

CD/PV.19
15 March 1979
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE NINETEENTH MEETING
held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 15 March 1979, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. L.D. THOMSON

(Australia)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

<u>Algeria:</u>	Mr. A. FENSMAIL
<u>Argentina:</u>	Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS Mr. F.J. DAVILA
<u>Australia:</u>	Mr. L.D. THOMSON Mr. A.J. BEHM
<u>Belgium:</u>	Mr. P. NOTERDAEME Mr. C. VAN DUYSE
<u>Brazil:</u>	Mr. A. CELSO DE OURO PRETO
<u>Bulgaria:</u>	Mr. P. VOUTOV Mr. I. PETROV Mr. I. SOTIROV
<u>Burma:</u>	U. THAUNG HTUN
<u>Canada:</u>	Mr. R. HARRY JAY P. J.T. SIMARD
<u>Cuba:</u>	Mr. L. SOLA VILA Mrs. V.B. JACKIEWICH
<u>Czechoslovakia:</u>	Mr. V. TYLNER Mr. L. STAVINOHÁ
<u>Egypt:</u>	Mr. M. EL-BARADEI Mr. N. FAHY
<u>Ethiopia:</u>	Mr. G. ALULA
<u>France:</u>	Mr. F. DE LA GORCE Mr. B. D'ABOVILLE

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. G. HERDER

Mr. S. KAHN

Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. J. PÖHLMANN

Mr. H. MÜLLER

Hungary:

Mr. M. DOMOKOS

Mr. C. GYÖRFFY

India:

Mr. S.T. DEVARE

Indonesia:

Mr. A. KAMIL

Mr. I. DAMANIK

Iran:

Mr. M. FARTASH

Mr. D. CHILATY

Italy:

Mr. N. DI BERNARDO

Mr. N. MORENO

Mr. C. FRATESCHI

Japan:

Mr. M. OGISO

Mr. T. NONOYAMA

Mr. T. IWANAMI

Mr. R. ISHII

Kenya:

Mexico:

Mr. A. GARCÍA ROBLES

Miss A. CABRERA

Mongolia:

Mr. L. BAYART

Morocco:

Mr. M. RAHHALI

Netherlands:

Mr. R.H. FEIN

Mr. A.J. MEERBURG

Nigeria:

Mr. K. AITED

Pakistan:

Mr. M. HUMAYUN KHAN

Mr. H. AKRAM

Peru:

Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO

Poland:

Mr. H. PAC

Mr. M. KRUCZYK

Romania:

Mr. V. TUDOR

Sri Lanka:

Mr. B. FONSEKA

Sweden:

Mr. L. NORBERG

Mr. S. STRÖMBÄCK

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. V.L. ISSRAELIAN

Mr. A.M. VAVILOV

Mr. A.I. TIOURENKOV

Mr. Yu.V. KOSTENKO

Mr. M.G. ANTIUKHIN

Mr. N.P. SMIDOVICH

United Kingdom:

Mr. D.M. SUMMERHAYES

Mr. N.H. MARSHALL

Mr. P.M.W. FRANCIS

United States of America:

Mr. A.S. FISHER

Mr. C. FLOWFREE

Mr. A. AKALOVSKY

Mr. M. DALEY

Mrs. B. KILLIAN

Mrs. J. ARENSBURGER

Mr. V.E. FALTER

Mr. C.H. BAY

Venezuela:

Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT

Mrs. R. LISBOA DE NECER

Yugoslavia:

Mr. D. DJOKIĆ

Zaire:

Mr. E. MULONGANDUSU

The CHAIRMAN: Before I give the floor to the distinguished representative of Belgium, I wish to extend, on behalf of the Chair and also of all members of the Committee, a very warm welcome to the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom, Ambassador David Summerhayes, who joins the Committee today for the first time. I need not emphasize the importance I personally attach to his presence in this Committee in view of his well-known personal and professional qualities, which I valued elsewhere when we served together in another diplomatic post when we were both a little younger. Ambassador Summerhayes has been associated with disarmament questions for some time, and I am sure that he will provide this Committee with the outstanding advice and support that characterized the work of his predecessors in the negotiating body. Among those predecessors, he will perhaps allow me to include Mr. Noel Marshall.

Mr. NOTERDAEME (Belgium) (translated from French): It gives me particular pleasure to take the floor today because you are in the Chair and because Australia and Belgium are new members of the Committee. That creates special ties between our delegations, both of which would also like to see our work progress and to make constructive contributions to that end.

However, I should like to emphasize the fact that, although Belgium is a new member of the Committee on Disarmament, it is not a newcomer to a field in which it has taken several initiatives in the past. Allow me to mention the important role played by several Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Belgium, and in particular Mr. Van Zeeland, Mr. Spaak and Mr. Harmel. I would also like to mention Belgium's important contribution to the elaboration of the so-called confidence-building measures within the framework of the Helsinki Agreements. Finally, my country, along with others, is involved in the exercise concerning a mutual and balanced reduction of forces, which we hope will mark a significant step forward at the earliest possible moment.

Only very recently, in a statement he made in Brussels, Mr. Henri Simonet, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belgium, appealed to the will and imagination of all those participating in these negotiations so that the work might break free from the lethargy into which it seems to have sunk at times.

(Mr. Noterdaeme, Belgium)

As we are to discuss our agenda and programme of work, I should like to express my country's views on some questions which we will no doubt take up as a matter of priority. I would add that my delegation hopes that we will be able to conclude our consultations on the drafting of the agenda as soon as possible and begin tackling the heart of the matter. These consultations must not become bogged down in semantic perfectionism; the spirit of the goal at which we are aiming and the will to reach that goal are more important than any excessive refinement of the texts. I feel that an approach that takes due account of the two major concerns voiced during our consultations, namely, the desire to define clearly the long-term general competence of our Committee but also the concern to determine exactly what we can reasonably tackle in the short term, should enable us to arrive at a solution acceptable to all.

My delegation is particularly interested in the rapid conclusion of an agreement on the complete prohibition of nuclear tests. The trilateral declarations made in this connexion in the past, the last one being in 1978, suggested that it would be possible to reach agreement in the near future. We therefore await with impatience the submission of the trilateral draft to the Committee for consideration, and we would like even at this early stage to express the hope that the treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear tests will be of long duration. Its duration will largely determine its credibility.

My delegation is also awaiting with interest the outcome of the current negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States on the question of chemical weapons. In our opinion, it should be possible for this question, which is of direct interest to so many countries and in respect of which a large number of delegations have proposed initiatives, to be submitted to the Committee for consideration as rapidly as possible. The bilateral talks on chemical weapons could benefit from an exchange of views taking place simultaneously in the Committee. This exchange of views would not replace the bilateral talks, but it might throw light on the views and concerns of delegations as a whole that also deserve to be taken duly into account by the Powers negotiating bilaterally. Moreover, nothing should stop the Committee considering the views of the two Powers in return. My delegation would like to contribute to the rapid conclusion of negotiations which should not remain exclusively bilateral. It understands and shares the desire of a number of delegations that want those parts of the treaty that have already been finalized or are being finalized to be considered by

(Mr. Notenbaene, Belgium)

our Committee. In any case, it feels that it would be highly desirable for the two Powers concerned to inform the Committee of the progress made in their bilateral talks in order to identify points of agreement and pin down those areas in which difficulties remain. These negotiations concern all countries and regions of the world, and all countries are also interested in being informed of matters that have a direct bearing on their security.

For all these reasons, my country is also participating in the seminars of experts concerned with this question now being held in the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom.

The importance of organizing seminars in the field of chemical weapons and, moreover, of the work of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and to Identify Seismic Events goes beyond their immediate objective. They should also enable us to envisage a more subtle and practical approach to the difficult question of verification. We know that this question is a particularly difficult hurdle to cross on the way to finalizing the treaties at present being negotiated. However, there is no way of dispensing with a valid system of verification and control under which the parties can be assured that the commitments entered into are being fulfilled. To deny this obvious fact is to run the risk of seeing the disarmament agreements turning into instruments of distrust rather than confidence, and giving rise to the danger of destabilization diametrically opposed to the desired results.

This having been said, my delegation believes that the problem of the paramount need for a credible system of verification could be resolved more easily if the technical and political aspects of verification were considered in terms of complementarity. Different delegations have proposed various approaches to this thorny question. It seems to us that these approaches should be regarded no longer as mutually exclusive but as complementary. It might therefore be possible, at different stages and in a sequence to be defined, for verification to be based both on objective methods, that is to say, for example, scientific and seismic verification mechanisms, and other methods which would include in particular the possibility of on-the-spot verification, still vital to confidence, and possibly verification by challenge, as recommended by the Swedish delegation.

With regard to the complete prohibition of nuclear tests, my delegation thinks it extremely important that the experimental exercise envisaged by the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and to Identify Seismic Events should begin reasonably soon, without

(Mr. Heterdaene, Belgium)

waiting for the completion of the tripartite negotiations between the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States. Belgium, for its part, is prepared, even now, to contribute fully to the organization of such an exercise.

My country's authorities have on many occasions declared themselves in favour of the rapid conclusion of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control for both nuclear and conventional weapons. We are pleased to see that the question of conventional weapons was selected by the General Assembly at its special session as one of the priority questions that should be dealt with at the same time as that of nuclear weapons.

We are also pleased to see the extent to which the regional aspect of security problems, beginning with disarmament, came into its own during the work of the General Assembly's special session. In this connexion, my country proposed a systematic study of all aspects of regional disarmament. The competent governmental experts will be meeting for the first time from 4 to 8 June this year. The advantage of regional measures lies mainly in the flexibility with which they can be implemented and adapted to local conditions. The study should therefore make it possible to consider all possible measures.

In other words, the purpose of this study should be the establishment of a list of rules and principles for use by States which constitute what is generally referred to as a strategically homogeneous geographical whole and which would like to reduce their expenditure in military equipment while maintaining a balance among the States comprising a single region at as low a level of armaments as possible.

My delegation would also like to take this occasion to say once again that recognition of the possibilities for the implementation of principles and suggestions emerging from the regional study must come from initiatives by the States in the region. And by that we mean all the States concerned: it is for these States, acting collectively, to be the sole judge not only of the choice of possible measures to be selected from among those recommended but also of the definition of practical methods for their implementation. It should therefore be clear that, in our opinion, no individual State and no international or other body can replace the States concerned with regard to the selection or implementation of the measures adopted by these States at the regional level.

(Mr. Noterdame, Belgium)

These are just a few ideas that my delegation would like to put forward at this stage in our consultations. We will, of course, have more specific proposals to make once our exchange of views is based on a more concrete programme of work, which we would like to finalize as soon as possible.

In that connexion, the relatively ~~expeditious~~ drafting of the rules of procedure would seem to us to be a good omen. I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that under your guidance these consultations will move forward and that we will finally be able to embark upon the actual process of negotiation which is precisely the reason for this Committee's existence.

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, at the sixteenth meeting of the Committee on Disarmament, held under your chairmanship on 6 March, Ambassador Herder, the distinguished representative of the German Democratic Republic in referring to document CD/3 containing the rules of procedure stated, among other things, and I quote: "The impression is, therefore, that the Committee has discussed and indeed adopted annex I as well but, as is known, the Committee did not have enough time to deal with annex I and that question has remained open. Accordingly, I and my delegation interpret the situation as meaning that after delegations have an opportunity to study this document, at least consultations should be held and the Committee should revert to this matter in order to adopt an appropriate decision in connexion with annex I as well".

As this point has been raised in a formal meeting, my delegation would like to refer briefly to the background to this question, especially as I had the privilege of occupying the Chair during the month of February when the rules of procedure were negotiated and adopted.

To begin with, allow me to point out that my delegation has no objection whatever to the suggestion made by our distinguished colleague from the German Democratic Republic that consultations should be held on the matter so that the Committee can revert to it in due course, if it so wishes. But, as I have said, for my own part I would like to recapitulate the course of events for the record.

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

The delegations present here will perhaps remember that when the Working Group set up to prepare the draft rules of procedure met for the first time to begin consideration of the matter, it had before it five sets of draft rules. It also had a list of topics which had been drawn up by the Chairman. The first place on that list was occupied by the topic of functions and membership, as section I. The Working Group began its consideration of the draft rules of procedure in that order.

Perhaps because the topic was so important or because it was its first exchange of ideas, the Working Group made no progress at all on the question of functions and membership at its first attempt, and decided to shelve it and to take up the other topics instead.

It may also be remembered that the observations made during that first exchange of ideas were concerned exclusively with the functions of the Committee.

The topic was taken up again at a second reading, when the Chair was asked to prepare a written draft to serve as a basis for discussion, as in the case of the other sections, and a text was accordingly proposed by the Chair.

When the text was submitted to the members of the Group, it was first explained, as in the case of the other sections, how its main provisions had been arrived at. I said that the main provisions relating to functions were embodied in all the sets of draft rules submitted, and explained that there had been only two criteria with regard to membership: one, that of the Western countries, which consisted in a list indicating the five nuclear-weapon States first and then the 35 remaining members of the Committee. I also pointed out that the Group of 21 mentioned the membership of the Committee, and made a reference in brackets to annex I in which the list was to be found.

In submitting my draft, I thought it desirable to amend the draft of the Group of 21, which referred to annex I in the second sentence where it was stated that the membership of the Committee would be reviewed at regular intervals. It seemed preferable to refer to annex I in connexion with the specific mention of the membership of the Committee and not the review of its membership.

In explaining this, I pointed out that a complete list of the members of the Committee would be given in annex I. There were no observations or comments at the time and, as was only natural, the attention of the Working Group remained focused on the basic question of the Committee's functions.

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

After the second reading of this section on functions (the others had already been given a second reading), the Working Group was still in somewhat of an impasse, but the comments made dealt entirely with the question of functions and not of membership. A small drafting group met, and after inevitably arduous negotiation, agreement was reached on a text which has been embodied in the rules of procedure, and consists of the introduction and section I, as it now appears in the rules of procedure, divided into rules 1, 2 and 3.

When the text agreed upon by the small drafting group was referred back to the Working Group, I again stated clearly what the text would consist of and repeated, in connexion with the question of membership, that a complete list of the members of the Committee would be given in annex I. No comments were made on that occasion either.

Consequently, after the text was approved at its third reading in the Working Group and then in a plenary meeting of the Committee, I took the responsibility of arranging for the Secretariat to include the list of members which now forms part of the text. May I venture to tax the patience of the members of the Committee and explain why I took that step.

In the first place, I did so because no one had raised any objections on the two occasions when I had explained that the complete list of the members of the Committee would be included. Secondly, there is the question of why it should be a complete list and not, as in the case of the draft submitted by the group of Western European countries, the names of the five nuclear-weapon States followed by those of the 35 States.

The explanation of this is very simple and relates to rule 9 of the rules of procedure where it states that the chairmanship shall rotate among all members of the Committee following the English alphabetical list of membership. If there is no list in which all the members are named one by one, how would it be legally possible to determine the English alphabetical order of rotation for the members.

If we had followed the Western criterion, the results would have been rather surprising as it would have been necessary to put, for instance, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Canada, followed by a series of dots and the explanatory note: "space reserved for a nuclear-weapon State", followed by Cuba, Czechoslovakia, etc. After reaching Ethiopia, there would again be a series of dots and the words: "space reserved for nuclear-weapon State", and so on, until the five nuclear-weapon States had spaces reserved for them in the list.

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

Frankly, it seemed rather absurd to adopt that procedure so, in accordance with the view I expressed to the Group on the need for a complete list, as specified in rule 9, I instructed the Secretariat to include such a list, as no objections had been raised earlier in the Working Groups.

I have gone into this question at some length, but I felt I would be failing in my duty as a former Chairman if I did not give the members of the Committee this explanation. I am always ready to listen to all points of view, and I realise that some delegations, such as the distinguished delegation of the German Democratic Republic, may have misgivings or doubts in this connexion which led that delegation to raise the matter as it did. For my part, I was anxious to place on record, possibly in too much detail, a clear explanation of why the list was included in the rules of procedure.

Having said this, it seems to me that, as Ambassador Herder said, it might be advisable to hold the consultations he himself proposed.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): First of all, I should like to draw the attention of the interpreters to the fact, confirmed by someone in the Committee, that certain passages in the statement made by the Soviet delegation on 28 February were allegedly not interpreted into Spanish.

In this connexion, I should like to remind the Committee once again of the statement made by the Soviet delegation in Russian at the fifteenth official meeting of the Committee on 28 February, when the Chairman was Ambassador Ortiz de Rozas, the distinguished representative of Argentina.

Immediately after the adoption of the rules of procedure, the Soviet delegation stated-- and I quote-- "As for the rules of procedure which have been adopted, all that the Committee still has to discuss is one minor question concerning annex I. We express the hope that the Committee will quickly succeed in adopting a decision on this matter as well".

Neither from the Chairman, nor from the delegations present at that meeting, did we hear any comments on this question, which did not surprise us. As is known, we did not manage to examine the text of the annex. Thus we noted in our statement that the annex to the rules of procedure listing the countries members of the Committee had not been examined in February. I do not intend now to engage in polemics on the subject of annex I, but merely to point out, once again, that this

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

list, as such, was not examined during the consultations. The Soviet delegation did not see it. Through the Chairman, I would like to put the following question to all members of the Committee. Did any delegation have this list in the form of an annex to the rules of procedure, now under consideration? I do not mean as an annex to the draft of the 21 States, but as an annex to the draft rules of procedure we considered. I should be very happy to hear which delegation had this list at his disposal. I can state with complete assurance that the first time the Soviet delegation saw annex I in its present form was not until after the rules of procedure had been circulated. But the rules of procedure are dated 1 March 1979. In other words, it is physically impossible that we could have seen such a list, before that date, particularly if account is taken of the time necessary to circulate the document, which in point of fact we received much later. Consequently, it is entirely natural that the delegation of the German Democratic Republic should have raised the question of annex I on 6 March. Annex I to the rules of procedure was not examined and was not approved. Our request was and remains a modest one. Since there was not enough time before, we ask that the annex should be examined in March. We maintain that request. We must not waste time in futile discussion concerning some absent or present member of the Committee, when he will appear, or when it will be his turn to be Chairman. Let us put this question on one side.

The fact remains, we did not see this annex. At least, the Soviet delegation entered an official reservation, which no one challenged. We insist on official approval of the annex and propose that the Chairman should hold consultations, after which a general understanding might be reached at the next meeting. There is a possibility that this annex may be officially approved, thereby settling the matter.

I should like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and to request members of the Committee to take account of the Soviet delegation's views, as well as those of other delegations which did not see the list and only became acquainted with it in March, thereby having no possibility of expressing their views on it.

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic): Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank, through you, the distinguished representative of Argentina, my colleague, Ambassador Ortiz de Rozas, for the explanation he gave with regard to the annex. I would also like to stress once again that the statement he has just made is further proof of his constructive approach and of the objective manner in which he usually acts, and in which he conducted the work of the Committee when the draft rules of

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

procedure were partly adopted on the last day of his chairmanship. I think that we should not continue a debate or discussion on this matter, but should follow his suggestion and our own to continue consultations. I am convinced that we would be able, in a very short time, to reach a common understanding on this question.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of the German Democratic Republic. I may say that I take note of the three statements that have been made here, and that the Chair certainly intends to consult delegations informally on the questions to which they have referred. However, it would be rather helpful to the Chair, which will be under some pressure over the next few days, if a little informal consultation could go on between delegations themselves on the time when he would be able to meet them. If there are no further comments on this matter, I would like to inform you that I shall shortly close the meeting, after I have given the floor to Ambassador Summerhayes. Before doing so, I would like to say that, following the plenary meeting, I would like to convene an informal meeting to consult you about something. I hope that there is no objection to my ~~proceeding~~ proceeding in that way. The next meeting of this plenary body will be on Tuesday morning at the customary time of 10.30 a.m. and now, before closing the meeting, I give the floor to Ambassador Summerhayes.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, before you close the meeting as you have proposed, I just wanted to take the opportunity to say a word of thanks for your very kind welcome to me as a member of this Committee. It is a special pleasure to be welcomed by an old colleague whose friendship I greatly valued in the past. As you have reminded the Committee, I am not a complete newcomer to the world of disarmament. It is already clear to me that much has changed in the five years during which I have been away, but it is also rather sobering to see some of the subjects now proposed for the Committee's agenda, and realise that a number of rather intractable problems are still before us. I take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to pledge my personal efforts (and those of my Government) to make progress in solving them.

As Lord Gornowy Roberts, the British Minister of State, said at the opening session of this Committee in January, my Government dedicates itself to pursuing the Committee's tasks with determination and in a spirit of co-operation.

The meeting rose at 11.35 a.m.