

FINAL RECORD OF THE THIRTY-FOURTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Thursday, 21 June 1979 at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. C.A. de Souza e Silva

(Brazil)

## PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. A. BENSMAIL

Argentina: Mr. A. DUCIOTT  
Hlco H. FREYRE PEHABAD  
Mr. C.A. PASSALACQUA

Australia: Mr. A. BEHN  
Ms. M. WICKES

Belgium: Mr. P. ROTTERDAEME  
Mr. G. VAN DUYSSE

Brazil: Mr. C.A. DE SOUZA E SILVA  
Mr. A.C. DE OURO PRETO

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV  
Mr. I. SOTIROV  
Mr. C. HALACHEV

Burma: U Thein AUNG  
U Thaung HTUI

Canada: Mr. R. HARRY JAY  
Mr. J.T. SNIARD

Cuba: Mrs. V.B. JACKIEWICH

Czechoslovakia: Mr. V. TYLNER

Egypt: Mr. M. EL-BARADEI  
Mr. N. FAHMY

Ethiopia: Mr. T. TERRIEFE

France: Mr. F. DE LA GORCE  
Mr. M. COUTHURES

German Democratic Republic: Mr. G. HERDER  
Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

Germany, Federal Republic of: Mr. J. PÖHLMANN  
Mr. H. HÜLLER

Hungary: Mr. H. DOIHKOS  
Mr. C. GYÖFFY

India: Mr. S.T. DEVARE

Indonesia: Mr. D.B. SULEMAN

Iran: Mr. D. AMERI

Italy: Mr. C. FRATESCHI

Japan: Mr. M. OGISO  
Mr. T. NONOYAMA  
Mr. T. IWANAMI  
Mr. R. ISHII

Kenya: Mr. S. SHITEMI  
Mr. A. JET ODENDO

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

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

Morocco: Mr. M. CHRAÏBI

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

Nigeria: Mr. K. AHMED  
Mr. T.O. OLUKOKO

Pakistan:Peru:

Mr. A. DE SOTO

Poland:

Mr. B. SUJKA

Mr. H. PAC

Mr. M. KRUCZYK

Romania:

Mr. C. ENE

Mr. T. ILESCANU

Sri Lanka:

Mr. I.B. FONSEKA

Sweden:

Mr. C. LIDGARD

Mr. S. STRÖMBÄCK

Union of Soviet Socialist  
Republics:

Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN

Mr. N.V. PESTREY

Mr. A.I. TIOURENKOV

Mr. M.G. ANTIUKHIN

Mr. V.P. PERFILIEV

Mr. N.P. SMIDOVICH

United Kingdom:

Mr. N.H. MARSHALL

United States of America:

Mr. A.S. FISHER

Mr. C.C. FLOWERREE

Mr. D. KOELEMAY

Venezuela:

Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT

Yugoslavia:

Mr. D. DJOKIĆ

Zaire:

Mr. E. MULONGAIDUSU

Assistant Secretary-General:

Mr. R. BJÖRNERSTEDT

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (translated from Russian): The start of the work of the summer session of the Committee on Disarmament coincides in a pleasant way this year with an event of international historical significance.

It was literally only a few days ago that a Soviet-United States meeting at the highest level was successfully concluded in Vienna. The main outcome of this meeting was the signing by L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and by J. Carter, President of the United States, of a new Treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms (SALT II), and of a number of other important documents, the significance of which extends far beyond the framework of bilateral relations between the USSR and the United States.

As is stressed in the joint Soviet-United States communiqué, the new Treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms and its Protocol make a substantial contribution to the prevention of nuclear war and the deepening of détente, and thus serve the interests not only of the Soviet and American peoples, but the aspirations of mankind for peace.

In the past few days, the general public in countries throughout the world has indicated that it thoroughly approves of the conclusion of the SALT II Treaty, and regards it as an important factor capable of having a favourable influence on the international climate as a whole.

The Governments of the Soviet Union and of the United States have reached agreements of vital importance to mankind for the adoption of practical measures on the quantitative limitation of offensive strategic arms and on curbing their qualitative refinement. Both sides have assumed the obligation to enter into active negotiations, after this Treaty comes into force, on further steps for the limitation and reduction of strategic arms.

These fundamental provisions of the new Soviet-United States instruments have been warmly approved by the Mongolian people and their Government, and the conclusion of the SALT II Treaty is regarded as a major step towards curbing the arms race and achieving the aims of disarmament.

In a Declaration made by the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic on 19 June 1979 it is stressed that the SALT II Treaty "is above all the result of the peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union and its repeated and persistent efforts directed towards the control of the arms race, the adoption of effective measures on disarmament and the strengthening of universal peace and security. Due recognition should be given to the fact that the prevailing good sense and realism of Washington's policy was of major significance in the conclusion of the Treaty".

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

In our opinion, the experience of the lengthy negotiations aimed at the conclusion of the SALT II Treaty, the main lines of which were defined as a result of the understanding reached at Vladivostok, and also the history of the SALT I negotiations, confirm that, however difficult and complicated the problems of curbing the arms race and of disarmament may be, mutually acceptable solutions can be found only if the parties are prepared to show the political will and determination to observe the principle of equality and of equal security as an essential condition.

It should be noted that there are certain circles that fight to obtain a unilateral advantage in the sphere of nuclear weapons, that stir up a war psychosis by their expansionist and hegemonistic aspirations, and that attempt in every possible way to hinder positive developments in disarmament matters.

In these conditions, it is essential that the signing of the new Soviet-United States SALT II Treaty, which is a well-balanced and reliably verifiable instrument, should be followed by its prompt implementation, which would promote further progress in the limitation of offensive strategic arms. Each new step in this matter will indeed little by little help to reduce the level of military confrontation in the world and to strengthen international security. It seems to us that the entry into force of the SALT II Treaty will signify the strict fulfilment by the parties of all obligations under the Treaty, which will permit creation of the material basis for the preparation of subsequent stage-by-stage measures in the sphere not only of further limitations on the expansion of armaments, but also of their reduction.

In this context, I should like to note the enormous importance of the signing in Vienna by the leaders of the USSR and the United States of a joint statement of principles and basic guidelines for subsequent negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms.

We are of the view that the SALT II Treaty will create preconditions favourable to the solution of such topical disarmament problems as the further strengthening of the régime of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons, and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed.

In our opinion, the fruitful outcome of the Vienna meeting will also provide a new impulse to other important negotiations, currently under way, on the total banning of nuclear-weapon tests, bilateral negotiations on a joint initiative for the

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

prohibition of chemical weapons, and also negotiations on the limitation and reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, etc.

In this connexion the Mongolian delegation would like to express the full support of the Mongolian People's Republic for the important proposal made by the Budapest meeting of the Committee of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Warsaw Treaty Member States for the convening, before the end of 1979, of a conference at the political level to be attended by all the European countries, the United States and Canada, to reach agreement on the dates and procedures for holding talks on ending the production of nuclear weapons and the prohibition of their use, the renunciation by all States of the use or threat of force, and the adoption of measures to strengthen guarantees for the non-nuclear-weapon States.

It is our profound conviction that the favourable atmosphere being created as a result of the Soviet-United States summit meeting in Vienna should be used in the most effective manner by all States, and above all by the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, for the purpose of achieving real measures in the sphere of disarmament. We consider that everyone should make constructive efforts in this direction, both in the United Nations and in other international forums, and particularly in such an authoritative multilateral negotiating body as the Committee on Disarmament.

As is known, the Committee approved its programme of work for the summer session at the previous plenary meeting. We are to continue the examination in the Committee of a number of important questions on the agenda for 1979, including the item on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. Specific proposals have been tabled on this question by a number of delegations from the socialist countries in the Committee. I have in mind document CD/4. We are convinced that useful consultations will be continued in this sphere, with a view to paving the way for practical negotiations.

Next week the Committee will embark upon an examination of the question of effective international agreements to strengthen guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States. In this connexion there are also relevant documents before the Committee, including the draft convention which was submitted by the Soviet delegation to the last session of the United Nations General Assembly, and which could serve as a basis for negotiations.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

As regards the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons, further progress in the bilateral negotiations on the preparation of a joint proposal will be greatly facilitated by the detailed consideration in this Committee of the numerous proposals already submitted by a number of delegations.

The Mongolian People's Republic continues to attach particular importance to the achievement of real progress in the trilateral negotiations on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. It welcomes the willingness shown by the USSR and the United States, together with the United Kingdom, to continue their efforts in the search for a positive solution aimed at completing the preparatory work for an appropriate agreement, as is emphasized in the well-known Soviet-United States document.

The Mongolian delegation has repeatedly come out in favour of the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We call on all States that have not yet done so to sign and ratify the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons before the opening in 1980 of the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty.

In the first half of July of this year the Committee will take up consideration of the question of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. In our view, this Committee has reason to expect concrete results from the discussion of this important question. The Mongolian delegation, together with other members of the Committee, expresses deep satisfaction at the joint Soviet-United States decision to submit to the Committee on Disarmament this year their agreed proposal on the question of prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons. The future examination of the draft of this treaty, on whose basic elements, as has already become known, bilateral agreement has been reached, and its submission to the United Nations General Assembly for approval would be a concrete result of the activity of the Committee during the recent period.

These are the few comments that the Mongolian delegation wished to make at this stage in the work of the Committee.



Mr. VOUTOV (Bulgaria): It is a pleasure for me to congratulate you once again, Mr. Chairman, on your appointment as the new representative of Brazil in the Committee on Disarmament and to extend at the same time my congratulations to the new leaders of the delegations of Argentina, Australia and Iran, with whom we shall carry on, as we have done so far, active and fruitful co-operation.

I should also like to express the satisfaction of my delegation with the appointment of Mr. Riki Jaipal, the representative of friendly India, as Secretary of the Committee and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

The speedy elaboration of the programme of work for the summer session under your wise guidance is a good omen for a businesslike approach to our tasks which seem to be of growing importance against the background of recent developments in the field of international security and disarmament.

The second part of the annual session of the Committee begins its work in a more favourable international situation, the symbol of which is the summit meeting in Vienna between Leonid Brezhnev, the President of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and James Carter, the President of the United States of America, that led to the signing of the SALT II agreements. The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, in a special declaration published yesterday, welcomed this most significant act in the efforts of humanity during the past several decades to curb the arms race and clear the road to disarmament. While congratulating both sides on this historic achievement, I cannot fail to stress the consistent peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union and personally of Leonid Brezhnev, whose dedicated and untiring efforts in the cause of peace and international understanding are universally admired.

Based upon the solid foundations of the principles of equality and equal security of both sides, the SALT II agreements are a convincing example that there are no questions in contemporary international relations that cannot be solved through negotiations. The results of SALT II and their ratification in the near future will strengthen the hope of all peace-loving peoples on our planet that a world nuclear holocaust may be prevented.

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

We are glad to note as well that the SALT II agreements will exert a positive influence upon the mutual increase of confidence and co-operation between the two greatest Powers of this world, and thus upon the international climate. This will be another proof that it is through arms control and disarmament measures, rather than by way of an incessant arms race, that international security can be realistically enhanced.

To us, the members of the Committee on Disarmament, the reflection of the Vienna summit upon the problems discussed in this body will be of significant importance. In this connexion I would like to express our gratitude to both the Soviet and the United States delegations for their very informative statements which confirmed that we could realistically expect an activation of disarmament negotiations in a number of directions. We listened with great interest to the statement of Ambassador Issraelyan, the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union, at the last meeting of the CD on the prospects which are being opened up after the Vienna summit for negotiations on all the disarmament problems, and especially nuclear disarmament, the complete ban on nuclear-weapon tests, new weapons of mass destruction and particularly radiological weapons, chemical weapons, etc.

As we see it, this pledge of the invigoration of current disarmament negotiations applies as well to the question which is at the top of the list of our tasks for this part of the session, namely, the nuclear test ban. Our delegation understands fully the major importance of a treaty to ban completely nuclear-weapon tests with a view to curbing the nuclear arms race - especially its qualitative aspects. We attach particular importance to obtaining the support of all nuclear-weapon States for such a treaty, thus making the ban not only complete but general as well. Waiting for early results of the trilateral negotiations, we note with satisfaction the statement of General Seignious, the distinguished Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, who underlined that the United States Government "is conscious of the impatience of the international community with the pace of negotiations". Let us hope that this realization will produce concrete and practical results in the near future. Thus, in the opinion of our delegation, the Western partners will demonstrate a

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

corresponding constructive approach in response to the radical steps taken by the Soviet Union in relation to the tripartite negotiations, announced by President Brezhnev back in November 1977, concerning a moratorium on peaceful nuclear tests and other elements of the future agreement.

In this connexion, may I express the optimism with which the Bulgarian delegation is looking forward to the possibilities of speedy headway towards a complete ban on nuclear-weapon tests. The problem has reached a stage where, in our view, a number of major obstacles to an agreement have been overcome. We are looking forward to the forthcoming final session of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts on the identification of seismic events, which we hope will reach a successful conclusion in its work. This would be a contribution to the final solution of the problem of the nuclear-weapon tests.

The Bulgarian delegation reserves the right to express its views on this problem later on when the Committee returns to consider it again.

Mrs. JACKIEWICH (Cuba): In speaking on behalf of the Group of 21, my delegation which is co-ordinator of the Group of 21 wishes, on behalf of both the Group and the Cuban delegation, to extend a hearty welcome to you, Mr. Chairman, and to say that you may count on our full co-operation. Also on behalf of the Group and my own delegation we would like to bid welcome to the distinguished Ambassadors of Argentina, Australia and Iran who have joined the ranks of the Committee and have come to help us in our work.

In beginning today the examination of the substantive subjects of this, the second part of the session of the Committee, the subject of a nuclear test ban has been included in the agenda, and as my country is at this moment co-ordinator of the Group of 21 I have the honour to communicate to you a statement on behalf of that Group.

The General Assembly has for several years accorded the highest priority to the issue of a comprehensive test ban treaty. At its first special session devoted to disarmament, the General Assembly stressed that such a treaty, and I quote: "should be concluded urgently and the result submitted for full consideration by the multilateral negotiating body with a view to the submission

(Mrs. Jackiewich, Cuba)

of a draft treaty to the General Assembly at the earliest possible date". At its thirty-third session, the General Assembly requested the Committee on Disarmament to undertake, on a priority basis, at its first session in January 1979, negotiations on a treaty. Furthermore, the General Assembly expressed regret that a draft treaty had not been concluded during the past year, and urged the three negotiating States to expedite their negotiations with a view to bringing them to a positive conclusion as a matter of urgency and to use their utmost endeavours to transmit the results to the Committee on Disarmament before the beginning of its 1979 session for full consideration. The Committee has not been able to discharge the mandate entrusted to it by the international community so far because the draft of a treaty on CTB has not yet been presented to it by the three negotiating States despite repeated appeals by the General Assembly.

The Group is of the firm view that the Committee should devote full attention to this priority question in its work during the current session. In this context the Group records its disappointment that, at the first part of the session of the Committee, the three negotiating States engaged in trilateral talks did not even furnish the Committee with a report on the progress of their negotiations. The Group would therefore urge the negotiating States to present to the Committee a comprehensive report on the state of their negotiations at the beginning of the current part of this annual session in order to facilitate the Committee's negotiations on this important issue in compliance with its mandate.

Mr. SHITEMI (Kenya): On behalf of the Kenyan delegation, I would like to say how delighted we are to see you chairing this very important session of the Committee on Disarmament. Your experienced hand, a clear cool head, have already proved a collective asset to this meeting. You can count on our support.

The question of disarmament is one of the most serious questions that remain unanswered to the satisfaction of all humanity. Little efforts here and there in the field of disarmament can be regarded only as pointers towards total and complete disarmament. As long as these little efforts are being made, the temptation to be overoptimistic that the end results will be good for all humanity is extremely deceptive. Because the hard realities facing the world, mistrust, imperialistic designs, greed — that are insensitive to the plight of the victims — selfish and short-sighted political and economic interests remain. We are aware

(Mr. Shiteni, Kenya)

that not all world problems can be solved overnight, but at least if a proper and honest diagnosis is made we can start treating the problems at the root cause and not the symptoms. Malaria as a disease in a patient is removed when it has been identified and treated as such; no amount of aspirin would cure it unless the appropriate treatment is given. Permit me to address myself to some of these realities:

For many years the world economy has been organized and in fact monopolized by certain Powers in the world who have consistently resisted any change in the status quo that has been for many years in their favour. A call for a just and fairer distribution of world resources has fallen on deaf ears. No wonder UNCTAD V ended the way it did. This will mean continued suffering for millions of people in the developing world who must have looked to UNCTAD V with hope that at last they could get a fairer price for their raw materials. The mistrust that this misunderstanding between the rich and the developing world engenders will in turn create international tension that could lead to more serious problems linked with encouraging armament rather than disarmament.

Minority régimes in southern Africa have continued to defy world opinion that has consistently called upon them to make way peacefully for the majority to participate fully in determining their own destiny. Not only have these minority white régimes become stubborn and intransigent, they have also become very aggressive and arrogant. They pose one of the most serious threats in Africa. Our topic this week is to debate the banning of all nuclear weapons; this is a laudable objective but while we are debating this, we have been presented with evidence that reveals that South Africa may well be the first nuclear Power in Africa thanks to the scientific and technical knowledge it continues to receive from its friends in the West. In fact at one stage South Africa was about to explode a nuclear device and, had it not been for one country which revealed that South Africa was about to explode a nuclear device, we would have known about it after the event. Certain countries in the West have the same facilities for verifying the goings-on in the nuclear field, and yet at this material time they choose to remain silent, a deep and unsettling silence. South Africa, with

(Mr. Shiteni, Kenya)

nuclear technical know-how, is easily the greatest threat facing Africa. That country has shown that it cannot be trusted on any issue. It is not enough for us in Africa to demand total economic sanctions against South Africa, we must, and we do insist that Africa should be declared a nuclear-free zone.

The introduction of nuclear technology into the world, including the explosion of nuclear devices, has seriously undermined the delicate environmental balance — so much so that in certain parts of the world, certain fauna and flora are facing a real threat of extinction. Man does not know enough to tinker with nuclear material as weapons or as nuclear reactors for peaceful uses. The likelihood of upsetting the delicate balance of the environment could make planet earth an inhospitable planet. We have already received the danger signal after the experience of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, in the United States. The world has been forewarned.

The moral impact of being our brother's keeper must be re-examined if man is to survive; we cannot afford the reckless philosophy of the survival of the fittest. We welcome the initiative to limit any further development of weapons of mass destruction even within the limited scope of SALT II, but we must urge those concerned not to be content with reaching parity in the field of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. A balance of terror does not necessarily mean a safer world. These countries must be encouraged to move quickly to a stage where all nuclear weapons, wherever they are stored, and such other weapons of mass destruction, including chemical and radiological weapons, are completely destroyed. This will usher in a new age of mutual trust. No one stands to lose if this is done. But we must insist that an effort must be made to remove all causes of mistrust and injustices brought about by unfair economic systems and short-sighted political gains. As long as we have Palestinians living in refugee camps, and minority Governments in southern Africa denying the majority their inalienable rights to self-rule, we shall continue to have tensions which, in turn, lead to Superpower rivalry.

All is not lost but we have not got much time. The goal is set before us and the vision of a peaceful world where we shall beat our swords into ploughshares and our spears into pruning hooks is also clear before us. It is the best vision to live for and, if need be, die for.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): It would be naive and pretentious to try to adduce new facts aimed at making more obvious the urgent and compelling need to bring about what in our agenda is called a "nuclear test ban". The discussions which have been taking place for so many years on the subject, not only in the First Committee and at the plenary meetings of the United Nations General Assembly, but also in multilateral disarmament negotiating bodies, have already provided incontrovertible proof of this pressing need.

I shall therefore confine myself in these extremely brief remarks to quoting from a statement which unfortunately apparently tends to be forgotten and which was made here at the European Office of the United Nations by the Secretary-General of the Organization himself over seven years ago, on 29 February 1972.

On that occasion, Mr. Waldheim drew the following unequivocal conclusions:

"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 holding all States to all earlier tests 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. Garcia 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 become 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.....

"A comprehensive test-ban treaty ..... would be a major step towards halting what has been called 'vertical proliferation', that is, the further sophistication and deployment of nuclear weapons, and would also strengthen the resolve of potential nuclear-weapon States not to acquire nuclear weapons and thereby help to prevent the 'horizontal proliferation' of such weapons. On the other hand, if nuclear-weapon tests by the nuclear Powers continue, the future credibility and perhaps even the viability of the Non-Proliferation Treaty achieved after such painstaking effort may be jeopardized. I need not describe the greatly increased dangers that would confront the world in such event."

I venture to hope that the three nuclear-weapon Powers which have been engaged in such lengthy negotiations on this issue will reflect upon the Secretary-General's well-founded arguments -- which are of special relevance in view of the fact that the outstanding problems, so we are told, are problems of verification -- and that, bearing in mind that the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is to be held in the coming year, they will be in a position to submit to us, before the end of this session of the Committee on Disarmament, the preliminary draft of the comprehensive test-ban Treaty which we have so long awaited.

Mr. DOMOKOS (Hungary): I would like to make an announcement, or rather a declaration. According to the programme of work of the Committee for the second part of its 1979 session, we are going to devote the period 25 to 29 June to the consideration of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. I would like to inform the Committee that the delegations of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, the USSR and my own country are going to table a draft international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States.



(Mr. Domokos, Hungary)

I would like to request the Secretariat, through you, Mr. Chairman, to make the necessary arrangements to circulate that document in the working languages of the Committee as soon as possible so that it will be available to the delegations of the Committee before we commence consideration of the subject early next week.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished delegate of Hungary. The necessary arrangements will be made with the Secretariat to comply with the request made by the delegation of Hungary.

Is there any other speaker who wishes to take the floor at this stage? If not, there are two procedural questions that I would like to put to the Committee for its consideration.

The first one concerns our meeting tomorrow, for which there are not yet any speakers inscribed on my list. We might therefore decide to hold either a formal meeting or an informal meeting. In any case, as the meeting tomorrow has already been approved in our programme of work, I should like to know whether delegates have any opinion as to whether we should hold a formal or an informal meeting. My suggestion is that, if there are speakers with statements already prepared who would like to have them put on the record, then we should have a formal meeting tomorrow. Otherwise, if no delegation is yet prepared, we might have an informal meeting on the subject on our agenda. So, if there are no suggestions, we will convene an informal meeting tomorrow at 10.30 a.m. in this room, and our next formal meeting will be held on Tuesday, 26 June at 10.30 a.m. in this room.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): You announced, Mr. Chairman, that if there is no formal meeting tomorrow, the next plenary meeting will be held on Tuesday. As the programme of work says that we intend to start our consideration of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons on Monday, 25 June, is it intended to start work on this item on our agenda on Monday, or are we deciding to postpone it to Tuesday. Do we intend to do nothing on Monday?

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished delegate of the Soviet Union for calling attention to this point. The idea, which I was going to put forward later on is that, as we have had formal meetings on Tuesdays and Thursdays, on 25 June we start the consideration of the item approved in our programme of work in an informal meeting. I would therefore like the Committee to consider whether it agrees to start with consideration of this item at a meeting on Monday, at 10.30 a.m. If no suggestions are made in this respect, I will take it that it is the wish of the Committee to convene here on Monday.

Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, we generally follow the procedure of beginning with the more formal statements and then proceeding to informal meetings once statements had been made by delegations, as a basis for ensuing deliberations. In this specific case we have heard the distinguished representative of Hungary tell us that his delegation, along with others, intends to submit a draft convention on this subject. If this draft were prepared for distribution on Monday it would perhaps be a good idea if we were to have a formal meeting in order to listen to the presentations that will doubtless be forthcoming from the co-sponsors and then, once we have heard these statements we could immediately transform ourselves, as has been done before, into an informal meeting. We might save time if we were to proceed in this fashion.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished delegate of Mexico for his suggestion. It is for the Committee to decide. If there are no other views on the suggestion, then I take it that it is the wish of the Committee that we meet formally on Monday, at 10.30 a.m., in this room for the consideration of the item on our programme of work.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to ask the members of the Committee for some orientation and guidance concerning the procedural aspect of the negotiations on chemical weapons. If the Committee agrees, I will now close this meeting and call a brief informal meeting immediately.

If there is no other suggestion I shall proceed accordingly.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.