambassador Jessel, to the Conference.

The Conference today begins consideration of item 5 of its agenda, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". In accordance with rule 30 of the rules of procedure, however, any member wishing to do so may raise any matter related to the work of the Conference.

I have on my list of speakers for today the representatives of Sri Lanka, Zaire, China and Mexico.

I now give the floor to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka, his Excellency Shahul Hameed.

Mr. HAMEED (Sri Lanka): Mr. President, may I first and foremost thank you for the kind references you made to my country.

Six years ago I had the pleasure and privilege of addressing this forum on the first day of the first Algerian Presidency. The then Committee on Disarmament had just begun its activities after its creation by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The wheel has now turned a full circle. Today another distinguished representative of friendly, non-aligned Algeria, is in the chair as I address this forum for the second time. The urge to look back is irresistible. What has been achieved in the intervening six years from 1979 to 1985 as the Presidency rotated round this table? Not one single disarmament agreement has emerged from the Conference and not one single measure has been agreed upon which would have the effect of reducing the danger of global conflict and nuclear war. In 1979 the world was spending \$480 billion per annum on armaments. Today that figure has risen to \$1,000 billion. In 1979, 4 countries conducted 53 nuclear tests. Last year 5 countries conducted 53 nuclear tests. The strategic nuclear-weapon stockpile of the United States and the USSR has trebled in these six years. No global war has broken out but we can hardly claim that as an achievement in an atmosphere of tension and power competition and in the face of so many local conflict situations. Not even the recent resumption of bilateral negotiations between the United States and the USSR can assure us that we have progressed since 1979 when agreements already concluded between them are in constant jeopardy.

The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament which created the new global machinery for disarmament was imbued with the same idealism as the Charter of the United Nations, the fortieth anniversary of which we observed last week. It is in the nature of Governments that we should set ourselves a great vision of the world we want. But is it also in the nature of things that we should fail so abysmally to achieve it? No man and no nation pledged to peace and the eradication of the scourge of war can accept that position. The facts of our present situation are well known to us all. The enormous arsenals of nuclear weapons whether for deterrent or for aggressive purposes have failed to engender an atmosphere of peace and security. The choice before us is to dismantle these arsenals or keep adding to them in a limitless fashion. It is not necessary for me to heap statistic upon statistic about the arms race to convince you of the enormity of our folly and the horror that awaits us unless we halt now and reverse the arms race. We must, rather, engage upon an analysis of the situation endeavouring to reach that convergence of view which alone will guarantee common action for our common survival.

(Mr. Hameed, Sri Lanka)

The first area of our inquiry must of course be our own forum. Do the reasons for our failure lie inherent in the way we conduct our proceedings as the single multilateral negotiating body? At the first special session we welcomed the democratization of the machinery for the multilateral deliberation and negotiation of disarmament. Our actual experience of it has fallen short of our expectations. Sri Lanka felt privileged when we were included among the eight new non-nuclear members of this multilateral negotiating forum. It was a recognition that not only the militarily powerful but also the militarily weak should and could be present in this historic Council Chamber to negotiate our common security. The Non-aligned Movement, of which Sri Lanka has been a founder member and former Chairman -- as indeed has your country, Mr. President -- had been from 1961 in the vanguard of the world-wide movement for disarmament. The Fifth Non-aligned Summit in Colombo in 1976 led to the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Final Document of which represents the acme of our achievement. It may be tempting to say that it has been downhill all the way since then -- but that would not only be melodramatic; it would also be untrue. The international community has maintained the structure of disarmament machinery as envisaged and the arena of discussion has been widened. But what has been gained in one dimension has not been matched in others. Sri Lanka's own participation -- modest as it has been in terms of our resources -- has brought us little satisfaction. We would have felt the glow of genuine fulfilment had the Conference on Disarmament produced even one disarmament measure.

There has been no dearth of initiatives and of draft treaties before this forum. The welter of argumentation has been impressive in its volume and incisiveness. The fault "is not in our stars"; nor even in ourselves here. It lies in the political frailties of our time. In this same city the second round of bilateral talks between the United States and the USSR is taking place. The resolution of their antagonism is the key to our problems. This forum has still had no formal notification of the proceedings of these talks despite well established conventions requiring this. We hope these talks will be fruitful although all indications are that we have an indefinite wait for any results. But what is so pronounced is the clearcut demarcation and discontinuity between the bilateral and the multilateral fora. Both fora are undoubtedly necessary. It is their complementarity that we would like to see acknowledged more clearly. It may be that powerful nations preside over our destinies but the limitations of power are only too well-known. The world today is unalterably interdependent. Isolationism and autarchy are obsolete -- however strong the urge may be for it. The need for co-operation in the international community on a multilateral basis is self-evident. Unilateralism and bilateralism cannot and should not be substituted for multilateralism. The Powers which have the biggest nuclear arsenals can come to agreements on their mutual reductions and, as we fervently hope their final elimination. On this there is no debate. They must however have the stamp of endorsement of all nations for disarmament treaties to be global in application and adherence. There can be no odd men out in disarmament negotiations. We are all involved because the stakes concern our common survival.

(Mr. Hameed, Sri Lanka)

Democratization of international institutions is no more a grandiose slogan. It is a concrete reality. The expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament achieves little if we are not in fact to negotiate here. As a representative of a country which has exercised universal suffrage since 1931 and witnessed the working of vigorous parliamentary democratic institution during the last half a century I believe deeply in the maxim "Vox populi: vox dei". The voice of the people is the voice of God. But what if we do not hearken to that voice? Are we not then making a mockery of democratization? The Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament made some believe that disarmament was close at hand as a result. Our experience has belied those expectations.

After the Orwellian year of 1984 we appear to be celebrating 1985 as a year of anniversaries. It is first and foremost the fortieth anniversary of the Charter of the United Nations which was signed on 26 June 1945 in a symbolic act affirming our faith in multilateral co-operation for peace and development. A recent poll in five industrialized countries reveals a popular view that the world is better off with the United Nations than without it. At the same time we have been reminded in this forum and elsewhere that it is also the fortieth anniversary of the end of the last war which embroiled the entire world. It is also 40 years ago that bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki producing that fearful mushroom cloud which has cast its shadow over the past four decades. For us in Afro-Asia it is also the thirtieth anniversary of the Bandung Conference, the non-aligned path to which my country, together with the other four participants of the Colombo Powers Conference of 1954, helped chart. The Bandung Conference, now acknowledged as a mainspring of the Non-aligned Movement, urged in its Final Communique in 1961 the need for disarmament in the following words: "The problem of peace is correlative with the problem of international security. In this connection all States should co-operate, especially through the United Nations, in bringing about the reduction of armaments and the elimination of nuclear weapons under effective international control".

We must not lose sight of the fact that this year has been designated as International Youth Year. It is a sombre task to ponder over what kind of world we shall leave for the youth to inherit. It is a world today where since 1945 more soliders have been killed in wars than were killed in World War II: it is a world where developed countries spend 20 times as much on military expenditure as they provide for economic aid: it is a world where the average world military expenditure for every soldier is \$20,000 whereas the average expenditure on public education for every school-age child is \$380: it is a world where for every 100,000 people there are 556 soldiers but only 85 doctors. We have a choice. A choice either to continue with an unproductive and escalating arms race or to achieve disarmament for our common survival and security. It is a choice between spending \$1 billion on 28,000 jobs in military goods and services or 71,000 jobs in education: of spending \$1,000 billion on arms expenditure or using just one-fifth of that money to abolish world hunger by the year 2000. The burden of responsibility on us in making this choice is tremendous. And yet it has not evoked the response it should.

(Mr. Hameed, Sri Lanka)

Fourteen years ago the United Nations adopted the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace -- an international security measure with which Sri Lanka has been closely associated. Sri Lanka has been Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and has worked strenuously to realize the objectives of the Declaration. The July 1979 Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean was a further milestone in our progress towards the convening of an international conference in Colombo which we would like to see held early so as to begin the process of establishing a zone of peace in our region.

1985 can be the watershed year in disarmament. Two conferences offer us an opportunity of making the right choice in the right direction. The first is the meeting of the Preparatory Committee for a Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. Sri Lanka has worked long and hard with other countries to see this Conference become a reality. We welcome the progress achieved towards holding this Conference as early as possible. It is vitally important to achieve consensus. The conversion of the military-industrial complex of the world into a productive structure that will increase the sum total of human happiness is surely a more certain way of achieving international peace and security than producing the bombs that threaten to annihilate us. The second conference I refer to is the Third Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Sri Lanka became a party to this Treaty nine years after its signature in the conviction that it did present us with an opportunity of achieving a safer world with the measures that were provided for preventing the spread of nuclear weapons both laterally and vertically. I would be less than frank if I did not say that the implementation of the Treaty leaves much to be desired. The ratification of the Treaty was an act of faith by us. That faith should not be betrayed. The opportunity of the Third Review Conference must be grasped to strengthen the credibility of the Treaty.

The agenda of work before this Conference covers a wide spectrum of disarmament issues. We have always believed that the disarmament process is not only a dynamic one but is also to be regarded as an integrated one. The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament stated unambiguously that "nothing should preclude States from conducting negotiations on all priority items concurrently". It is understandable that we should be able to make greater progress in some areas than others. On a nuclear test ban we would like to see urgent work towards a comprehensive test ban particularly since the scientific work regarding the verification of such a ban has made rapid progress. It is obvious that what we need now is the necessary political will to conclude a ban, which is in fact only a preliminary step in the disarmament process. Pending this ban I propose a written agreement on a moratorium on nuclear testing if not among all five nuclear weapon States then at least between the two super Powers. The prevention of nuclear war, which is acknowledged to be the greatest danger facing mankind, must receive greater attention in this body. Differences in security perceptions should not prejudice the initiation of discussions on this subject since the very purpose of having a subsidiary body for this item is to harmonize and accommodate views so as to arrive at a common approach.

(Mr. Hameed, Sri Lanka)

Sri Lanka is happy to note the progress made in the Conference with regard to achieving a chemical weapons ban. It is appropriate that concrete steps are being taken to conclude a Treaty in this sixtieth anniversary year of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 on Chemical and Biological Warfare. The Third World has suffered greatly from the use of these horrible weapons including the use of herbicides aimed at destroying vegetation. We appeal for a speedy resolution of all issues with a view to arriving at a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons.

Sri Lanka has played an active role in seeking the prevention of an arms race in outer space. We welcome the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on this subject as we look forward to constructive work being undertaken under the Chairmanship of Egypt. An examination of the existing body of international law on this subject should not lead to mutual recrimination about violations. Rather it should focus on the lacunae we must cover in a new treaty. We have already lost valuable time. Today we talk of prevention of an arms race in outer space; tomorrow we may, post facto, be compelled to talk about arms control and disarmament in space. Such is the reality of our time that while we are unable to agree on disarmament measures the arms race continues to encompass fresh dimensions. Already commercial interests are vying with each other for contracts for the research on new weapon systems to be followed inevitably by their actual manufacture. The military-industrial complex is transnational in its scope and will compel the blurring of national nuances on this extension of the arms race.

The need to protect non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is an urgent one. These assurances have to inspire confidence. We are glad that the Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons has begun work in a purposeful manner approaching the various issues comprehensively. The work of the Ad Hoc Committee on a comprehensive programme of disarmament under the wise leadership of my learned friend Ambassador García Robles is scheduled to conclude its work this year. The United Nations General Assembly meeting in its fortieth anniversary year awaits the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament and I wish the Ad Hoc Committee all success.

Mr. President, an area not usually addressed in this Conference is the question of conventional weapons. Undoubtedly nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind because it threatens to render the human species extinct. However, the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament identified as one of the priorities in disarmament negotiations the subject of conventional armaments and the balanced reduction of armed forces. Small and militarily weak countries which have by international treaty commitments renounced the nuclear weapon option have to rely on their foreign policy as their shield of defence. This shield has proved too brittle and vulnerable in the recent past. The imbalances and inequalities in one area of the arms race are more immoral and unjust than their duplication in other areas only by degree. The

(Mr. Hameed, Sri Lanka)

alarming development of conventional weapons and their use is of great concern. Four-fifths of the world military expenditure is estimated as being for conventional arms and armed forces. While we live under the threat of nuclear war 150 armed conflicts have been fought on the territories of over 71 States since 1945 accounting for 20 million lives. The manufacture of conventional arms fuels a thriving arms trade into which many Third World countries are drawn -- sometimes even as suppliers. It also fuels the increasingly widespread phenomenon of terrorism and anarchism throughout the world, with proven links to narcotics trafficking, putting into the hands of mindless gunmen sophisticated weaponry with fearful destructive power which imperil innocent lives and the development efforts of poor countries. The global conventional arms trade is today in the region of \$US 35 billion. When weapons are sold deviously to terrorists, Governments are compelled to buy arms from the same salesmen to defend themselves diverting scarce and valuable resources from development expenditure. Only 15 per cent of world military spending is by developing countries while the balance 85 per cent is by the six major military Powers and other industrialized countries. The vast bulk of this is on conventional weapons. It is time that we address frontally and honestly the question of conventional disarmament and curbs on arms transfers. In this connection Sri Lanka has noted with satisfaction the unilateral Declaration of the People's Republic of China on 4 June that it has decided to reduce the People's Liberation Army by 1 million men over a two-year period.

Mr. President, I referred at the beginning of my address to the fact that the wheel had come a full circle, in fact you have said so, with the inauguration of your Presidency today. We could say, as Shakespeare's King Lear did, that we are, all of us, "bound upon a wheel of fire" and that we are still in search of the bliss of disarmament, peace and security. We must urgently seek and find solutions to the problems of the arms race before that wheel of fire destroys the universe not only for us but for generations to come.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka for his important statement and for the kind words addressed to the President. Your Excellency, you may be sure that I grasp the full importance of the symbolism of your making a second statement when Algeria has the privilege of presiding over this Conference. Thank you once again.

I now give the floor to the representative of Zaire, Ambassador Bagbeni.

Mr. BAGBENI (Zaire) (translated from French): Mr. President, allow me, at the beginning of this month of July 1985, when you have just assumed the Presidency of our Conference, to congratulate you warmly on your assumption of this office and to assure you of my delegation's readiness to offer you its unstinting co-operation. I have no doubt that the Conference will make progress in its work under your wise direction.

My delegation's statement will focus on agenda items 1 and 2, in accordance with rule 30 of the rules of procedure of the Conference, as well as on other issues which deserve the Conference's attention at this particularly troubled period in international affairs.

The dangerous developments in world affairs rightly arouse the concern and anxiety of the international community, at a time when the increasingly rapid pace of the arms race and the danger of seeing it spread to new spheres considerably increases the danger of nuclear confrontation.

To halt the arms race and set it on a downwards spiral is in fact to save mankind from the threat of war: that is and must be the principal objective of the efforts of all States members of the Conference on Disarmament.

It is in this spirit that the negotiations in Geneva between the two super-Powers aroused great interest in the international community and struck a spark of hope for the halting of the arms race and for the conclusion of a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests in accordance with paragraphs 48 and 81 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly. That resolution, S-10/2, sets out the special responsibilities incumbent in this sphere on the two super-Powers. In my delegation's view, the only means of preventing nuclear war is to prohibit nuclear weapons totally and destroy them completely.

Indeed, the Secretary-General of the United Nations has said that existing means of verification were sufficient to guarantee compliance with an agreement on a nuclear-test ban and the alleged lack of such means was merely a pretext in order further to develop and refine nuclear weapons!

It is therefore ever more evident that the scientific and technical aspects of the problem of verification have been explored so thoroughly that only political will, or indeed I would say a political decision, is now required to reach final agreement. The United Nations General Assembly has already adopted nearly 50 resolutions and devoted more than 25 years of study to the question of the complete cessation of nuclear-weapon tests.

In this connection I share the views expressed by my colleague and friend Ambassador Ali Skalli of Morocco that "the real obstacle to negotiations for the preparation of a treaty for a complete prohibition of nuclear testing is the lack of genuine political will".

For although the General Assembly in resolution 39/52 condemned for the eighth time all nuclear-weapon tests, they are continuing unabated against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the States Members of the United Nations.

(Mr. Bagbeni, Zaire)

It is in this context that the United Nations General Assembly in resolution 39/52 of 12 December 1984, operative paragraph 7, reiterated its appeal to all States members of the Conference on Disarmament to initiate immediately the multilateral negotiation of a treaty for the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests and to exert their best endeavours in order that the Conference may transmit to the General Assembly at its fortieth session the complete draft of such a treaty.

Given the speed at which the Conference's work on agenda items 1 and 2 is advancing, bearing in mind the attitude of some delegations towards the idea of setting up an ad hoc committee on a nuclear-test ban, there is reason to doubt the possibility of submitting such a draft treaty at the fortieth session of the General Assembly, although this matter is of the highest priority for the entire international community.

In this connection, General Assembly resolution 39/53 of 12 December 1984 was more explicit in stressing the urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. In operative paragraph 4 it urges the Conference on Disarmament to establish at the beginning of its session in 1985 an ad hoc committee under item 1 of its agenda, and to resume its substantive work relating to a comprehensive nuclear-test ban, including the issue of scope, as well as those of verification and compliance, with a view to the negotiation of a treaty on the subject.

The lack of progress by the Conference on Disarmament in this field is becoming more and more disturbing, especially since the General Assembly itself, in resolution 39/60, deeply deplored that the Conference on Disarmament has to date been prevented from carrying out negotiations with a view to reaching agreement on such a treaty.

My delegation considers that consultations should take place either in the form of informal meetings of the Conference or through working groups which should be set up to review, with a view to their implementation by the Conference, all the relevant resolutions of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly taken in relation to items 1 and 2 of our agenda.

Another approach that could advance the Conference's work on agenda items 1 and 2, which I consider to have the highest priority, could be to ask each group to prepare a memorandum or background note on the possibilities of implementing resolutions 39/52, 39/53 and 39/60 before the fortieth session of the General Assembly. These notes or memoranda could then be collated by the secretariat for informal exchanges of views which could lead to genuine negotiations.

For until consultations or negotiations are begun on agenda items 1 and 2, and so long as delegations do not agree to tackle these questions in a determined and realistic manner, it is my bitter conviction that the Conference on Disarmament will practically go round and round in circles without tackling the essential, top-priority subject of nuclear disarmament.

As a national of a developing country, I cannot help considering the impact of an international conference on the relationship between disarmament and development, as has been so judiciously proposed by France.

(Mr. Bagbeni, Zaire)

My delegation considers that if a significant part of the resources were released by disarmament measures, precisely at a time when world military expenditures have reached terrifying proportions -- \$2 million per day, following a trend which contrasts sharply with the rest of the world economy, fraught with famine, unemployment, recession and worsening terms of trade -- those sums would relieve the sufferings currently endured by a large part of mankind.

A conscientious, organized effort should therefore be made to develop the means, including the institutional machinery, required to attain that end, and the undertakings should be made to enable such resources to be released and reallocated to economic and social development purposes.

The climate of confidence among nations would be appreciably improved by the conclusion of agreements on measures to put an end to the arms race and furthermore to avert an arms race in outer space. General Assembly resolution 39/59, in operative paragraph 8, requests the Conference on Disarmament to establish an ad hoc committee on that issue at the beginning of its session in 1985 with a view to undertaking negotiations for the conclusion of an agreement or agreements, as appropriate, to prevent an arms race in all its aspects in outer space.

Operative paragraph 9 of the same resolution urges the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America to initiate immediately and in a constructive spirit negotiations aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space and to advise the Conference on Disarmament regularly of the progress of their bilateral negotiations so as to facilitate its work.

In operative paragraph 5, the same resolution reiterates that our Conference, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, has a primary role to play in this sphere.

The international community is aware of the general interest of all mankind in exploring outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, and using it for strictly peaceful purposes. In my opinion, the work of the ad hoc committee on the prevention of an arms race in outer space should be oriented in that direction.

Despite the existence of a legal framework, which besides is now outdated, in this area, the States parties to the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space seem to overlook the fact that they have agreed, under article III of that Treaty, that their space activities should be carried on in accordance with international law including the Charter of the United Nations, in the interest of maintaining international peace and security and promoting international co-operation and understanding.

Nuclear disarmament has the highest priority, of course, but it is also necessary to envisage other priority disarmament measures such as the conclusion of a treaty for the prohibition of chemical weapons in accordance with General Assembly resolution 39/65 B, which in operative paragraph 3 urges the Conference on Disarmament to intensify the negotiations in the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons with a view to achieving accord on a chemical weapons convention at the earliest possible date and, for this purpose, to proceed immediately to drafting such a convention for submission to the General Assembly at its fortieth session.

(Mr. Bagbeni, Zaire)

In this context, the refinement and increasing build-up of conventional weapons in many parts of the world lend a new dimension to the arms race, especially in the case of the States possessing the largest military arsenals. Consequently, conventional disarmament efforts should be resolutely pursued with a view to general and complete disarmament.

In addition, the adoption of disarmament measures should take place in such a way as to guarantee the right of every State to undiminished security. Mass supplies of weapons to States which base their security on subjective arguments to strengthen colonial domination, foreign occupation or apartheid have the effect of perpetuating intolerable situations and exacerbating conflicts, and seriously endanger international peace and security; they should therefore cease.

The fact that South Africa has adopted apartheid, an institutionalized form of racial discrimination, as a policy instrument is contrary to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations relating to human rights and the rights of all peoples to self-determination.

In its isolation and as a desperate measure the Pretoria régime has resorted to military action as an instrument of repression inside the country and of aggression abroad. South Africa has therefore sought to develop and acquire nuclear arms, which has been made possible by the active collaboration it has received in the nuclear field from certain well-known countries as well as transnational corporations.

The disappointment felt by most member States following the lack of consensus in Working Group II of the Disarmament Commission at the end of its substantive session for 1985 has heightened the fears and apprehensions of the international community. Although the question of South Africa's nuclear capability was brought to the international community's attention in resolution 34/76 B, and has been included in the agenda of the Disarmament Commission since its first session in 1979, it must be acknowledged that large numbers of amendments submitted by some delegations serve to create delays and thus postpone sine die any decision on this major issue.

I should like to conclude with an affirmation endorsed by the overwhelming majority of member States, namely, that it is recognized that to establish the right conditions for increasing confidence among nations and ensuring the success of the disarmament process, all States should strictly comply with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations as well as with the other relevant principles of international law relating to international peace and security.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Zaire for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the President.

I now give the floor to the representative of China, Ambassador Qian Jiadong.

Mr. QIAN JIADONG (China) (translated from Chinese): Mr. President, at the outset, please allow me to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament for the month of July. Just as China maintains long-standing and friendly relations with Algeria, in discharging your important

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

duties you may count on the full co-operation of the Chinese delegation. I would also like to thank your distinguished predecessor, the Ambassador of Zaire, who brilliantly presided over the work of last month. I wish to join other colleagues in welcoming Ambassador Jessel of France to participate in the work of this Conference and bidding farewell to Ambassador Carasales of Argentina. I wish him every success in his new post.

The Chinese delegation is very much honoured today by the presence of Mr. Hameed, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka, our friendly neighbour. We have listened with great interest to his statement, which once again demonstrates the active role Sri Lanka has played in the Conference as well as its contributions to it. We feel particularly pleased that, in his statement, the distinguished Minister mentioned an important decision the Chinese Government has recently made on the question of disarmament, and praised it highly. I wish to extend to him our profound thanks on behalf of the Chinese delegation. This decision of the Chinese Government is the topic I am going to touch upon today.

Not long ago, two Chinese leaders, namely Deng Xiaoping, Chairman of the Central Military Commission, and Hu Yaobang, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, made important speeches on the issue of peace and disarmament, announcing the Chinese Government's decision, of its own accord, to cut back its armaments and reduce its armed forces, and in particular the decision to reduce the Chinese People's Liberation Army by 1 million men in the next two years. Their speeches have attracted world-wide attention and interest. In order to facilitate the understanding of various delegations to the Conference on Disarmament about China's stand and views on disarmament, the Chinese delegation has submitted to the Secretariat extracts from Chairman Deng Xiaoping's speech and General Secretary Hu Yaobang's speech to be circulated as an official document of the Conference. I should now like to make a brief statement on this document.

Speaking at an enlarged Meeting of the Central Military Commission held recently, Chairman Deng Xiaoping stressed that China wants to concentrate on its economic development, which represents China's over-all interest and to which everything else should be subordinated. Therefore, China needs a peaceful international environment and has been working hard to create and safeguard such an environment. By demobilizing 1 million troops, the Chinese Government will make a concrete contribution to the safeguarding of world peace. This decision of the Chinese Government, which enjoys nation-wide support, will be implemented in an orderly manner step by step in the next two years.

Speaking to peace activists from more than 20 countries attending a forum on safeguarding world peace, General Secretary Hu Yaobang emphasized the historical duty of all countries to safeguard world peace. He pointed out: "Every statesman endowed with foresight should reflect on his responsibility for peace and security of the people of his own country and of the whole world,

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

indeed for the survival and development of the entire human race. Doing so, he cannot but adopt the only wise alternative in approaching the issue of war and peace, that is, upholding peace on the basis of full respect for the independence and sovereignty of each and every country". He added that, in order to prevent a world war, practical actions were needed to urge the super-Powers, from different angles and by various means, to halt the arms race, especially the nuclear-arms race and the arms race in space and the conventional arms race as well, and to urge all countries involved in international disputes to settle them through peaceful means. He expressed the readiness of the 1 billion Chinese people to make unremitting efforts for world peace.

The speeches of the two Chinese leaders gave a clear-cut expression to the will and determination of the Chinese Government and people to strive to preserve world peace. We have declared time and again that opposition to war, maintenance of peace and effort for disarmament constitute the principal objectives of China's foreign policy. While laying stress on the special responsibilities for disarmament of the two countries possessing the largest military arsenals, we are fully conscious of our own responsibility for disarmament. Except for the necessary defence capabilities needed for the security of our country, we have all along in recent years, and on our own accord, been cutting back armaments and reducing our troops, and switching parts of the defence industry to civilian production on a large scale. The facts prove that on the question of disarmament we have matched our words with deeds.

At present, the arms race between the super-Powers, far from slowing down, continues to escalate, posing a serious threat to international peace and security. The people all over the world strongly demand that they stop their arms race and embark conscientiously upon disarmament. We hope that the two super-Powers will pay heed to the voice of the world's people, enter into negotiations in real earnest and reach an agreement to reverse their arms race and drastically cut down their armaments at an early date. Likewise we hope that the present session of the Conference on Disarmament will be able to achieve substantive progress on some priority items of general concern to all countries. The Chinese delegation will, in accordance with the consistent stand of the Chinese Government and in keeping with the spirit of the speeches of the two Chinese leaders as mentioned above, co-operate with other delegations for progress in the work of the Conference on Disarmament. Chairman Deng Ziaoping and General Secretary Hu Yaobang both pointed out in their speeches that, although the danger of war still exists and the factors for war are likely to increase due to the ongoing arms race, it may be hoped that war can be prevented and world peace safeguarded so long as the people of the whole world and all peace-loving countries unite their unremitting efforts.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of China for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the President.

I now give the floor to the representative of Mexico, Ambassador García Robles.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Mr. President, may I convey to you the sincere best wishes of my delegation for success in the important duties which will be yours during the month of July, now beginning, in which you may rely on the unstinting co-operation of the Mexican delegation. It is quite right that Algeria, which has so often shown by its actions that it is in complete agreement with the purposes and principles of the Final Document of 1978, should be the first of the members of the Conference on Disarmament to assume for the second time the presidency of this single multilateral negotiating body which it presided over for the first time, as you stated, some six and a half years ago in January 1979.

I also wish to take this opportunity to congratulate your predecessors, the distinguished representatives of Yugoslavia, Ambassador Vidas, and of Zaire, Ambassador Bagbeni, who directed the work of the Conference with model tact and efficiency during the months of April and June, respectively.

I am also happy to express the deep satisfaction with which we listened a few moments ago to His Excellency the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka, Mr. Hameed. His dedication to the cause of disarmament and his broad knowledge and experience in the field are well known to me, as I have the good fortune to be a member of the United Nations Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies, of which he too is a member.

I should also like to add my voice to that of those of my colleagues who have welcomed here among us the distinguished representative of France, Ambassador Jaques Jessel, and to convey to our outstanding colleague and dear friend, Ambassador François de la Gorce, the Mexican delegation's high appreciation and special esteem.

I should not like to conclude this introduction without saying how much we regret the forthcoming departure of another of our colleagues, Ambassador Julio C. Carasales, who for more than four years has made a valuable contribution to what was then the Committee and is now the Conference on Disarmament, and whom we wish every success in the important new duties entrusted to him by his Government.

In this statement I shall deal with the first and oldest of the items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, an item which has been addressed for over a quarter of a century by the United Nations and to which the General Assembly has more than once asked that the utmost priority be granted: a nuclear-weapon-test ban.

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

In his statement a week ago, the distinguished representative of Brazil, Ambassador de Souza e Silva, emphasized the undertaking assumed by the parties to the Partial Test Ban Treaty -- the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union -- 23 years ago next month, to seek "to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time" through "the conclusion of a treaty resulting in the permanent banning of all nuclear test explosions". He also added, while pointing out that his country is not a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, that it should be borne in mind that in the latter instrument, opened for signature in July 1968, the commitment undertaken in the Moscow Treaty to which I have just referred was reaffirmed.

The satisfaction with which I always listen to the persuasive eloquence of my distinguished colleague is heightened in this case by the fact that my delegation's position is exactly the same as that he described, since on countless occasions I have specifically referred in my statements to the legally binding undertakings assumed by the three nuclear-weapon Powers which I named a moment ago. By way of example, I shall venture to recall only the following two of those statements.

First, in the statement I made at the opening meeting of the third session of the Committee on Disarmament on 3 February 1981, referring to the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session at the Mexican delegation's initiative concerning the question with which we are concerned, I said the following:

"The last paragraph of the preamble of resolution 35/145 A, which I have been quoting, draws particular attention to a fact that there is a tendency at times to forget, the fact that the three nuclear-weapon States which act as depositaries of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water, undertook in that Treaty almost 20 years ago '(I was speaking in 1981)' to seek the achievement of 'the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time' and that such an undertaking was explicitly reiterated in 1968 in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons."

The second is the statement I made at the 234th meeting of the Committee on 16 August 1983, in which I said that the first concrete nuclear disarmament measure which "the peoples of the world have been anxiously awaiting for more than a quarter of a century, is the elaboration, through multilateral negotiations, of a treaty on the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests". I went on to say:

"The adoption of this measure would mean simply that the three States which are depositaries of the Moscow Treaty signed in 1963 would have finally decided to honour the legally binding commitments they assumed in that Treaty and reaffirmed five years later in the Non-Proliferation Treaty to 'achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time' and to 'continue negotiations to this end'."

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

Thus while I fully endorse what Ambassador de Souza e Silva had to say about the legally binding nature of the commitments undertaken under the Moscow Treaty by the three nuclear-weapon States acting as depositaries of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, I regret that our identity of views could not extend to my delegation's supporting the replacement of document CD/520, sponsored by the Group of 21, by the Brazilian document, CD/602. Fortunately, such a substitution does not appear essential, as the distinguished representative of Brazil explicitly said in his statement that his country "continued to support" the Group of 21's document. The best course would then appear to be to take the latter as a basis and fuse the two documents in whatever manner is considered most appropriate; the result would have to establish clearly and unequivocally that the fundamental objective of the ad hoc committee on Conference agenda item 1 will be the immediate initiation of what is described in document CD/520 as "the multilateral negotiation of a treaty for the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests".

With regard to the statement made here by the distinguished representative of the United States, Ambassador Lowitz, I regret that it consisted once again of a repetition of what we have heard for more than four years from his country's present Administration, reflecting an attitude that is utterly at odds with the attitude that existed in this regard during the 1970s and which now prevails amongst the vast majority of Member States of the United Nations and in non-Governmental circles in the United States itself. In many of the statements I have made in this chamber over the last three years there are sufficient elements to form an opinion on this trend, particularly in the statements included in the records of plenary meetings 175 of 3 August 1982, 181 of 24 August 1982 and 277 of 31 July 1984. Those interested in the topic can easily consult the full texts of those statements in the corresponding verbatim records. For the moment I shall confine myself to recalling a few paragraphs from them, purely for illustrative purposes.

In my statement at the 175th plenary meeting I ventured to quote, among other documents, a New York Times editorial published on 23 July 1982, under the significant title of "Nuclear Sand in the Eye", which contained inter alia the following comments:

"The Administration has avoided test-ban negotiations for 18 months; it clearly has no interest in the total treaty. That is too bad for Soviet-American relations and for the cause of non-proliferation. Without great military risk to either power, a total ban would do much to help discourage other nations from pursuing nuclear weapons.

"So there would be no insuperable obstacle to monitoring compliance. The Soviet Union has gone further than ever before in agreeing to American-controlled monitoring boxes where Washington wants them and to the idea of on-site inspection on challenge ...".

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

At the 181st plenary meeting, I read out many paragraphs of testimony taken from the United States Senate official records of the hearings of the relevant Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1971 and 1972. I shall confine myself here to mentioning, among that testimony, the statement made on 14 July 1971 by Ambassador James Wadsworth, who was for several years the deputy representative of his country to the United Nations and, from 1958 to 1960, none other than head of the United States delegation to the Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapon tests in Geneva. What I shall read out now, taken from the verbatim record of the plenary meeting I have just mentioned, may give an idea of the content of this testimony.

"Speaking both on behalf of a distinguished group of citizens who have organized the Task Force for The Nuclear Test Ban, and from my own experience as Chief of the United States Delegation to the Conference on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in Geneva from 1958 to 1960, I fervently hope that these hearings will at long last put us back on the road to a comprehensive East-West test ban and thus signal the end of the nuclear arms race.

"There is increasing evidence that the security of the nation will not be strengthened through further development of nuclear weapons. Underground testing, therefore, may and should become obsolete.

"However, it is hardly necessary to warn that severe opposition must be expected -- and not chiefly from the Russians ...

"I can testify that President Eisenhower was dedicated to the goal of a ban on all nuclear tests. Several times during my years at Geneva, it seemed the test ban agreement with the Russians could be concluded. Each time, however, obstacles arose which even the President, with all the power of his office, could not overcome. I believe the following brief analysis of the tactics used by the opposition could serve to alert us to the hurdles we should be prepared to surmount, as once more a test ban agreement is in sight ...".

The analysis referred to by Ambassador Wadsworth is a detailed analysis which may be consulted in the verbatim record which I mentioned a moment ago; I shall jump it and go on to the following paragraph.

"As far as our Joint Chiefs were concerned, the issue of effective inspection was a smokescreen. Continuation of an aggressive underground test programme was, for them, a prerequisite. Ultimately, they prevailed.

"It is on the basis of this personal experience that I believe the public must have all the facts if we are to end the arms race. I am reassured that the Congress is conducting these hearings. Despite the record of the past, by being alert to the tactics of those who oppose a nuclear test ban, I believe that their opposition can be overcome.

"Inaccurate evidence will no longer be acceptable as a basis for decision. The true reasons for the objections will be recognized. The evaluation that American weaponry is already sufficient for defence, that a test ban can be agreed without endangering American security, and that the risks involved are now acceptable, is of overriding public interest".

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

In that same statement at the 181st plenary meeting I quoted the statement made at those hearings in May 1972 by Ambassador Adrian S. Fisher, who was subsequently the head of the United States delegation to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament during 1977 and 1978 and to the Committee on Disarmament during 1979 and 1980. Ambassador Fisher said the following, on which no comment is required.

"My testimony is directed primarily to the political significance of a comprehensive test ban. I do not believe, however, that we are dealing with a situation in which we have to rely on political assets to overcome military liabilities because I am persuaded, on the basis of expert testimony, that from the point of view of weapons development, a test ban is, on balance, advantageous to the United States. The experts with whom I have consulted, and whom you have heard, have made it clear that, even allowing for the possibility of some cheating in relation to small underground tests, the relative position of the United States to the USSR would be more favourable under a comprehensive test ban, monitored solely by national means, than it would be under the present circumstances which permit testing through a much wider range of yields.

"The political advantages of a comprehensive test ban are considerable. As this committee is aware, the United States in the Limited Test Ban Treaty, signed by President Kennedy, pledged itself to continue negotiations to ban all nuclear weapons test explosions. This commitment was reaffirmed in the Non-Proliferation Treaty, negotiated under President Johnson and ratified by President Nixon. Thus, three administrations have undertaken this commitment.

"It is clear to me that other countries of the world take this commitment of ours quite seriously. In the particular context of the Non-Proliferation Treaty I have grave doubts that it will have any success in persuading certain potential powers to seriously consider the Non-Proliferation Treaty as long as we are conducting an extensive series of underground tests ...

"We have heard a good deal about verification and doubtless will hear more. But let's put things in proper perspective: verification of a comprehensive test ban has always been only a part of the problem. The main question which existed in 1958 and exists today, 14 years later, is really this one: do we want to continue testing nuclear weapons? Is our over-all security better with a comprehensive test ban even though there is some risk of a few small clandestine tests, or without a ban, which allows the Russians to test at all yields, encourages additional nations to acquire nuclear weapons and continues indefinitely the arms race? If we decide that it is in our best interest to ban tests, I do believe that our present capability to distinguish earthquakes from explosions at very low magnitudes should be satisfactory to permit us to move toward a comprehensive test ban treaty ...".

Finally, last year at the 277th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament, after reading out extensive quotations from the tripartite report jointly submitted to the Committee on Disarmament on 30 July 1980 by the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union as the parties in the so-called "trilateral negotiations" which had been under way since 1977, I considered it necessary to express the following appraisal:

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

The gaping abyss between words and deeds is truly incomprehensible; between these solemn declarations made in a document which was barely four years old yesterday and in which it is explicitly recognized that the conclusion of a treaty for the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests "for decades has been given one of the highest priorities in the field of arms limitation"; that the objectives pursued "are important to all mankind" which is why "it is understandable that the international community has repeatedly called for the earliest possible conclusion of the treaty"; that the three nuclear-weapon Powers taking part in the negotiations "are mindful for the great value for all mankind that the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon-test explosions in all environments will have, and they are conscious of the important responsibility placed upon them to find solutions to the remaining problems" and that therefore "they are determined to exert their best efforts and necessary will and persistence to bring the negotiations to an early and successful conclusion"; the abyss which gapes, I repeat, between these solemn and eloquent statements and the attitude of open opposition adopted five days ago in this very chamber which made it impossible to make a modest step towards the beginning of the multilateral negotiation of such a treaty.

With regard to verification, the United States' favourite topic which it uses as a smokescreen to hide its very real refusal to conclude a treaty prohibiting underground testing, any number of quotations of the highest authority, all from western countries of international officials, can be adduced to show that this is purely a pretext without any valid foundation whatsoever. So as not to lengthen this statement unduly, I shall solely review three of them:

In his first statement to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament Mr. Kurt Waldheim, who was then and for 10 years Secretary-General of the United Nations, said the following on 29 February 1972:

"No other question in the field of disarmament has been the subject of so much study and discussion as the question of stopping nuclear-weapon tests. I believe that all the technical and scientific aspects of the problem have been so fully explored that only a political decision is now necessary in order to achieve final agreement. There is an increasing conviction among the nations of the world that an underground test ban is the single most important measure, and perhaps the only feasible one in the near future, to halt the nuclear arms race, at least with regard to its qualitative aspects. There is a growing belief that an agreement to halt all underground testing would facilitate the achievement of agreements at SALT and might also have a beneficial effect on the possibilities of halting all tests in all environments by everyone. It is my firm belief that the sorry tale of lost opportunities that have existed in the past should not be repeated and that the question can and should be solved now.

"While I recognize that differences of views still remain concerning the effectiveness of seismic methods of detection and identification of underground nuclear tests, experts of the highest standing believe that it is possible to identify all such explosions down to the level of a few kilotons. Even if a few such tests could be conducted clandestinely, it is most unlikely that a series of such tests could escape detection. Moreover, it may be questioned whether there are any important strategic reasons for continuing such tests or, indeed, whether there would be much military significance to tests of such small magnitude.

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

"When one takes into account the existing means of verification by seismic and other methods, and the possibilities provided by international procedures of verification such as consultation, inquiry and what has come to be known as 'verification by challenge' or 'inspection by invitation', it is difficult to understand further delay in achieving agreement on an underground test ban.

"In the light of all these considerations, I share the inescapable conclusion that the potential risks of continuing underground nuclear weapon tests would far outweigh any possible risks from ending such tests."

Secondly, in the "report on a comprehensive nuclear test ban" prepared in 1980 by the United Nations Secretariat with the assistance of four expert consultants, there are 11 conclusions including the following which are of particular relevance to the question with which we are concerned here:

"A main objective of all efforts of the United Nations in the field of disarmament has been to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race, to stop the production of nuclear weapons and to achieve their eventual elimination.

"In this connection, a comprehensive test ban is regarded as the first and most urgent step towards a cessation of the nuclear-arms race, in particular, as regards its qualitative aspects.

"Over the years, enormous efforts have been invested in achieving a cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests by all States for all time. These efforts have occupied the uninterrupted attention of the Members of the United Nations for a longer period of time than any other disarmament issue...

"A comprehensive test ban could serve as an important measure of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, both vertical and horizontal.

"A comprehensive test ban would have a major arms limitation impact in that it would make it difficult, if not impossible, for the nuclear-weapon States parties to the treaty to develop new designs of nuclear weapons and would also place constraints on the modification of existing weapon designs.

"In the view of the Parties to the non-proliferation Treaty, a comprehensive test ban would reinforce the Treaty by demonstrating the awareness of the major nuclear Powers of the legal obligation under the Treaty 'to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date'."

Thirdly, as we have jumped from 1972, the date of the first quotation, to 1980, the year of the second, I think it is worth closing this statement with a third much more recent quotation from barely a week ago: on 27 June the Prime Minister of Sweden, Mr. Olof Palme, in the Keynote Address at the Colloquium recently organized by the Groupe de Bellerive in Geneva, said the following:

"A treaty banning all nuclear weapon tests would be the single most important step to slow down the qualitative arms race. It would be a good complement to the bilateral negotiations by reducing the risk that cuts in the arsenals eventually agreed upon in the strategic talks would be nullified by the development of new nuclear systems. The work done by experts in my country in this field for a long time has convinced me that existing scientific and technical capabilities make it possible adequately to verify a comprehensive nuclear test ban."

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Mexico for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the President. I now give the floor to the representative of Canada, Ambassador Beesley.

Mr. BEESLEY (Canada): I shall be speaking very briefly this morning, merely to make an announcement of an essentially procedural nature on the outer space issue.

Before doing so, however, I should like to express my pleasure at your assumption of our Presidency and compliment you on your truly excellent opening statement. May I also say again, what a pleasure it was to serve under the distinguished presidency of our colleague Ambassador Bagbeni of Zaire.

We also have heard today an inspiring, statesmanlike, and, in every sense, outstanding address from the distinguished Foreign Minister of Sri Lanka, on which I would not presume to comment, except to say that he has given us much food for thought on both nuclear and conventional arms control and arms sales, particularly his references to the non-proliferation treaty. It crossed my mind as he was speaking that had we had an instrument in place, analogous to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, relating to conventional weapons, we might be in a much better position today. It follows, of course, that without the Non-Proliferation Treaty, we would, indeed, be in a far worse position.

I might also mention, in passing, your own statement; and the statement of the distinguished representative of Zaire, and those of China and Mexico, as providing further stimuli for all of us, but particularly on the question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space. I would like just to note also the importance, in itself, and also as a precedent, of the decision of China to reduce its armed forces.

Turning to the outer space question, I think all members of this forum took special satisfaction at our success earlier this year, after much effort, in reaching agreement on a mandate for this subsidiary body. That agreement reflected, as we saw it, a constructive spirit of compromise and a wide-spread appreciation of the importance and urgency of concrete work on issues directly relevant to the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The difficulties which were experienced and which are still being experienced in reaching agreement on a work programme should not discourage us. While such problems give us cause for concern, there are also signs of progress behind the scenes. Certainly, if we are to have any success at all, we must sustain the spirit of readiness to achieve a mutual accommodation which enabled the Ad Hoc Committee to come into existence in the first place. We also take great satisfaction in our wise choice of Ambassador Alfarargi of Egypt, a close friend and colleague of many year's standing, as Chairman of that Ad Hoc Committee. It will be recalled that in an earlier statement, I undertook, on behalf of the Canadian Government, to table a working paper -- perhaps a series of working papers -- on outer space, at the appropriate time. As part of our preparation for participation in discussion of that issue, the Canadian Government has compiled a comprehensive, two-volume compendium of the working papers and final records of the Conference which relate to outer space questions.

This compendium is similar to those we have tabled in the past on chemical weapons and, more recently, on radiological weapons. We are pleased to announce that, as a modest, but we hope practical, contribution to our deliberative

(Mr. Beesley, Canada)

efforts, particularly to the widespread desire for concrete documentation, and having drawn on the much appreciated assistance of the secretariat staff, copies of this compendium will shortly be provided to all members of the Conference, it not today, then we hope, tomorrow.

We hope and trust that they will be found to be a useful working tool. Both by its very bulk as by its very substance, this documentation illustrates, we believe, not only the extent of past work but also certain achievements on matters relating to outer space. It illustrates also of course, that there is a daunting range of issues and problems to be addressed falling squarely within the terms of our mandate. I urge that we get down to the task at hand as quickly as possible, and we hope very sincerely that this modest contribution by the Canadian delegation will assist us in the process.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Canada for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the President. I now give the floor to the representative of Brazil, Ambassador de Souza e Silva.

Mr. de SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil): Before making a very brief intervention I should like to say how much I warmly welcome you, Mr. President, to the chair of our Conference and pledge the full support of my delegation to your endeavours during the current month. I should like also to take this opportunity to thank the Ambassador of Zaire for his performance last month.

I have asked for the floor in order to make a brief statement on a matter which I believe concerns all States Members of the United Nations. It also touches upon the work and the endeavours of this Conference.

As you know, an important international event, entitled "Colloquium of the Group of Bellerive on Nuclear War, Nuclear Proliferation and their Consequences", took place last week in Geneva. I should like to praise that initiative, which contributed constructively to the better understanding of crucial problems of the present political reality in the world.

On Thursday 27 June, at the opening meeting, several messages from world leaders, including the Secretary-General of the United Nations, were read out by the President of the Colloquium.

In his message, my good old friend Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar makes several important and pertinent comments on the prevention of nuclear war, on the consequences of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and on the need for nuclear disarmament. However, in that statement, he also makes value judgements about an international treaty to which several Member States of the United Nations are not Parties, and thus obviously do not share some of the views expressed therein about the role played by that instrument to achieve its stated aims.

I quote from the message of the Secretary-General: "The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is an essential measure against this eventuality. The Treaty has played a most constructive role in restraining the horizontal spread of nuclear weapons".

(Mr. de Souza e Silva, Brazil)

Statements of opinion such as those I just quoted are unusual, when made by international civil servants, inasmuch as such statements do not represent the view of the Organization as a whole. I recall, in this connection, the provisions of article 100 of the Charter of the United Nations.

I make these observations in a friendly and constructive spirit, and with all due regard for the high office of the Secretary-General of the United Nations and for the person of its distinguished incumbent. I would kindly request his personal representative and Secretary-General of this Conference, Ambassador Komatina, to convey to Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar both my respects and my remarks.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Brazil for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the President. There are no more speakers on my list. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor? I see none. I now wish to give the floor to the Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Komatina, for a brief statement.

Mr. KOMATINA (Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General) (translated from French): I should like to inform the Conference that the secretariat has received from New York the text of the Secretary-General's report on the prevention of nuclear war, which is transmitted to the Conference in accordance with General Assembly resolution 39/148 P of 17 December 1984.

The report has been circulated today in all the official languages of the Conference under symbol CD/603 of 25 June 1985. The text of General Assembly resolution 39/148 P, which is annex I of the document, will be circulated as an addendum to the report in document CD/603.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General for the information he has just given us. I should like to remind the Conference that next Thursday, immediately after the plenary meeting, an informal meeting will be held to consider the question of the improved and effective functioning of the Conference.

The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 4 July, at 10.30 a.m. The meeting is adjourned.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.