

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIFTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva  
on Tuesday, 27 March 1973, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. M.A. Khattabi

(Morocco)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Argentina:

Mr. C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS

Mr. V.E. BERASATEGUI

Brazil:

Mr. P.N. BATISTA

Mr. F.M. PERRI

Bulgaria:

Mr. P. VOUTOV

Mr. O. MITEV

Burma:

U THAUNG LWIN

Canada:

Mr. W.H. BARTON

Mr. D.R. MACPHEE

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. J. STRUCKA

Mr. M. STEMBERA

Egypt:

Mr. H. KHALLAF

Mr. A.E. KHAIRAT

Mr. S.A. ABOU-ALI

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. GEBRU

Hungary:

Mr. I. KOMIVES

Mr. F. GAJDA

India:

Mr. P.K. BANERJEE

Mr. G. SHANKAR

Italy:

Mr. N. DI BERNARDO

Mr. E. GIUFFRIDA

Mr. P. BRUNI

Mr. L. RUSSIANI

Japan:

Mr. M. NISEBORI

Mr. H. OKA

Mr. Y. HAMADA

Mexico:

Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES

Mr. M. MARIN

Mrs. M. PRIETO

Mongolia:

Mr. M. DUGERSUREN

Mr. J. CHOINKHOR

Morocco:

Mr. M.A. KHATTABI

Mr. S.M. RAHHALI

Netherlands:

Mr. M.J. ROSENBERG POLAK

Mr. E. BOS

Nigeria:

Mr. J.D.O. SOKOYA

Mr. A.A. OLUMIDE

Pakistan:

Mr. M.J. KHAN

Poland:

Mr. W. NATORF

Mr. S. TOPA

Mr. A. CZERKAWSKI

Mr. H. BOSAK

Romania:

Mr. C. ENE

Mr. O. IONESCO

Mr. A. SASU

Sweden:

Mr. L. ECKERBERG

Mr. S. ERICSON

Mr. U. REINIUS

Union of Soviet Socialist  
Republics:

Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN

Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN

Mr. V.P. ABARENKOV

Mr. A.N. KASHIRIN

United Kingdom:

Mr. H.C. HAINWORTH

Mr. J.T. MASEFIELD

Mr. R. HOULISTON

United States of America:

Mr. J. MARTIN

Mr. R.W. DREXLER

Mr. P. SEMLER

Mr. H.G. MOEN

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. <sup>V</sup>CVOROVIC

Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC

Special Representative of the  
Secretary-General:

Mr. ILKKA PASTINEN

Alternate Representative of the  
Secretary-General:

Mr. R. BJORNERSTEDT

Special Consultant:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament today held its 595th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the Chairmanship of Mr. M.A. Khattabi, Representative of Morocco.

Statements were made by the Representatives of Yugoslavia and Argentina.

The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 29 March 1973, at 10.30 a.m.

\*

\*

\*

The CHAIRMAN (Morocco) (translated from Spanish): Before giving the floor to the representative of Yugoslavia, it is my pleasure, on behalf of all of you, to greet Ambassador Don Carlos Ortiz de Rozas, head of the delegation of Argentina, upon his return to our midst. He has many friends among the members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, who have, on various occasions, been able to appreciate his merits and his active contribution to the work on disarmament both here, in Geneva, and in New York. I very cordially welcome Ambassador Ortiz de Rozas.

Mr. ČVOROVIC (Yugoslavia): The statements which we have been listening to so far in the Committee on Disarmament during this year's session impose the conclusion that there is a high degree of consent among the members of the Committee on the following:

First, that the present international political situation is favourable for achieving concrete results in the field of disarmament measures because of a number of positive developments in the international political scene which enhance détente and relaxation of tension in the world and in Europe in particular;

Second, that the stagnation of the Committee's work, which is being felt for the second consecutive year, and the lack of progress in the solution of disarmament problems are in direct contradiction with the present international political situation and its current favourable trends;

Third, that such a state of affairs can no longer exist side by side and that either the political situation should adequately be reflected in the Committee's work, or, the importance of the Committee's role as entrusted to it by the United Nations and the international community will be diminished.

In this connexion, may I be permitted to focus the attention of the members of the Committee not only on the memorandum presented by eight States (CCD/396) but also on the timely question raised by the representative of the Netherlands, Mr. Rosenberg Polak in his statement on 6 March:

"How can the Committee on Disarmament fit into this global picture of a world striving for better and more enduring relations among nations? Does our Committee still have a role to play or is it doomed slowly to disappear?" (CCD/PV.589).

I also beg your indulgence for a reference to the similar concern expressed in the statement of the distinguished representative of Canada, Mr. Barton, on 13 March:

"... if this body fails to make meaningful progress on the issues before it within the near future, its reputation will suffer, frustration will

(Mr. Čvorović, Yugoslavia)

grow and the Committee's future could, perhaps, be placed in jeopardy.

We should all be alive to the dangers of such a development, but none of us more than the two Co-Chairmen". (CCD/PV.591).

Similar concern, a feeling that the right momentum has been missed has found expression in statements of many other representatives.

The irony of our position lies in the fact that we all recognize this contradiction and that none of us is satisfied with the present state of affairs in our Committee. However, there is a lack of political readiness to undertake joint action for removing this contradiction so that necessary progress is made in achieving practical measures of disarmament. Political readiness should no longer be assessed by eloquent speeches which are heard so often in this Committee but solely by practical proposals which might serve for substantial negotiations which could lead to concrete results.

Activity on disarmament is one of the essential aspects of the United Nations work for peace and international security. The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, as the main multilateral negotiating body for disarmament, is, therefore, of fundamental importance for the achievement of this objective of the United Nations.

In the course of last year's session, there were many pertinent remarks and criticism expressed with regard to the structure, composition, method of work and procedure as well as to other aspects of our Committee's work. Regretfully, however, determination was lacking in order that the required adaptations and necessary changes should be introduced so that the positive developments that have taken place in the world political scene could be reflected in a timely and adequate manner in the Committee, contributing to an ever greater efficiency in its work. This was the imperative of the moment which the members of this Committee failed to recognize. That does not mean, however, that this imperative has been put aside; on the contrary, it has become even more pressing.

We do not consider that international machinery can by itself solve problems without the necessary political will and determination of its members, but, similarly, an adequate and efficient institutional structure and an appropriate method of work contribute to the creativeness and maturity of political will, the realization of the necessary degree of mutual trust and understanding and thus facilitate the adoption of concrete measures.

(Mr. Čvorović, Yugoslavia)

The problem of disarmament as world problem No.1 is of vital interest for all countries and nations in the world. Therefore, it is necessary to establish and permanently improve an institutional structure and arrangements which would enable all countries, regardless of their size and material strength, to contribute to the consideration of disarmament problems in order to accelerate the negotiating process and the solution of priority issues.

The decision of the General Assembly on the convening of a World Disarmament Conference and on the establishment of the Special Committee is the expression of the general assessment of world public opinion that the time has come to give a new impetus to the faltering disarmament discussion and negotiations within such a universal gathering.

The non-aligned countries have constantly and resolutely put forward their request, as far back as the First Conference of Heads of States or Governments, held in Belgrade in 1961, to convene a world disarmament conference in order to search for effective solutions of the question of disarmament.

The complex of disarmament issues exercises a decisive influence on the further development of international relations. In order to enable the international community to embark, from the present stage of détente and relaxation of tension, upon the broad avenues of progress, co-operation and lasting peace, it is indispensable to effect as soon as possible radical changes in the policy of armaments. We are deeply convinced that adequate preparations and the holding of the World Disarmament Conference could contribute considerably towards the formulation of a comprehensive platform for such a new policy which will enable all countries to take an active part in further efforts in the field of disarmament.

Here again, we are confronted by serious difficulties as regards the composition and commencement of work of the Special Committee, although all United Nations Member States, with one abstention only voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 2930 (XXVII) on the establishment of the Special Committee. The task of the Committee is a very modest one. It is

"to examine all the views and suggestions expressed by Governments on the convening of a world disarmament conference and related problems ...".



(Mr. <sup>V</sup>Cvorović, Yugoslavia)

My government attaches great importance to the timely and complete implementation of General Assembly resolution 2930 (XXVII). As one of the members of the Special Committee we are ready to exert all necessary efforts in order to surmount the existing difficulties, so that the Committee could commence its work without delay. If all efforts towards this end remain fruitless, it would, in our view, be indispensable to urgently convene the session of the United Nations Commission on Disarmament in order to realize the generally acceptable objective, as set forth in General Assembly resolutions 2833 (XXVI) and 2930 (XXVII).

This is the twelfth year of the existence of the Committee on Disarmament and it looks as though we are at the turning point of its work when new joint efforts should be resumed to uphold its viability. To achieve this objective our only alternative is to urge the Committee's work towards the solution of priority issues which have been so long overdue. In this respect, the statements in this year's session of the Committee point to the following:

First, two items, namely the complete prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and of their destruction, and the comprehensive nuclear test ban, are of indisputable priority at this year's session.

Second, the consideration of these two items in the course of the current session has been limited mainly to the repetition of previously expressed views because the Committee's files concerning these two items are already vast and comprehensive. Consequently, we have reached the point where the expression of political readiness is decisive in order to move from the phase of exploration to the negotiating process itself.

What is the state of affairs as regards the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons? In the course of last year, the delegations of nine socialist countries presented to the Committee a draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and of their destruction (CCD/361). My delegation has welcomed this document, as "one of the constructive contributions for negotiating the complete prohibition of chemical weapons".

The United States delegation tabled a comprehensive Work Programme regarding negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons (CCD/360) and five working papers concerning various technical aspects of the question (CCD/365-369). On that occasion we expressed the hope that the United States delegation would find

(Mr. <sup>V</sup>Čvorović, Yugoslavia)

it possible to translate working papers into concrete proposals as an effective contribution towards the beginning of the process of drafting the text of a convention. Unfortunately, more than a year has passed since we have been expecting this second step to take place.

Inspired by their desire to contribute to the acceleration of the negotiating process, a number of other delegations have also submitted their working papers, which deal with the various aspects of the prohibition of chemical weapons and mainly with major issues such as scope and verification. The following eight delegations submitted ten working papers: United Kingdom (CCD/371), Sweden (CCD/373 and 384), Italy (CCD/373), Japan (CCD/374), Finland (CCD/381), Netherlands (CCD/383), Canada (CCD/389) and my own delegation (CCD/375 and 377).

Furthermore, informal meetings of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament were held on 5 and 6 July at which technical experts from nine member States participated. The report of the Committee on Disarmament to the General Assembly and to the Disarmament Commission of 6 September 1972 (CCD/391) specified that during the informal meetings a fruitful discussion took place concerning various aspects of the question of defining the chemical agents, various technical verification methods and the utility of national and international methods of verification.

Finally, a great many ideas, suggestions and proposals, very often thoroughly elaborated in numerous statements both in this Committee and at the sessions of the General Assembly were put forward during the last year.

The reason for enumerating so explicitly these proposals, suggestions and conclusions, for which enormous efforts on the part of Governments and delegations have been made, lies in the following question that I venture to raise before this Committee. Cannot we say that on the basis of the existing proposals and suggestions and as a result of intensive four-year efforts on the part of the Committee on Disarmament and the United Nations General Assembly, sufficient elements have been accumulated to permit the setting into motion of the negotiating process on the elaboration of a draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons? Should the reply to this question be in the negative, the only conclusion I could draw is, that the Committee, unfortunately, does not give equal treatment to all proposals and documents. It looks as though, by some incomprehensible method and procedure in the work of the Committee, there are proposals which are taken into consideration

(Mr. <sup>V</sup>Cvorović, Yugoslavia)

as a basis for negotiations and other proposals that are not considered for this purpose. This is the context in which we view the conclusion drawn by Mr. Ené, the representative of Romania, in the analysis of the method of work of this Committee, in his statement on 15 March:

"The many suggestions submitted by different countries have been ignored and have not been the subject of effective negotiations, as would have been normal and desirable; for this very reason, the Committee is now in its present critical situation." (CCD/PV.592).

My delegation endorses the view expressed in the Committee that it is of both substantive and political importance for the elaboration of the draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons that the United States delegation should submit its proposals in any appropriate form which may facilitate further progress. With this in mind, we note with satisfaction the assurances of Mr. Bush, the representative of the United States, given in this respect in the First Committee of the General Assembly on 23 October 1972. While looking forward to the promised response of the United States delegation, is it indeed not possible to come, on the basis of the existing proposals and working papers, at least a step closer to our objective -- the formulation of a draft convention?

The proposals and suggestions submitted so far contain, in our view, replies to almost all questions that should be dealt with in the provisions of the future agreement. Even for such complex problems as the scope of prohibition and verification and possible organizational and procedural issues, appropriate solutions have been suggested, making it possible to initiate effectively their technical elaboration.

Mr. Roshchin, the representative of the USSR, in his statement of 20 March, put forward a thorough analysis of a number of the submitted working papers and other proposals and suggestions and proved convincingly that:

"... as a result of a thorough and comprehensive consideration of the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons, there is a good political and technical basis for the elaboration of an appropriate international agreement." (CCD/PV.593).

(Mr. Čvorović, Yugoslavia)

-We are aware of the complexity of certain aspects of the complete prohibition of chemical weapons and of their destruction and of the difficulties for the realization of this task. Yet, within the limits of what can be realistically undertaken now, there is a number of issues on which there seem to exist a high degree of consensus. Should not their identification and final harmonization represent an important contribution to the elaboration of a draft convention? On the basis of such identified and recorded areas of agreement, the further work of the Committee could be concentrated on the consideration and detailed elaboration of those issues for which considerable differences of position still exist.

We consider that a political decision is an essential prerequisite for the realization of progress in this field. However, the counter-argument is being voiced that the passing of any political decision should be preceded by a thorough and objective study of the problems and of the opportunities offered by various approaches. Why do we then not proceed along a parallel track? Why not agree to begin elaboration, on the technical level, of the proposals put forward by various delegations in this Committee of draft texts or alternative solutions of some issues for which the assistance of experts is still indispensable? If we have come for example to a consensus, at least as a working hypothesis, that verification should be based on a combination of measures of national and international control, why should we then not establish an ad hoc international body of experts of different specialities to elaborate proposals for the procedure and method of verification, as suggested by my delegation at last year's session (CCD/PV.569). Regrettably, this and other proposals, put forward by a number of delegations have been simply ignored in this Committee. Here again, I wish to associate myself with Mr. Ene, who in his statement on 15 March said:

"A body entrusted with multilateral negotiations cannot operate effectively unless it takes account of the viewpoints of all its members, with all participating, as the interests of all peoples of the world demand." (CCD/PV.592).

My delegation has given considerable thought to the problem of the prohibition of chemical weapons and has come to the conclusion that it is now high time to put an end to a closed circle of isolated monologues and open up a process of dialogues and negotiations. May I at this point, recall that we are committed to this

(Mr. Čvorović, Yugoslavia)

obligation both jointly and severally by the undertaking contained in article IX of the Convention on the Prohibition of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons as well as by numerous General Assembly resolutions. It does not suffice, however, repeating constantly in our statements that we are keeping up to our obligations. They should be speedily and fully implemented through concrete proposals and the initiation of a process of substantive negotiations, for the elaboration of a legally binding instrument.

I would like now to refer to the question of the comprehensive test ban. What has happened since 1963 when the partial test ban Treaty was signed? Did nuclear arms testing stop or lessen in number or intensity? No. Were there any qualitative limitations imposed with regard to nuclear armament? No. Are we getting any closer to these objectives? The answer is again: no. The only apparent difference since 1963 is that starting from this year, which marks the tenth anniversary of the signature of the partial test ban Treaty, we are beginning to count in decades rather than in years, the time since the States Parties to that Treaty undertook to pursue negotiations with a view to achieving

"the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time".

Several of the representatives who have preceded me at the rostrum have elaborated in detail many salient points with regard to a comprehensive test ban. There is hardly anything more to add to what has already been said in this respect by the representatives of Canada, Sweden, Romania, Morocco, Japan and others.

A deaf ear has been turned to 24 successive resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly on this subject, in spite of many proposals, suggestions and ideas submitted to this Committee which deserve full attention on the part of the two major testing Powers.

Among these proposals the most outstanding place, in the view of my delegation, should be given to the working paper of the Swedish delegation which, in fact, contains suggestions and proposals for possible provisions of a treaty banning underground tests (CCD/348) and which, since no concrete proposals have been submitted by the representatives of the countries who jointly act as co-chairmen, should be taken as a basis for discussion and negotiations. No less attention should be paid to the efforts undertaken, and the current co-operation, among the scientists of Canada, Japan and Sweden, with regard to seismic verification methods.

<sup>v</sup>  
(Mr. Cvorović, Yugoslavia)

This year, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has a particular obligation to the United Nations General Assembly. By operative paragraph 5 of resolution 2934 B (XXVII), the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament is requested "to give first priority to its deliberations on a treaty banning underground nuclear weapon tests ... and to submit a Special Report to the General Assembly ... of the results of its deliberations on this matter". In this connexion, I wish to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that now is the appropriate time to start considering seriously what would be the substance and the form of this special report.

Progress on disarmament is an essential element of, and prerequisite for, improved international confidence and lasting stability in the world. Both have a direct bearing on economic and social progress and development. The arms race consumes enormous and ever growing human, financial and technological resources. World military expenditures exceed annually the amount of 200,000 million dollars, which represents 6.5 per cent of the gross national product (GNP) of the countries of the world and is 30 times greater than the total of official development assistance to developing countries.

Any success in the field of disarmament could have a favourable effect upon economic development. Any international action aimed at narrowing the economic gap between developed and developing countries is closely correlated to the strengthening of the security of all nations. Development is, therefore, an essential path to international peace. In other words, it is one of the new names for lasting peace in the world.

In proclaiming the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade, the Member States affirmed that a substantial portion of the savings derived from measures in the field of disarmament should be devoted to promoting economic and social progress, particularly in developing countries.

In a number of important studies recently prepared at the request of the General Assembly, the connexion between disarmament and development is considered with a view to implementing the solemn undertaking contained in the International Development Strategy. The shift of only 5 per cent of the current military expenditures of the industrialized countries to the development of the developing countries would make it possible to approach the target of the official assistance established in the Strategy, namely 0.7 per cent of GNP. We believe that the present international political situation is favourable for the consideration by our

(Mr. Cvorović<sup>V</sup>, Yugoslavia)

Committee of the limitation of military expenditures, which would assure additional financial resources for the needs of an accelerated economic development which cannot be any further delayed.

It does not seem, perhaps, inappropriate to repeat once again in the conclusion of my statement that, according to the view of my delegation, the state of affairs in the Committee is highly unsatisfactory.

For my delegation and the other seven sponsors of Memorandum CCD/396, there is no valid reason which may justify the current absence of effective negotiations, especially in the case of two priority issues, namely the prohibition of chemical weapons and the cessation of nuclear weapon tests. The authors of the Memorandum consider that the main prerequisite for a turning-point in the existing situation could be accomplished only by a positive contribution of all members of the Committee and in particular by the joint and separate action of the two Co-chairmen, upon whom rests the primary responsibility for creating the necessary conditions for the urgent beginning of the negotiating process on the two priority issues.

After the statement of Mr. Khattabi, the representative of Morocco, at the Committee's meeting of 22 March regarding the remarks on the Memorandum of the eight States made by Mr. Roshchin, the representative of the USSR, on 20 March, I have to add that my delegation cannot accept the manner in which Mr. Roshchin has ignored the general assessment of the situation in the Committee presented by one third of its members, paying attention to one of its aspects only.

The members of the Committee, and Mr. Roshchin in particular, are well aware of the favourable response of the sponsors of the Memorandum to the draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons submitted by nine socialist countries (CCD/361).

This fact was admitted several times by Mr. Roshchin himself in the course of the same statement of 20 March--at the end of which, to our surprise, he suddenly noted "an unobjective approach" by the sponsors of the Memorandum.

In conclusion, I wish to assure the members of this Committee that my delegation's sincere desire is to contribute, along with other delegations, to overcoming the existing stagnation which, if continued, would endanger the very existence of the Committee.

Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): I have asked for the floor to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the cordial and, to be sure, very generous words which you were good enough to address to me as I resume the duties of representative of Argentina in the Committee on Disarmament.

After an absence of nearly two and a half years, I am particularly happy that on returning to the work of this body it was your turn to be Chairman and I should be welcomed by you with your customary eloquence and courtesy and, what is more, in my own language.

You rightly said that I would find good old friends around this table. I can assure you that with them and with those that I have had the privilege of meeting today for the first time, I will continue to join in efforts to attain the goals that are common to us all.

The meeting rose at 11.20 a.m.