

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. BENSTAIL  
Mr. N. KERROUMI

Argentina: Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS  
Mr. F.J. DAVILA  
Mr. A.N. HOLTEMI

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

Belgium: Mr. P. NOTERDAENE  
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. SIMARD

Cuba: Mr. L. SOLA VILA  
Mrs. V.B. JACKLEWICH

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

Egypt: Mr. O. EL-SHAFEI  
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. HEFFTER  
Mr. J. POHLMANN  
Mr. H. MULLER

Hungary: Mr. M. DOMOKOS  
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. H. FARTASH  
Mr. D. CHILATY  
Mr. D. AMERI

Italy: Mr. N. DI BERNARDO  
Mr. M. MORENO  
Mr. C. FRATESCHI

Japan: Mr. H. OGISO  
Mr. T. NONOYAMA  
Mr. T. IWANAMI

Kenya: Mr. C. GATERE HAINA  
Mr. G.N. MUNIU

Mexico: Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES  
Miss A. CALDERA

Mongolia: Mr. D. ERDENBILEG  
Mr. L. BAYART

Morocco: Mr. A. SKALLI  
Mr. S.M. RAHHALI  
Mr. A. BEN BOUCHTA  
Mr. M. CHRAÏBI

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

Nigeria: Mr. T.O. OLUTOKO

Pakistan: Mr. M. AKRAM

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. MELESCANU

Sri Lanka: Mr. I.B. FONSEKA

Sweden: Mr. C. LIDGARD  
Mr. S. STROMBACK

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. 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 NECER

Yugoslavia:

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

Zaire:

Mr. M. ESUK

Assistant Secretary-General  
for Disarmament:

Mr. R. BJORNERSTEDT

Mr. GHAREKHAN (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. Gharakhan, 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. Gharakhani, 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 II 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 53/66 A and B adopted by the thirty-third regular session of the General Assembly, like its predecessor, 32/64, 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, 13 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.