

CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

CCD/PV.519
8 July 1971
ENGLISH

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND NINETEENTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 8 July 1971, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. A.A. KHATTABI

(Morocco)

(Previous verbatim records in this series appeared under the symbols
ENDC/PV.1-ENDC/PV.430.)

GE.71-14493

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Argentina:

Mr. E. de LA GUARDIA

Brazil:

Mr. R. SARAIVA GUERREIRO

Mr. L.F.P. LAMPREIA

Bulgaria:

Mr. I. PEINIRDJIEV

Burma:

U KYAW MIN

Canada:

Mr. G. IGNATIEFF

Mr. R.W. CLARK

Mr. R.E. MOORE

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. K. VEJVODA

Mr. J. STRUCKA

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. GEBRU

Hungary:

Mr. I. KOMIVES

Mr. J. PETRAN

India:

Mr. K.P. JAIN

Italy:

Mr. R. CARACCILO

Mr. E. GIUFFRIDA

Mr. R. BORSARELLI

Mr. U. PESTALOZZA

Japan:

Mr. H. TANAKA

Mr. R. ISHIKAWA

Mr. S. YAMADA

Mr. H. OTSUKA

Mexico:

Mr. J. CASTAÑEDA

Mr. M. MARIN

Mongolia:

Mr. O. KHOSBAYAR

Mr. Z. ERENDO

Morocco:

Mr. M.A.A. KHATTABI

Netherlands:

Mr. E. BOS

Nigeria:

Mr. J.D.O. SOKOYA

Mr. A.A. CLUMIDE

Pakistan:

Mr. S. KHAN

Mr. T.O. HYDER

Poland:

Mr. W. NATORF

Mr. J. STACHOWSKI

Mr. R. WLAZLO

Romania:

Mr. I. DATCU

Mr. C. NITRAN

Mr. N. CHILIE

Mrs. F. DINU

Sweden:

Mrs. A. MYDRAL

Mr. L. ECKERBERG

Mr. R. BOMAN

Mr. U. ERICSSON

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. A.A. ROSHCIN

Mr. I.I. TCHEPROV

Mr. V.B. TOULINOV

Mr. Y.C. NAZARKINE

United Arab Republic:

Mr. O. BIRRY
Mr. Y. RIZK
Mr. M. ISMAIL

United Kingdom:

Mr. H.C. HAINWORTH
Mr. W.N. HILLIER-FRY
Mr. J.T. MASEFIELD

United States of America:

Mr. J.F. LEONARD
Mr. A.F. NEIDLE
Mr. W. GIVAN
Mr. R.L. McCORMACK

Yugoslavia:

Mr. A. VRATUSA
Mr. M. CVOROVIC
Mr. M. BOZINOVIC
Mr. M. VUKOVIC

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. I. PASTINEN

Alternate Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

1. The CHAIRMAN (Morocco) (interpretation from French): I declare open the 519th plenary meeting of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.
2. Before calling on the first speaker on my list I should like first of all to welcome to our midst Mr. Vratusa, Deputy Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia. I take the opportunity also to announce with regret that our friend Minister Milorad Božinović, deputy leader of the Yugoslav delegation, has been recalled by his Government in order to undertake other important functions and will be leaving us shortly. Until now Mr. Božinović has been one of the most active members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. He has devoted his ability and his efforts to the cause of disarmament, in which he believes profoundly. By his human qualities, his competence and his spirit of co-operation he has won the sympathy and the esteem of all delegations. I believe I am interpreting the feelings of all members of the Committee in expressing to Mr. Božinović our gratitude and our warmest feelings, while wishing him every success in his new functions.
3. Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia): The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament resumes its work in world political and general circumstances which are not very different from those prevailing during its previous sessions. Thus, the international situation is still far from satisfactory; too many world problems have to be settled and international security has to be strengthened. There is no doubt that disarmament negotiations could have a very favourable effect on the general international situation if pursued with sincerity and resoluteness. The socialist countries, including Czechoslovakia, are fully aware of the importance of negotiations on world security and disarmament problems. The Warsaw Treaty countries have expressed many times their determination to work for the safeguarding of peace and security throughout the world and to pursue an active policy of relaxation of tension, broad international co-operation and world disarmament.
4. The initiatives taken recently in this field by the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union correspond fully to that policy of all the socialist countries and therefore have their full approval. The general demand for the strengthening of international security and for disarmament is becoming so universal that the international political bodies must not let those initiatives come to nothing through lack of response or inadequate attempts by some members of the world community to understand each other.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

5. When we started our deliberations in the spring many representatives were in rather a pessimistic mood. The Committee was deadlocked on the proposed convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons and on their destruction (A/8136). When consideration of this item showed that it did not appear to be possible to come to an early agreement the socialist delegations in this Committee, in order to find a way out of the apparent deadlock, submitted a draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of only bacteriological (biological) weapons and toxins and on their destruction (CCD/325/Rev.1). In submitting that proposal the socialist delegations stated clearly that they considered this step to be part of their endeavour to bring about a complete prohibition of both bacteriological and chemical weapons and that they were only trying to find an easier and more acceptable solution. The spring session of our Committee then focused its main attention on this item; many representatives stated their attitude to the socialist draft convention; others postponed their statements for the summer session until after they had completed consultations in their capitals. We believe that the time is now ripe for the completion of our work on the complete prohibition of bacteriological (biological) weapons and toxins so that a draft convention acceptable to the Committee can be submitted to the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Pending comments of other delegations we reserve our right to speak on this item more fully later during our deliberations.

6. Today we should like to point out that even when we are focusing our main attention upon the problems of bacteriological and chemical weapons we must not dismiss from our minds the most horrible weapons of mass destruction, namely, nuclear weapons. The successfully concluded Treaty on their non-proliferation (ENDC/226*) far from fulfilled our objectives in that field. We rejoiced when that Treaty entered into force, and we expressed our satisfaction when the Committee on Safeguards in Vienna wound up its work successfully and found solutions to many complicated problems regarding safeguards. But we should not rejoice too much. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that too many countries are still outside the Treaty, that too many still have not ratified it, and that the

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

negotiations on safeguards between EURATOM and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) have not yet begun. Our Committee, which worked on the non-proliferation Treaty with such zeal and success, should consider its duty to be to come back to it now and then and see how its obligations have been observed.

7. When the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was concluded the nuclear Powers solemnly assumed the obligation to pursue further negotiations on effective measures to end the nuclear arms race and on nuclear disarmament. The great importance of this task is stressed by the fact that nuclear disarmament could play a key role in strengthening international security, which is so much demanded by the world community. Only nuclear disarmament can free the world from the threat of nuclear war. Nuclear disarmament would also constitute a basic step towards general and complete disarmament -- a long-standing aspiration of all mankind. Nuclear armaments not only increase the danger of nuclear conflict but also draw from the national revenues enormous sums which could otherwise be used for raising the standard of living.

8. In one of its statements during the spring session of the Committee the Czechoslovak delegation expressed this opinion:

"Experience gained in the negotiations on the problem of banning weapons of mass destruction indicates that the danger inherent in them may be eliminated only through a comprehensive ban on their use, to be followed by their complete elimination" (CCD/PV.512, para. 74).

This is the road we are pursuing in the field of bacteriological and chemical weapons. An agreement on a comprehensive ban on their use has been achieved by the Geneva Protocol of 1925 (A/7575/Rev.1, Annex VI). Now we are striving for an agreement on their complete elimination. A similar road can be embarked upon in our endeavour to free mankind from the dangers of nuclear weapons. We reminded the Committee on the occasion to which I have referred (CCD/PV.512, para. 75 et seq.) that the demand for prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons has been expressed several times by United Nations resolutions. We suggested that if it proved to be impossible to reach an agreement on a comprehensive ban on the use of nuclear weapons, at least an undertaking might be achieved by nuclear-weapon States

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

not to use nuclear weapons as a means for launching an attack. In repeating this suggestion of ours we want only to stress that the problem of nuclear disarmament must not be dismissed from the attention of our Committee.

9. While our ultimate objective is the elimination of nuclear weapons from world arsenals, we also support all partial measures directed towards that end. Such a partial measure is the recently successfully concluded Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof (General Assembly resolution 2660 (XXV), Annex; CCD/318). We heard with satisfaction the announcements of Mr. Roshchin, the representative of the Soviet Union, at our 517th meeting and Mr. Tanaka, the representative of Japan, at our 518th meeting that their countries had recently ratified that Treaty (CCD/PV.517, para. 46 and CCD/PV.518, para. 12). We expect other States to follow suit in the very near future. The process of ratification in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has already been commenced and will be concluded in the very near future.

10. When speaking on problems of nuclear disarmament we are fully aware that, while all countries of the world aspire after it, special efforts to make it a reality must be the concern of all the nuclear Powers, which also under the United Nations Charter bear the main responsibility for peace and security in the world. Bearing that in mind, the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic welcomed in its Declaration of 24 June the initiative of the Government of the USSR calling for the convening of a conference on nuclear disarmament of all five nuclear-weapon Powers, that is, the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the People's Republic of China. The Czechoslovak Government holds the view that the convening of such a conference not only would constitute an important step directed to nuclear disarmament but also would significantly contribute to a relaxation of tension in the world and enhance confidence among States, thus facilitating the promotion of all-round peaceful co-operation among countries having different social systems. By its positive effect on the situation in the world, the convening of a conference of nuclear-weapon Powers would definitely contribute to positive results also in other disarmament negotiations under way and thus facilitate the curbing of the arms race, which is going on all the time.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

11. We are of the opinion that our Committee should not stand aside from giving support for the convening of such a conference on world nuclear disarmament. We have much to gain and nothing to lose by such a conference. Our Committee would then work under more favourable conditions brought about by the improved international situation and would thus be able to tackle more successfully the problems of all weapons of mass destruction, regional disarmament, the liquidation of military bases on foreign soil, and so on -- and finally, of course, also our main objective: the attainment of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

12. Much as the convening of a conference of nuclear-weapon States should not be dismissed from our attention, we must not forget to support efforts for the convening of other conferences aimed at strengthening international security and disarmament, such as regional conferences on security, mutual co-operation and regional disarmament measures. In that connexion we should like to stress once again that the convening of a conference on European security might play an important role in efforts to achieve stronger international security, and might also lead to agreements on important steps towards limiting the arms race and towards disarmament.

13. The Czechoslovak Government attaches great significance to the convening of a conference on European security. It has always striven to contribute to the maximum relaxation of tension in Europe, and as regards disarmament it is prepared to do its best to ensure the success of all disarmament negotiations which have positive substance and could lead to positive results. A number of bilateral talks between the Czechoslovak Government and other European governments, non-aligned as well as aligned, have taken place. In those talks opinions were expressed on problems of European security and European disarmament. The Czechoslovak Government stands ready to continue those talks.

14. I should like also to welcome all steps leading to negotiations on mutual reduction of forces in Central Europe. We would only express the hope that such negotiations will not later be made dependent on the results of negotiations in other fields. At this point we should like once more to emphasize that to bind one thing to another is in our opinion essentially a wrong approach and one that should be got rid of in all disarmament negotiations, as well as in negotiations aimed at the strengthening of international or regional security.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

15. Those are the views which the Czechoslovak delegation felt obliged to express at the beginning of our summer session, which we sincerely hope will bring positive results.

16. Before concluding my statement I should like to welcome to our midst Mr. Khosbayar of the Mongolian People's Republic and Mr. Cvorović of Yugoslavia and extend to them our best wishes in their work for disarmament. I should like also to join you, Mr. Chairman, in welcoming the Deputy Foreign Minister of Yugoslavia, Mr. Vratusa and to say "Goodbye and good wishes" to Mr. Božinović, who has been such an active member of our small disarmament community.

17. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan): I intend today to present the Pakistan delegation's views on the subject of chemical and biological weapons. Before doing so I should like to associate my delegation with the other representatives who have welcomed to our midst Mr. Khosbayar of Mongolia and Mr. Cvorović of Yugoslavia. We have no doubt that they will make a valuable and constructive contribution to the deliberations of this Committee. May I also associate my delegation with the welcome you, Mr. Chairman, have expressed to Mr. Vratusa and join you in the tribute you have paid to Mr. Božinović, who has made such a positive contribution to the work of this Committee.

18. Since the beginning of the year this Committee has discussed in depth questions relating to the prohibition and elimination of chemical and biological weapons. Divergent views were expressed in favour of and against a joint convention, which led us to conclude that we were moving towards an impasse. However, on 30 March the Soviet Union, on behalf of the socialist group, submitted a separate draft convention on biological weapons (CCD/325/Rev.1). In welcoming the Soviet initiative the Pakistan delegation appreciates the spirit in which that proposal is made, aimed as it is at taking a positive step forward in the field of disarmament. Thus this Committee has before it two drafts on the subject: the first (CCD/255/Rev.2*), submitted by the United Kingdom, and the second, to which I have just referred, submitted by the socialist group.

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

19. Pakistan's position on the need for a single treaty on chemical and biological weapons has been stated in unequivocal terms in this Committee as well as in the General Assembly. Pakistan, along with other members of the non-aligned group in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, is a co-sponsor of a joint memorandum (CCD/310) on the question of chemical and biological methods of warfare. We are of the view that a joint treaty on chemical and biological weapons would constitute a positive and real step towards disarmament. Thus a separate treaty on biological weapons and the postponement of a treaty on chemical weapons would, in my delegation's opinion, inevitably create an impression that a treaty on chemical weapons is not within reach in the foreseeable future. Secondly, this Committee has as its mandate the United Nations General Assembly resolution 2662 (XXV) (CCD/318) which requires that chemical and biological weapons should continue to be treated jointly. Another reason in favour of having a joint treaty is that a separate treaty on biological weapons would tend to weaken the Geneva Protocol of 1925 (A/7575/Rev.1, Annex VI).
20. We have listened with great interest and attention to the statements made in this Committee on this subject. We have listened with particular interest to the arguments put forward by the socialist countries in presenting their draft since they are aimed at meeting the reservations that have been expressed in this Committee with regard to a separate treaty on biological weapons.
21. While my delegation is in favour of upholding the principle of a joint treaty on chemical and biological weapons, we do appreciate that there exist certain obstacles to progress on the banning of chemical methods of warfare. We also appreciate that there is a sincere effort on the part of the sponsors of the two drafts to move ahead with a treaty on biological weapons, a treaty that would represent our first step towards disarmament rather than the measures for non-arnament that we have taken in the past. It is in this spirit of co-operation that I offer the following remarks on the two drafts that are before this Committee.
22. In my delegation's view the most important element of any separate convention on biological weapons would be the link clause for the conclusion of a convention on chemical weapons. This clause would spell out in clear and unequivocal terms

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

an undertaking for the early conclusion of a convention on chemical methods of warfare. In this way the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament would remain actively seized of the formulation of a convention on the prohibition of chemical methods of warfare. In this context we feel that the proposal made by the representative of Poland (CCD/PV.510, para. 28) for the establishment of a time-limit for the conclusion of negotiations on chemical weapons deserves serious consideration. We look forward to the elaboration of this proposal by the Polish delegation. In our view a convention on chemical methods of warfare should be concluded within three years of the entry into force of a convention on biological methods of warfare.

23. At the beginning of this statement I referred to the importance that my delegation attaches to the mandate that has been given to the Committee by United Nations General Assembly resolution 2662 (XXV) as well as to the need for maintaining the sanctity of the Geneva Protocol of 1925. Bearing those considerations in mind, we feel that the preamble to the socialist draft, which refers specifically to the elimination and prohibition of chemical weapons as well as to the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and to the United Nations General Assembly resolutions, should be maintained.

24. There has been much discussion in this Committee regarding the inclusion of a reference to the use of biological weapons. Those who have argued in favour of the inclusion of the term have pointed to the fact that there are some signatory States that have entered reservations to the Geneva Protocol of 1925. Thus, in certain circumstances the use of those weapons of warfare is not totally excluded. On the other hand, it has been stated that any reference to the use of those weapons would axiomatically undermine the force of the Geneva Protocol. In my delegation's opinion, the eighth and tenth paragraphs of the preamble of the socialist draft and its article VIII, which refer to the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and to the General Assembly resolutions adequately meet the issue of use.

25. I pass now to the question of verification which has been the principal obstacle to the conclusion of a convention on chemical weapons. My delegation appreciates the efforts that have been made towards overcoming this hurdle. A number of working papers have been submitted to this Committee and yesterday we listened with great interest to distinguished experts who discussed the subject in depth

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

at our informal meeting. My delegation feels that the solution of this problem would pave the way to a convention on chemical weapons and therefore we fully support the proposal made earlier by the Japanese delegation (CCD/PV.456, para. 82) for a group of experts to be formed with a view to studying and overcoming this important obstacle.

26. With regard to an undertaking not to stockpile, produce or develop biological weapons, this subject is treated in a separate article, article I of the socialist draft. Article II of that draft refers to the destruction of those weapons and article III requires member States not to assist, encourage or induce other States to take action contrary to the provisions of the convention. My delegation feels that all these three items are sufficiently important to merit their being treated separately under different articles as has been proposed in the socialist draft. We are of the view, however, that subparagraph (b) of article II of the United Kingdom draft, in accordance with which parties would undertake not to conduct, assist or permit research aimed at production of biological agents should be included in the convention.

27. Regarding the important question of the verification and complaint procedure, we share the view expressed by the United Arab Republic delegation (CCD/PV.516, para. 22) that occasions could arise when relations between States were of such a nature that consultation and co-operation between them would not be practicable. My delegation also feels that the need to act quickly is of the essence on such occasions, and a procedure which ensured credible and effective measures for the Security Council to take action would be supported by my delegation.

28. We also welcome the inclusion of article X in the socialist draft which will encourage the exchange of scientific and technological information for the development of peaceful uses of biological agents and toxins. We feel that this measure will help to bridge the technological gap that exists between scientifically-advanced and developing countries. We are in favour of such measures in all disarmament agreements.

29. My delegation is also of the view that differences in the terminology used in the draft conventions -- between "agents" and "weapons", etc. -- could lead to ambiguity and possible flaws in the convention. Therefore, in the interest of uniformity, my delegation prefers the term "chemical methods of warfare" recommended in the United Kingdom draft as the most suitable phraseology for the convention.

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

30. We notice also that the socialist draft does not contain a withdrawal clause. We feel that in accordance with established practice in disarmament conventions a withdrawal clause should be included in the convention. We therefore feel that the principle stated in article IX of the United Kingdom draft should be included in any treaty on biological weapons. For the same reason, we support the inclusion of an article on amendments as proposed in article XI of the socialist draft.

31. In conclusion, I should like to state that my Delegation maintains its preference for the concept of a joint treaty on chemical and biological weapons. We feel that a separate convention on biological methods of warfare would not be satisfactory but we have offered our comments on the two drafts before this Committee in a spirit of co-operation and with a view to saving time should the Committee decide finally that for the present the only possibility of progress is to go forward with a separate treaty on biological weapons. Should that be the case, my delegation is of the opinion that a convention on biological weapons should be formulated without delay. We earnestly hope that the time available to us before the forthcoming General Assembly session will be profitably spent in achieving concrete progress towards a comprehensive test ban treaty as we stand committed to furnish the General Assembly, in accordance with its resolution 2663(XV) (CCD/318), with a special report on this subject.

32. Mr. VRATUSA (Yugoslavia): Mr. Chairman, may I first of all thank you very much for the kind words of welcome you have extended to me. It is always a pleasure for me to participate personally in the activities of this Committee. I should like also, in the name of the Yugoslav delegation, to welcome to our midst the new representative of the Mongolian People's Republic, Ambassador Khosbayar.

33. There have been some encouraging signs recently in the disarmament field. At the first meeting of the summer session, the two co-Chairmen reminded us that the Governments of the USSR and the United States had agreed in principle to achieve an agreement this year restricting activities in the sphere of ABMs while at the same time indicating that some other as yet undefined steps relevant to limiting offensive nuclear weapons would be undertaken also (CCD/PV.517, paras. 15 and 44). The representatives of the United States and the

(Mr. Vratusa, Yugoslavia)

Soviet Union pointed out further the readiness of their respective Governments to begin talks in the near future on mutual balanced force reductions in Europe (ibid., paras. 17 and 48). For the present I shall confine myself to expressing the hope that with the active co-operation of all interested governments these activities will bear fruit.

34. The purpose of my remarks today, however, is to submit some of the views of the Yugoslav delegation on the present state of the negotiations on chemical and biological weapons. Our position on the fundamental problem connected with this question is familiar; it has been stated several times here in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament as well as in the United Nations General Assembly and on other occasions. It is reflected also in the memorandum of the non-aligned group (CCD/310) submitted at last year's session of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. That attitude of ours remains unchanged.

35. However, negotiations on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons have been developing in such a way as to make necessary some more detailed comments, especially since nine socialist countries submitted on 30 March a draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) weapons and toxins, and on their destruction (CCD/325/Rev.1).

36. Some delegations have already expressed their views on that draft. The Yugoslav delegation has been studying these views very carefully. On 27 April we too submitted our preliminary views (CCD/PV.511, paras. 31 et seq.). On that occasion the Yugoslav delegation emphasized especially that it was necessary, in approaching the problem of banning bacteriological weapons and toxins, to preserve an adequate link between the prohibition of chemical weapons and that of biological weapons irrespective of whether they were dealt with in a single instrument or separately.

37. The first point I should like to stress at present is the continuity of negotiations on banning chemical weapons. Actually, this is our basic concern and primary task at this stage. As a matter of fact, since 30 March the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has dealt in large part with the

(Mr. Vratusa, Yugoslavia)

problem of prohibiting biological weapons and toxins, whereas the negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons have not been in proportion to the urgency of their elimination from the arsenals of States, although that urgency was recognized in General Assembly resolution 2662 (XXV) (CCD/318). Even if we regard this matter from the formal standpoint it is apparent that we do not have as yet an instrument or instruments accepted as a basis for negotiations on that intricate and complex issue. There is the feeling that this subject is still being discussed in fragments, frequently only from the technical aspect of control. The impression is, therefore, that the necessary political determination to conduct appropriate negotiations on banning those weapons is lacking. In these circumstances we may ask in all seriousness where negotiations on banning biological weapons and toxins only are getting us. We may well ask also if it suffices, in the draft convention on biological weapons and toxins, simply to undertake the obligation in principle and in a generalized fashion to conduct negotiations also on chemical weapons.

38. I agree with the views of the representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Khallaf, who, in his remarks on 13 May, requested the insertion of the obligation not only to conduct negotiations but also to achieve an agreement on prohibiting chemical weapons (CCD/PV.516, para. 13). However, even if such an obligation were inserted in the draft convention on biological weapons and toxins it would not have full relevance unless accompanied by suitable political action on the part of States to renounce chemical weapons as a means of warfare generally. It would also lack substance unless, on that basis, appropriate instruments on which to negotiate were elaborated and submitted for negotiation without delay. For the moment we consider this as the primary purpose of our activity here and also later in the United Nations General Assembly.

39. In other words, it should be clear that the separate approach to the issue should not be interpreted as an act intended to isolate the solution of the problem of biological weapons and toxins while postponing negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons. We look upon these as functionally linked and think of their separate treatment as a technical device made necessary by the complexity of the problems involved.

40. Another important consideration in the focus of our attention is related to safeguarding the Geneva Protocol (A/7575/Rev.1, Annex VI) from any kind of direct or indirect weakening. Studying the document of the nine socialist

(Mr. Vratusa, Yugoslavia)

countries we notice that it strives to attain that objective. However, we ask ourselves whether one article in the convention declaring good intentions would be enough to eliminate our fears in this respect. We feel, furthermore, that the text of the convention should retain the elements that consolidate the validity of the Geneva Protocol as an instrument of international law. Those elements were fought for and won in the action conducted during the past few years and there is no reason whatsoever for their not being registered in this convention. I have in mind above all resolution 2603 A (XXIV) (CCD/275).

41. Actually, our observations relate for the most part to certain formulations in the preamble which mention only bacteriological (biological) weapons and toxins, leaving out chemical weapons. Those formulations should be completed -- that is, adequately amended. The same could be said concerning the declaration expressing readiness to continue negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons. For instance, it is hardly acceptable that a review conference to deal with the question of progress made in the field of chemical weapons should be held not earlier than after a period of five years. That conference should be held much sooner -- in two or three years at most after agreement has been reached on bacteriological (biological) weapons. I have noted with pleasure that some other delegations have expressed a similar view.

42. The changes that we should like to see in the draft convention on biological weapons and toxins are not extensive. As a matter of fact, the substance is already in the draft and all that remains to be done is to define some points more precisely and to call others by their right names. I assume that it will not be found difficult to act along these lines.

43. Before concluding my statement may I take this opportunity, when discussing the draft of the first international instrument relating to disarmament, i.e., the convention on biological weapons and toxins, to draw attention to the necessity of reaffirming the principle according to which savings from disarmament should be channelled to social and economic development, taking into account primarily the requirements of developing countries. What I have in mind is not so much the amount of the savings from this particular measure of disarmament as the importance of the principle per se which has been widely accepted in General Assembly resolutions of the United Nations.

(Mr. Vratusa, Yugoslavia)

44. Having presented now our preliminary observations on the draft convention on biological weapons and toxins I should like to come back later to the question of assuring continuity of work on elaborating the convention for banning chemical weapons. May I at this stage emphasize once more the readiness of the delegation of Yugoslavia to co-operate with others during this session in elaborating further the elements for the prohibition of chemical weapons and, simultaneously, in endeavouring to improve the draft of the convention on biological weapons and toxins. In our view, this work requires joint efforts and mutual understanding as well as much patience and a spirit of confidence so that whatever we produce here may become the property of all States in common.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament today held its 519th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of Mr. Mohamed Al Arbi Khattabi, representative of Morocco.

"Statements were made by the representatives of Czechoslovakia, Pakistan and Yugoslavia.

"The delegation of Canada submitted 'Explanatory comments on Working Paper on Seismological detection and identification of underground Nuclear Explosions' (CCD/327/Add.1).

"The delegation of the United States of America submitted a 'Working paper containing remarks of Dr. Stephan Lukasik, Director of the U.S. Advanced Research Projects Agency, regarding research on seismic detection, location and identification of earthquakes and explosions, presented at Informal Meeting on 30 June 1971' (CCD/330).

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Tuesday, 13 July 1971, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 11.25 a.m.