

CD/PV. 49
9 August 1979

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FORTY-NINTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 9 August 1979, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: U SAW HLAING (Burma)

GE.79-63592

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria:Argentina:

Mr. A. DUMONT

Australia:

Sir James PLIMSOLL

Mr. A. BEHM

Ms. M. WICKES

Belgium:

Mr. P. BERG

Brazil:

Mr. S. DUARTE

Bulgaria:

Mr. I. SOTIROV

Mr. C. HALACHEV

Burma:

U SAW HLAING

U NGEW WIN

Canada:

Mr. R. HARRY JAY

Mr. J.T. SIMARD

Cuba:

Mr. L. SOLA VILA

Mrs. V.B. JACKIEWICH

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. V. TYLNER

Egypt:

Mr. O. EL-SHAFEI

Mr. N. FAHMY

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. TERREFFE

Mr. G. ALULA

France:

Mr. F. DE LA GORCE

Mr. M. COUTHURES

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. W. KOETTER
Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. J. POHLMANN

Hungary:

Mr. M. DOMOKOS
Mr. A. LAKATOS

India:

Mr. C.V. GHAREKHAN
Mr. S.T. DEVARE

Indonesia:

Mr. S. DARUSMAN
Mr. D.B. SULEMAN
Mr. SILABAN

Iran:

Mr. D. AMERI

Italy:

Mr. V. CORDERO DI MONTEZEMOLO
Mr. FOLCO DE LUCA
Mr. C. FRATESCHI

Japan:

Mr. T. NONOYAMA
Mr. R. ISHII
Mr. TSUNOO

Kenya:

Mr. S. SHITEMI
Mr. A. JET ODENDO

Mexico:

Mr. M.A. CACERES

Mongolia:

Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
Mr. L. BAYART

Morocco:

Mr. S.M. RAHHALI

Mr. M. CHRAIBI

Netherlands:

Mr. R.H. FEIN

Mr. A.J. MEERBURG

Nigeria:

Mr. T.O. OLUMOKO

Pakistan:

Mr. J.K.A. MARKER

Mr. M. AKRAM

Peru:Poland:

Mr. B. SUJKA

Mr. H. PAC

Mr. M. KRUCZYK

Romania:

Mr. C. ENE

Mr. V. TUDOR

Sri Lanka:

Mr. I.B. FONSEKA

Sweden:

Mr. L. NORBERG

Mr. S. STROMBACK

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Mr. V.L. ISSRAELIAN

Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN

Mr. M.M. BELOUSOV

Mr. N.V. PESTEREV

Mr. A.I. TIOURENKOV

Mr. E.D. ZAITSEV

Mr. M.G. ANTIUKHIN

Mr. N.P. SMIDOVICH

United Kingdom:

Mr. D.M. SUMMERHAYES

Mr. P.M.W. FRANCIS

United States of America:

Mr. A.S. FISHER

Mr. A. AKALOVSKY

Mr. R. MIKULAK

Mr. M. SANCHES

Mr. J. CALVERT

Mr. W.H. DUNLOP

Mr. M. DALEY

Mr. D. KOELEMAY

Venezuela:

Mrs. R. LISBOA DE NECER

Yugoslavia:

Mr. D. DJOKIC

Zaire:

Mr. E. MULONGANDUSU ESUK

Secretary:

Mr. R. JAIPAL

The CHAIRMAN: Yesterday I proposed to the Committee that we now hold informal consultations among delegations in order to reach agreement on the substantive paragraphs of our report under the various items. We have received a number of draft paragraphs under individual items from different delegations, and there are also the secretariat papers.

In my view, we should now try to find an area of consensus and then agree on common texts. This can best be done through informal consultations, and I am glad that this suggestion has found general acceptance. Specifically, I should like to propose that these informal consultations begin immediately, under the chairmanship of my successor, namely the Ambassador of Canada.

We have already completed our statements of views and it remains for us now to take decisions on the basis of consensus. I suggest, therefore, that at informal consultations the representation of delegations be at the decision-making level. If we proceed in this manner, it is likely that we can complete our work by tomorrow evening. I hope my suggestion will be accepted by the Committee and that all delegations will extend their full co-operation.

I would like to thank the Ambassador of Canada for kindly agreeing to chair the informal consultations, and for assisting me in this manner.

While the informal consultations are going on, I shall continue to chair the plenary and informal meetings and guide the Committee through the first, second and final reading of the report.

If there is no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The Ambassador of Canada will begin the informal consultations at the end of this plenary meeting in room C.108.

The following documents are being circulated today by the Secretariat:

- (1) Document CD/48, submitted by the delegations of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America, entitled: "USSR-USA Joint Report on Progress in the Bilateral Negotiations on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons".
- (2) Document CD/49, submitted by the delegation of the Netherlands, entitled: "Chemical weapons - Answers to questionnaire contained in CD/41".

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic): The 1979 session of the Committee on Disarmament comes to its end. Looking back at our activities we can state that very intensive and active work has been done. The rules of procedure laid down in writing for the first time in the Committee's history have stood the test. Given these rules of procedure, the Committee is provided with the necessary flexibility

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

in solving its tasks and, on the basis of these rules, the Committee accorded priority during its summer session to the discussion of questions of substance in accordance with its programme of work.

My delegation appraises as positive the work that has been done. This is confirmed by the numerous concrete proposals that were submitted. The socialist States have presented proposals regarding all problems on the agenda, and this is also reflected in the draft report. We are gratified about it. At the same time, however, we are well aware of the fact that the Committee unfortunately has not made use of all possibilities to take further concrete steps in the implementation of the programme of work.

In this respect, we underline our position that the Committee could still have continued its meetings for some weeks. This, no doubt, would have enabled the Committee to achieve some more results before the thirty-fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

It is not coincidental that the Committee appraised the signing of the SALT II Treaty as an outstanding event in the field of limiting the nuclear arms race. Taking into account that this Treaty will be immediately followed by negotiations on a SALT III treaty, the importance of SALT II as a step towards nuclear disarmament becomes evident. We share the opinion which has been often expressed that the results of the SALT II negotiations will exert a positive influence on other disarmament negotiations, above all, for instance, on the Geneva Committee on Disarmament.

But on no account should they be used as a pretext to abandon nuclear disarmament negotiations within the Committee. We hold the view that the Committee on Disarmament, as a multilateral negotiating body, can and has to live up to the specific responsibility it bears in the field of nuclear disarmament. An important task should be to determine exactly this role and to draw relevant conclusions for its practical work.

The issues of the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament have taken, with good reason, a central place in our activities. It is gratifying for us to note the general agreement that effective measures to be taken in this field constitute a high priority task. It was and continues to be the concern of the German Democratic Republic and other socialist States members of the Committee to see this priority reflected in the Committee's practical work. There is no doubt that, in the course of this year's session, the Committee has made great efforts to live up to this commitment.

We note with great pleasure that the exchange of opinions on concrete measures to halt the nuclear arms race has been given new impetus by the proposal made by the socialist States concerning negotiations on ending the production of all types of

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed (CD/4). This proposal took a central place in the framework of the discussion on nuclear-disarmament measures. It generated great interest and was largely approved.

Now -- at the end of this year's session -- the Committee is, no doubt, provided with plenty of ideas about the future organizational procedure, on the one hand, and with various ideas regarding the substantial implementation of the proposed negotiations, on the other. We are of the view that the statement made by the Group of 21 (working paper CD/36/Rev.1), with which we agree in general, deserves special attention. We also consider the various remarks made and questions raised by numerous speakers in the course of official and informal meetings to be valuable and useful. The exchange of opinions up to now has made a contribution to clarifying a number of questions and to paving the way for further progress. This has in general improved conditions for a fruitful continuation of our activities in this field in 1980.

The main concern of the proposal made by the socialist States was, as you know, to agree upon concrete decisions to prepare immediately negotiations on comprehensive nuclear disarmament, even at the current session. Though this goal could not yet be reached, we nevertheless deem it to be important that fundamental principles for negotiations on nuclear disarmament measures have been discussed.

Many speakers, for instance, reiterated the need for a step-by-step procedure. We share this view. What does this mean in terms of our practical work?

When agreement has been reached on the necessity of solving the problem of nuclear disarmament, and when we have on hand fundamental guidelines for the approach -- we all are of the opinion that the Final Document of the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly, in particular its paragraph 50, constitutes such a general guideline -- the next logical step would be to reach understanding on the organization and technical preparation of negotiations, which should start as early as possible. This is exactly the concern of the socialist States.

The problem of guarantees of the security of States justly plays an important role in the negotiations. We believe that, in this respect, a fundamental question arises, the reply to which is extremely important for achieving progress in the field of nuclear disarmament. The question is how to guarantee the interests of national security under prevailing conditions -- do these interests provide a possibility for maintaining and building up, without hindrance, a country's potential of nuclear weapons? Or is it not better to meet the security interests of every State through mutually agreed measures to reduce constantly the level of the balance of military

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

forces and to proceed finally to the complete destruction of the material means for nuclear warfare? As we see it, the latter way seems to be the only alternative.

The Committee was often requested to single out one element or a set of elements to start negotiations on nuclear disarmament. The representative of Nigeria expressed the idea of first taking measures to "freeze" the nuclear arms race. This is a very interesting idea, which, in our opinion, deserves attention. By freezing the nuclear arms race, the present, approximately balanced, relationship of forces would be maintained.

This would at the same time be the best prerequisite for ongoing steps on the way towards nuclear disarmament. In the view of the German Democratic Republic, the Committee should pursue this course next year.

Finally, I would like once again to state the conclusion that the time has come to set up a working group which should agree on the date, place and participants for substantial negotiations. In addition, a catalogue comprising all measures which play a certain role in the process of nuclear disarmament as a whole could be drawn up. Manifold suggestions have been made in this respect in the course of this year's session of the Committee on Disarmament. They should be put into practice, right away.

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): I wish to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to associate my delegation with the congratulations and good wishes expressed to you on your assumption of the chairmanship of the Committee.

I should like also to place on record our appreciation to the outgoing Chairman for the month of July, the distinguished representative of Bulgaria, for his wise and skilful guidance of our work last month.

As this busy session of the Committee on Disarmament comes to an end, one is naturally tempted to reflect, with the benefit of hindsight, on the course of our deliberations, to make an assessment of their results and -- on that basis -- to draw conclusions. With your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, I should like to make some general observations on the work of the Committee at its session this year, and to comment on some of its results.

In the view of my delegation, this session has differed from those of past years in more ways than one. For one thing, the Committee comprises a greater number of delegations, so that we have been meeting in a more representative forum than ever before. For another, and more significantly, our session has taken place in an international climate which has seen some positive changes.

Thus, owing to the results of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, we arrived at this session better prepared

(Mr. Suika, Poland)

to discharge our mandate more effectively. Our efforts in the field of disarmament and arms limitation have been, moreover, aided and facilitated by the further evolution of the policy of peaceful coexistence, as well as by the experience of its practical application in international relations.

Looking at things from that angle, my delegation would have no major difficulty in responding to the unduly perplexed question which seems to bother some in this room, namely: "what shall we tell our constituencies about the results of the Committee's work in 1979?" My delegation believes that each and every delegation should, first of all, inform its constituency what it itself contributed to the Committee's collective endeavours and what share of the Committee's accomplishments or failures, for that matter, it can legitimately claim for itself.

This is not to deny that the Committee should be held accountable for the end product of its exertions. What we have some difficulty with is the proposed method of doing that.

To our way of thinking, the only fair method of holding this organ accountable for its results is to ask: "What has my delegation contributed?" We all represent sovereign countries. Each of our countries pursues a foreign policy which it considers most appropriate in the light of its history and international position, a policy which is most consistent with the needs of its people and the perceptions of its leaders.

Diverse as our historical and political backgrounds are, we have assembled around this conference table to seek agreement on measures which are necessary in order to promote the objectives we all appear to share. We have pledged that we shall seek these objectives on the basis of consensus -- the only practicable basis for reaching decisions with implications for national security interests.

Undeniably, that method of decision-taking should serve to facilitate understanding between sovereign States, not to hinder progress towards goals they cherish. As we all agree, there are two sides to the principle of consensus which complement each other. The first is a set of rights devolving on parties, rights which they can claim to defend their vital interests. The other one is a corresponding set of duties to do one's best to promote the attainment of the agreed objective. As we see it, consensus must be seen as a coherent unity of rights and duties of each party and on each issue. It would be utterly unthinkable to have a situation in which one party were to claim for itself only the rights, leaving for the other only the duties. If anything, such an approach would relegate the question of equality of parties to the sphere of rhetoric and semantics.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

While we are broadly agreed as to the negotiating character of this body, we occasionally had some difficulty with agreement on what exactly the verb "to negotiate" means, or how it should be interpreted. My delegation, for one, believes that it should be interpreted as a multiphased process of arriving at an understanding wherein clarification of positions is followed by the identification of common and divergent areas and the concentration of effort on overcoming the latter. Only in that final phase can parties profitably proceed to the drafting of specific treaty language.

I should like to refer to one item in our programme of work to illustrate both the complexity of the problems we have faced at the current session and the manner in which my delegation sought to make its contribution to the work of the Committee. And that, incidentally, will be what we are going to tell our constituency.

As we know, in their approach to the question of a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons, some delegations would have the Committee proceed already at this stage to the actual drafting of specific provisions of a future convention. Towards that end, it was felt that the establishment of an Ad Hoc Working Group would be desirable.

My delegation would have had no difficulty in supporting that procedural suggestion, and we said so repeatedly at our informal meetings and plenary sessions. It turned out, however, that no meeting of minds would be possible in the Committee in that regard.

Things standing as they were, my delegation perceived two possible solutions to the dilemma: either we should seek to make rapid progress towards our ultimate objective in one long jump, or we should decide to move forward in that direction in steady and determined steps.

Since the first solution would, most likely, have provoked an increasingly formalistic and acrimonious procedural debate, a debate for the sake of debate, which far from promoting our common objective might well drown our baby in a flood of words, we opted for the second, more pragmatic approach.

This approach, in our view, offered a chance of exploiting all possibilities of a substantive discussion and substantive work in the area of chemical weapons, a procedure which would help us gradually overcome our difficulties.

Consequently, we first suggested that our work should be carried out through an informal contact group and informal consultations, in order to determine the most appropriate manner of harmonizing bilateral and multilateral efforts in the field of chemical disarmament.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

As a result of the consultations, my delegation found it possible and desirable to suggest that the Committee should proceed to the negotiating process starting with the elaboration of a substantive outline of a future convention on the basis of the record of the CCD, the Committee on Disarmament and the bilateral negotiations.

My delegation finds with satisfaction that, to a considerable extent, this proved to be an effective and workable approach. Indeed, we have been able to identify many elements of an outline of a future convention. In fact, we have enough substance in hand to draft a fairly detailed document of that kind -- and my delegation would certainly like to reserve its right to do so at an appropriate time -- a document which could constitute a sufficiently realistic basis for the continued work of the Committee in the field of chemical weapons.

The substance which I have in mind includes:

The working documents tabled by several delegations, more specifically those of the Netherlands and my own;

The important joint report on the state of the bilateral negotiations between the USSR and the United States;

The results of the wide-ranging discussion at the current session of the Committee, as well as the many working papers addressed to specific substantive chemical warfare questions.

We have grounds to believe that the two Powers involved in the bilateral negotiations, whose dedication to effective chemical warfare prohibition was confirmed in their joint report, will continue to co-operate with our efforts in that respect. We would wish to hope also that other States, or groups of States, will offer a valuable and constructive contribution in that regard. My delegation looks forward to working with them towards our common goal -- an early and effective ban on chemical weapons.

The Polish delegation does not share the sceptical -- not to say negative -- assessments of the outcome of this session which were voiced by some delegations. Neither do we entertain any doubts as to the credibility of this Committee as an effective and viable organ of multilateral negotiations in the field of arms limitation and disarmament. While, regrettably, we have failed to achieve much tangible progress in such high-priority areas as the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests or a comprehensive ban on the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, we have done much better in other areas.

Thus, apart from constructive and worthwhile work in the field of chemical weapons, the Committee has received a joint Soviet-United States document containing

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

major elements of a draft convention on the prohibition of radiological weapons. . After due study of that document by experts in our capitals, it will certainly be possible for the Committee to elaborate on its basis next year another valuable international instrument. As a matter of fact, my delegation was entirely prepared and willing to initiate work in that respect even in the time available to us this year.

Furthermore, the Committee has also had the possibility of taking a useful first look at the question of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, a conclusion one can certainly draw from the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group, set out in document CD/47.

All these are by no means negligible results of our work in 1979. That work and its results, we submit, was the necessary first stage and a stepping-stone to our work in the future.

Obviously, further progress in the areas within our competence will depend to a large extent on the political will and constructive co-operation of all delegations around this conference table.

As at the 1979 session, the Polish delegation will also strive to make every positive contribution it can to the Committee's work in 1980.

Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The 1979 session of the Committee on Disarmament is drawing to an end. The time has come to take stock of this session, which has lasted altogether for more than five months. This year the Committee on Disarmament has worked for the first time as an enlarged body: it includes nuclear and non-nuclear States situated on different continents and in different regions of the world, participants in military alliances and non-aligned countries. There are therefore good possibilities in the Committee, of comparing views on specific questions on the agenda, of bringing out constructive ideas and of selecting proposals conducive to progress in the matter of stopping the arms race and in disarmament.

The Soviet Union attaches great significance to the Committee on Disarmament as the main body for multilateral negotiations on stopping the arms race and on disarmament. This is vividly attested by the fact that a message of greeting was addressed to the Committee on Disarmament by the Head of the Soviet State, Leonid Ilyich 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. The hope was expressed in that message that the 1979 session would see the Committee's activities produce the practical results which are awaited by all the peoples of the world.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

What is needed to achieve those practical results? As was emphasized in the message from the Head of the Soviet State: "The efforts to bring about a decisive turn in the struggle to stop the arms race must be doubled, trebled, increased ten-fold".

The Soviet Union is acting precisely in this way. It is sparing no effort to put an end to the arms race, to prevent the threat of world nuclear war. The meetings of L.I. Brezhnev with United States President J. Carter and the President of France, Giscard d'Estaing, are in accordance with those noble goals. The signing in Vienna of the Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT II), which initiates the reduction of a number of the most destructive types of weapons, was an extremely important event. As we know, SALT II is to be followed by the SALT III negotiations.

Questions of stopping the arms race are to be given primary importance in the meetings of L.I. Brezhnev with the leaders of fraternal socialist countries this summer.

An entire complex of proposals to remove the threat of war, to proceed to military détente, was put forward at the meeting of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty which took place on 14-15 May 1979 in Budapest. New proposals were also tabled by the socialist countries at the negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe.

The active, enterprising line taken by the Soviet Union and other socialist States on disarmament questions is due to the nature, the social order, of these States, in which there are no classes or social strata with an interest in the arms race. It is from this that the line pursued in the Committee on Disarmament by the Soviet delegation, and by the delegations of other socialist countries, takes its origin. It was with this purpose in view that we put forward various proposals, submitted draft agreements, gave explanations and called upon the Committee to concentrate on questions of substance in the discussion of disarmament problems and not waste time in fruitless procedural battles. That was why we firmly advocated a businesslike and constructive approach to the disarmament problems on the agenda, and why, finally, we suggested an extension of the 1979 session, being convinced that real negotiations on the complex, many-faceted questions involved, and progress towards the goal of disarmament, mean much more for the destinies of the world than a mournful wringing of hands over the fact that there is still no chance today of solving all or even some of the problems of disarmament at a blow.

There was practically not a single item on the agenda concerning which the Soviet delegation -- either alone or jointly with other socialist States, or with other States members of the Committee -- did not submit documents which provided the foundation or basis for the discussion of one question or another in the Committee.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

The position of the Soviet Union and the other co-sponsors was stated and reflected in a number of working documents, namely:

Document CD/4, "Negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed", submitted jointly with other socialist countries (item 2 of the agenda);

Document CD/23, "Draft international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States", submitted jointly with other socialist countries (item 3 of the agenda);

Document CD/48, "USSR-United States joint report on progress in the bilateral negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons" (item 4 of the agenda);

Documents CD/35 and CD/31, "Negotiations on the question of the prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons" and the "Agreed joint USSR-United States proposal on major elements of a treaty prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons" (item 5 of the agenda).

Finally, the Committee heard the joint statement on progress in the negotiations between the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States on a treaty prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests in all environments, and its protocol covering nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. To explain its position and the grounds for particular provisions, the Soviet delegation has repeatedly made detailed statements at both formal and informal meetings of the Committee. We are gratified by the interest shown in our proposals. Many delegations -- those of India, Australia, the Netherlands, Japan, Sweden and others -- put questions to us, asked for clarifications of particular points in the statements of the Soviet delegation or in the documents submitted by or with the participation of the USSR delegation. Some dozens of questions were put on the nuclear-disarmament document, on the joint Soviet-United States proposal on the prohibition of radiological weapons, on the prohibition of chemical weapons and on guarantees of the security of the non-nuclear States. We studied those questions and devoted several statements to answering them. I may add that this work at the 1979 session has given us profound satisfaction because it illustrates the businesslike and constructive nature of the Committee's activities and testifies to its great potential possibilities.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Are we satisfied with the results of the session? It is difficult to give an unqualified answer to this question. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries played, as before, an active and constructive role in the Committee's work, and we are of course pleased about this. I hope it will not sound immodest to say that the group of socialist States has made quite a weighty contribution to the Committee's work. In this connexion I should like to express gratitude to my colleagues from the delegations of socialist countries for their creative approach to the Committee's work, for their concrete and constructive proposals on various items of the agenda.

We are also pleased with the growing co-operation among all delegations and with the understanding with which the majority of the Committee's members and the non-aligned States in particular, received our proposals for the solution of specific problems in connexion with the cessation of the arms race and disarmament. We are glad that, in the spirit of the decisions taken at the Vienna meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States, we have submitted to the Committee, jointly with the United States delegation, a number of important documents which were highly appraised. Lastly, we are glad that on a number of questions negotiations have been started and a fair chance of achieving further progress created.

On the other hand, we consider that more progress could and should have been made. The Soviet delegation considered it unjustified that the Committee has spent the greater part of its time on discussing various questions of procedure and organization.

Of the five-and-a-half months of the Committee's work in 1979, only about six weeks were devoted to the discussion of the substance of disarmament questions. The solution of procedural questions is, of course, important, for a good organization of work creates the necessary conditions for the conduct of negotiations on questions of limiting the arms race and of disarmament. But we will inevitably prejudice the negotiations themselves if we give our main attention to their organization.

Nevertheless, there is a tendency for some of our colleagues to be carried away by procedural discussions. The Committee's annual session is drawing to a close and yet we must note with regret that many delegations have still not expressed their opinion on the substance of the questions under discussion, though their voices are quite often heard in the various protracted debates on organizational matters. I would like to put a question to them: is it not time to devote more attention to the substance?

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

We also regret that, because of the position taken by certain States, we did not succeed in achieving more concrete results on some questions, in particular, on the question of nuclear disarmament.

It also seems unjustified to us that some delegations are unwilling to continue the work of the Committee's current session, despite the fact that the specific documents submitted on the questions of the prohibition of radiological weapons, chemical weapons and the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States have provided a good basis for achieving, even at this session of the Committee, more substantial results and greater progress towards the goal we have set ourselves. We expect more active participation by all delegations in the Committee's work, we believe their knowledge and experience will be helpful in solving our common tasks. And our tasks are common indeed. The tremendous material resources which are at present being spent on the production of armaments must be diverted to the satisfaction of people's material and cultural needs. As for the Soviet Union, I can assure the members of the Committee that our country will have enough patience, energy and determination to conduct negotiations on the entire complex of disarmament problems and to strive for real disarmament.

In conclusion, the Soviet delegation would like to express its gratitude to all delegations in the Committee for their co-operation, and voice the hope that the next session will bring greater results than the present one. I cannot but thank also all the members of the secretariat staff for their tireless efforts to keep the Committee's work going.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of this meeting you were good enough to mention that a paper had been tabled on behalf of my delegation, document CD/49, entitled "Chemical weapons, answers to questionnaire contained in CD/41". With your permission I should like to say a few words in explanation of both these papers, since I did not introduce CD/41 at the time that it was tabled.

Members of this Committee will recognize these papers since they have dealt with them at informal meetings on various occasions. You will recall that the origin of document CD/41, the questionnaire, was an informal working paper circulated with a view to stimulating discussion on the substance of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

We left it as an informal working paper until references were also made to the paper in formal meetings of this Committee. We therefore thought it would be logical and wise to have it circulated as an official working paper, which was done under the symbol CD/41.

Having put these questions to the members of the Committee and having obtained at least some answers, we felt that we ourselves should also endeavour to answer our own questions, and we did this, again in the form of an informal working paper, which was drafted by the chemical-weapons expert of my delegation, Dr. Oons, and circulated as such. As we are now drawing to the end of this year's session of the Committee on Disarmament; and in view of the results we have obtained in discussing the substance of chemical weapons, we thought it would also be better to circulate those answers to the questions contained in CD/41 as a formal working paper. I may add that these answers are somewhat different from the ones contained in the earlier informal paper, they have been amended slightly but they now contain the official views of the Netherlands Government on these substantive questions of chemical weapons.

Mention has been made this morning in several speeches of the possibility of this Committee adjourning its work tomorrow, 10 August. Therefore the possibility of discussing these papers substantively during this year's session are somewhat limited, although my delegation would have no problem at all in continuing the discussions. For us, 10 August is not a magical date. However, if it is not possible to do so during this year, we hope that next year we will begin with the substance immediately without wasting any time on procedural matters, as I am afraid we have done this year.

Those are two things that I wanted to say, but with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to recall a proposal that was made earlier in the session, I think it was 22 April, when the representative of Australia proposed the holding of a seminar on chemical weapons to be organized in conjunction with the secretariat. We found the proposal very interesting, and although it will perhaps not be possible to go into much more detail during this year's session of the Committee we would nevertheless like to suggest that at the beginning of our session next year we do look into that possibility again.

This is all I have to say for the moment. I apologize that my statement is a lot less impressive than some other statements we have heard this morning, but we of the Netherlands have tried to contribute in a positive and concrete way, and I think the introduction of two papers on chemical weapons is a befitting end to my work in this session of the Committee on Disarmament.

SIR James PLIMSOLL (Australia): As some other members have taken the opportunity of this meeting to give some of their impressions and assessments of the current session, and others no doubt may wish to do so when we are signing the report, I thought it might be easiest for everybody if I too took the opportunity of saying something now.

I agree with a great deal of what has been said by previous speakers about this session. I think myself it has been a useful session, one that we need not apologize for. Every member around this table would have liked something to have been done differently. He might have preferred some different priorities. He may have wanted some things given different emphasis. But in the Committee, where we work by consensus, very properly by consensus, we have to accommodate ourselves to different senses of priorities, but also to the different stages at which questions have come forward for discussions. I know that all of us from time to time have been sorry that when we approach a problem we do not yet have before us all the reports or statements of views that we might like, but we take into account, and we should take into account, the fact that we are dealing with real problems in the world where things do not always come to a point of decision or report at exactly the time that is most convenient for the Committee's work.

I am not surprised that we have not been able to go faster. Indeed, looking at the work of the international community on disarmament since the Second World War, the surprising thing is that so much has been done over that period. For the first time in the history of the world there has been some real progress on a world-wide scale on the control of arms. I think very few people at the United Nations in its first session, in 1946 -- as I was -- would have thought that by now we would have got as far as we have on international control of arms. I agree with what Mr. Issraelyan said when he spoke today -- he said there is no possibility to solve in one fell swoop all disarmament problems. We here in this Committee should not be surprised that, when we meet, we are not going to solve in one session, perhaps in several sessions, perhaps in many sessions, problems that have defied mankind for so long. There are real problems to be tackled. We are not playing with words. Behind the words are real questions of security of each member State. And the problems are complex.

When people examine the records of this Committee, they will have to take account of the fact that the public records will not always show what we have done

(Sir James Plimsoll, Australia)

this year. There have been the informal meetings of the Committee, for which there are usually no records. There have been meetings of working groups, for which there are no records. There have been the private discussions that have been going on between delegations. But we around the table can assess for ourselves the total amount of work that has been done this year. This Committee has got a wider representation than previous Committees on Disarmament. It has in its nominal membership all the nuclear Powers, and four of them have been at the table. I think one of the hopeful things is that four nuclear Powers have been participating to an extent to which in most things they have not in the past come into multilateral discussions for decisions to be taken. It was very important and symbolical that immediately after the SALT II agreement was reached in Vienna, the United States and the Soviet Union reported it to the Committee on Disarmament. That was a symbolical act of considerable importance, I think, as an indication of a willingness to involve this Committee. They have presented us, too, at this session with what amounts to a draft treaty on radiological weapons. They have given us a detailed report on some of the issues involved on chemical weapons. If we are frank, we will recognize to ourselves that the second of those reports is at least more detailed than at one stage we had realistically hoped. It is important that they have been involving themselves in the work of the Committee. It does, as I have said before in this Committee, impose upon other countries some reciprocal responsibility. We for our part, those of us who are not nuclear Powers, should also behave as partners. We must avoid a confrontation between the nuclear Powers and the rest of the Committee. We are partners. That is one of the important things we have to bear in mind in our discussions. Sometimes in discussions there is a tendency to separate ourselves and to say that the nuclear Powers are not telling us enough or that they should be doing more. We and they each have responsibilities.

In assessing our work there are some questions. The first is: what are negotiations? I agree with what the representative of Poland said. Some are attaching to the word negotiations too exclusive a meaning. They are interpreting that word to cover only sitting down and negotiating a specific text of a treaty or an agreement. Now that is a stage, usually a final stage, in negotiations. But there are other stages, and we have been following those stages. One of them is to clarify the issues, to state particular positions or interests that have to be taken

(Sir James Plimsoll, Australia)

into account, so that when we do get down to negotiating a text, each of us will have in his mind first of all what the issues are and the facts, and secondly what the interests are of all those we want to have as parties to the text. I think we have been doing that, and I will come back to that in a minute or so. But we have been doing a lot of that, particularly in this second session.

There are other words that are bemusing us -- those that describe our various sub-organs, the subordinate bodies of this Committee. Take "working group". Some representatives have suggested that, if we do not have a working group on a subject, we are not working on it, we are not doing anything on it. But in fact there are other forms of machinery. Sometimes the discussions in the Committee itself are a form of negotiation. Sometimes the discussion in the informal meetings of the Committee are a form of negotiation. I think that has been true on the draft treaty on radiological weapons, and in the discussion on chemical weapons. Our discussions there, our detailed discussions, the expression of substantive positions by countries, the asking of questions, has been part of the process of negotiation. The work on this of all of us around this table is not just what is done here in Geneva in the Committee on Disarmament; it is also what is being done in capitals. Some of what we have been doing here has been a necessary preliminary or a necessary accompaniment to the consideration that is being given in our capitals. It will bear fruit when we meet next year. Our Governments should now be in a better position to form opinions. They should know at the next session what they should be prepared to take positions on, because discussions here have opened this up. And we have also, I hope, played some part in educating not just one another but the world. In particular, other Governments will be getting the records of our proceedings.

Now I think, to follow the example of those who have spoken earlier today, I should say something on individual items. For the Australian delegation, the biggest disappointment has been the comprehensive test-ban treaty. We had hoped that we could have at this session, if not a detailed text, at least a more detailed account of where things stand than the United Kingdom and the United States and the USSR were able to give. In saying that, I repeat what I said before, that we do not charge the three nuclear countries concerned with deliberately trying to frustrate this Committee. There are real problems, real interests, and if there are delays it is a fact that

(Sir James Plimsoll, Australia)

has to be recognized. We are sorry, however, that on this matter, where I think agreement is attainable in a way that in some other fields it is not, we have not yet got a draft treaty. I hope that before we meet again next year there will be a draft treaty. But there are things that the rest of us can do beforehand, while waiting. I hope that the seismic experts group will be able to do something on it.

Then we had a proposal on radiological weapons. There, while we have not got down to negotiating a treaty, we have cleared the air a bit and opened the way to something next year. It was impossible for any Government to take a position on that text without examining it. It will take detailed consideration, consultation between departments in our Governments. This process began. There have been a number of questions raised here. A number of interpretations have been sought by representatives in questions. A number of Governments, through this Committee, have expressed views on some of the real issues involved, such as the question of the relationship of these controls on arms to the peaceful uses of radiology, and so forth. I think it will be possible, and this is our goal, to submit to the General Assembly next year a text agreed on by this Committee. If we do this, that will be an achievement, and this session, which is coming to an end, has played its part in it.

Then we have had chemical weapons. Now there, I think, we can also say that we have made some progress. It is an extremely complicated area. There have been exposed here two of the big preoccupations. One is the relationship of weapons to civil industry, legitimate civil peaceful industry. That concerns every one of us. It does not concern only the nuclear Powers. It does not concern only the advanced industrial Powers. It concerns every country of the world, including quite undeveloped countries, because stricter controls on chemical industries could limit the possibilities of economic development in any country. Chemical industry is the basis of a lot of economic development -- plastics industry, and so many industries. So that is a real question. The fact that some countries have raised it, even in a tentative way, has been I think a contribution to our understanding of it. Then also under chemical weapons there has been some discussion by some countries of the problems of verification, which are much greater than the problems of verification in the nuclear industry -- because you have a much greater overlap into civil industry, and because the means of detection are much more difficult. We want to avoid a system

(Sir James Plimsoll, Australia)

of verification that will be too costly or that will involve an unwarranted intrusion into industrial knowledge or security knowledge. The fact that we discussed that has been a contribution, and the Committee should not ignore the extent to which it has brought this matter forward by its discussion. I had hoped at one stage that we might have been able to agree in a very tentative way on setting out a statement of some of the issues to be resolved -- in a very tentative way, because I think very few of us are in a position to take a firm position on any substantive issue. Until we have the report before us that we are presenting to the General Assembly, our annual report, one cannot say definitely that that will not be achieved, but it is, I think, unlikely. However, even without an agreed text from this Committee, it is possible by studying the records of the discussion and by looking at some of the working papers that have been submitted, and the paper the Netherlands have submitted today -- it is possible for our own Governments to work out for themselves some of the questions to which they should be addressing themselves before this Committee begins its work next year.

We have also had a discussion on nuclear disarmament. I must say that I do not see that as a field where we are going to get any quick resolution. The destruction of nuclear arms or even the complete control on their production is much more complicated than some of the other things before us. I do not see that as an area where this Committee is going to make a positive progress in the form of decisions on a programme or a course of action in the near future. But we have had some useful discussions on the issues involved. I think many of us are better informed than we were when we came. Some of us believe that in that field, too, it may be possible to make some progress without waiting for decision on the complete question -- the so-called "cut-off", for example, or, to use the actual words in the General Assembly resolution, "adequately verified cessation and prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices". That is something that Australia and some other speakers believed we should be able to make some progress on without waiting for nuclear disarmament more broadly to be agreed on either as a programme of action or as a programme for consideration.

We had before us the question of guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States, and that is one thing where the Committee did agree on a paper. Each of us is now better

(Sir James Plimsoll, Australia)

informed on that than at the beginning of our discussion, and we are better informed on the attitude of some of the key countries.

So next year we have got the same agenda before us. We may have more items on it. The fact that it is the same agenda does not mean we have made no progress. we will then have to determine our future priorities. And I do not think we can do that until we meet next year. In the meantime there is going to be the General Assembly intervening and the international discussions that accompany it. We will have to bear in mind that the non-proliferation treaty review conference is coming up, and it may be that this Committee may be able to do something to help that forward and in particular in regard to the comprehensive test-ban treaty.

Australia has come here this year for the first time. We are a new member of the Committee on Disarmament. We have participated actively in it. We have expressed some views on substance. We have taken part in the questioning and the exploration of issues and the examination of questions. We suggested in the first session that there should be a seminar or a demonstration or something like that on chemical weapons; and the representative of the Netherlands has just referred to that again this morning. I hope that the Secretariat may feel that this matter has reached a sufficient stage to put something in the budgetary way to the General Assembly this year. The Australian delegation did, as you know, propose 17 August as the closing date, so we would have been prepared to go longer in the examination of questions. Even as it is, if we finish tomorrow, I think that this Committee can take some satisfaction in what it has achieved. There is no need for us to apologize. I think the Australian delegation at any rate, if I might pick up the point made by the representative of Poland, does not need to have difficulty in explaining to our people in Australia what we have done. I think there are many other delegations around this table which also will have no difficulty in explaining what they have done.

Mr. DOMOKOS (Hungary)(translated from French): It is natural that, towards the end of a session, we should take stock of the work we have accomplished, try to assess the results and, if we are not satisfied with our achievements, try to discover and analyse the causes and circumstances of our dissatisfaction, and the unfavourable factors. So it is that in the past few days we have heard several statements by

(Mr. Domokos, Hungary)

member countries on the performance of the Committee on Disarmament at this session. I should like to describe briefly the position of my delegation on this subject.

In January of this year, my delegation took its place at this negotiating table in the hope that we would succeed in making tangible progress towards the solution of many disarmament problems. We combined this hope with our determination to try by all possible means to reach a more meaningful result this year than in previous years.

If we compare our hope, our willingness to contribute and the efforts we have made with the outcome of this session, and if we then compare the results with the magnitude of the task, we can say that greater progress would have been justified in the interests of reversal of the armaments race. But we also think that the outcome of a session should be compared with that of the previous session. In this respect -- we consider -- we would not be unjustified in drawing a picture which is on the whole positive.

It is true that the Committee was unable, during this session, to negotiate a draft treaty or convention. Nevertheless, we witnessed many favourable trends during this session, and the Committee did work which will yield considerable benefits in the following period.

In this connexion, I should like to pause briefly on item 3 of the Committee's agenda concerning negative security guarantees, which was included in our Committee's agenda and programme of work for the first time. My delegation attaches particular importance to this topic, which is why we participated actively in the consideration and negotiation of this subject.

In our opinion, the Committee has done useful, even indispensable work, if we are to make swifter progress in the future.

The Ad Hoc Working Group set up by the Committee has, to all intents and purposes, prepared the way for negotiations. It has completed the preliminary work which can be regarded as an integral part of the negotiating process and which must necessarily be done prior to the elaboration of particular articles of a draft convention. We cannot claim to have gone beyond this preparatory period. Yet, analysing the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group, we can come to satisfactory conclusions. The working papers submitted to the Committee, the draft conventions of the socialist countries and Pakistan, and the compilation prepared by the Secretariat have enabled us to have

(Mr. Domokos, Hungary)

a better idea of the viewpoints of others, on the one hand, and to come closer to discovering possible means of preparing practical arrangements on the other. The Working Group has identified several elements for future negotiations and produced many valuable ideas, interesting arguments, which will facilitate the elaboration of common denominators. The report was able to note an identity of views on several questions. It is a promising sign that the idea of concluding an international convention on negative security guarantee was, in principle, accepted. On the basis of the achievements of the Working Group, therefore, we can rightly hope that at its next session the Committee will be able to speed up the preparation of a convention on this subject. We consider, too, that the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group represents a useful contribution to subsequent examination of this problem in the United Nations.

We are convinced that no single country or group of countries can claim for itself the results we have achieved during this session. The will to make progress in the negotiations on various disarmament topics cannot be the privilege of a few. Work in the Committee is collective: the decisions adopted reflect a consensus. It follows that the results and responsibility must also be shared among the member countries of the Committee. I should like to emphasize, however, that the socialist countries were particularly active throughout the session. They took many initiatives, submitted concrete proposals and working documents, in order to advance negotiations on all items on the annual agenda of the Committee on Disarmament.

MR. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): I would just like to add a few points to one of the remarks made earlier by the distinguished representative of the Netherlands in his statement on chemical weapons. I want, incidentally, to congratulate the Netherlands delegation on the enormously constructive and active role they have played in CW during the course of this session.

Ambassador Fein referred to the possibility of holding a seminar on CW, perhaps during the coming 1980 session of our Committee. This idea had been put forward earlier by the Australian delegation, and I want to say that my delegation fully supports this. We think that this is an excellent idea. The aim of a CW seminar would be to inform those of us who will be involved in CW negotiations in this Committee next year of the main problems which we shall need to consider. I imagine

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

that this seminar would be of a kind designed to help, but would be mainly technical; it might concentrate on a few of the concepts and questions which we shall need to be familiar with, for example, what is meant by toxicity criteria, what is a dual-purpose criterion, what sort of problems are involved in destruction of stocks, and so on. If the seminar were arranged to coincide with a period when the CW experts were with us it would be possible, I think, to draw on their experience as part of the briefing, and they would help us, the non-experts, to understand some of these questions better. I think the seminar could be arranged with a minimal cost, and it would help our work for the elaboration of a convention on CW.

I would like to make one further suggestion, on this question. Those delegations who sent experts to the United Kingdom, to our CW workshop last March, know that my Government then arranged a demonstration of various chemical defence protective equipment. I think it was agreed that such a demonstration proved to be a useful confidence-building measure. I would like to suggest that a similar demonstration might be held in Geneva to coincide with the seminar. I would like to say now that if some delegations do see some merit in this idea, and would be prepared to arrange to send equipment, my own authorities would be glad to do so. I hope that this would help us in our work in the coming session.

MR. GHAREKHAN (India): Since this has turned out to be an evaluation session, and with a view to saving the maximum possible time of the Committee for the other informal negotiations, I would like at this stage to make a statement on behalf of the Group of 21, of which I happen to be the current chairman.

We would like this statement to be issued as an official document of the Committee, and after I have finished reading the statement, we will hand the text to the secretariat so that it could be issued as a document of the Committee with a symbol number.

The text of the statement is as follows:

"The special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament recognized the inadequacy of the results of the then existing multilateral disarmament machinery and established, inter alia, the Committee on Disarmament as a single multilateral negotiating body with a wider

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

representative character, in order to revitalize disarmament negotiations. It was the expectation of the Group of 21 that this, together with the consensus adoption of the Programme of Action at the special session, would lead to concrete progress in disarmament negotiations, particularly on the priority issues.

During this, its first annual session, the Committee on Disarmament worked intensively. In the light of past experience, the adoption by the Committee of its rules of procedure is a significant achievement. The discussions on this subject reflected the general desire of all States to participate effectively in the process of disarmament negotiations. Likewise, the adoption by the Committee of its agenda is an advance since it reflects a consensus of the Committee, on the one hand, regarding the broad framework of its responsibilities and, on the other, on those issues which require urgent negotiations by the Committee, having been repeatedly so recommended by the United Nations General Assembly.

The Group reiterates the importance and urgency of concluding a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. Unfortunately, during its 1979 session, the Committee was unable to give substantive consideration to the question of a nuclear test ban despite the repeated resolutions by the United Nations General Assembly and its request that the Committee on Disarmament undertake negotiations on such a treaty as the highest-priority item. This was due to the fact that member States engaged in the trilateral negotiations on the subject did not seem prepared to negotiate within the Committee on Disarmament.

The Group expresses its dissatisfaction with the report on the trilateral negotiations, conveyed at the very end of the Committee on Disarmament's session. The Group believes that it should have been possible for the States concerned to provide a comprehensive and detailed report on the status of these negotiations and of the areas of agreement and disagreement. However, it is apparent from the reported progress made in the trilateral negotiations, as indicated in the official statements of the States concerned, that there is no justification to delay any further the initiation of concrete negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament on a CTBT.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

The Group, therefore, affirms that such negotiations should be initiated at the beginning of the next session of the Committee on Disarmament as the highest-priority item.

The Group appreciates the work done by the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events during the session and endorses its continuation.

The Group reiterates the consensus reached at the special session that nuclear disarmament has the highest priority among disarmament objectives. It therefore welcomed the initiative taken during 1979 to begin negotiations on the subject in the Committee on Disarmament. For its part, the Group submitted concrete proposals towards that objective.

The Group considers that the item on nuclear disarmament should be included on the agenda of the 1980 session of the Committee on Disarmament and that negotiations should be conducted in accordance with paragraph 50 and other relevant provisions of the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament.

The Group believes that the most effective assurance of security against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is nuclear disarmament and prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. The nuclear-weapon States have an obligation to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The Group notes with satisfaction that proposals for the conclusion of effective international arrangements on that subject were submitted by some of its members. In that context, it notes that there is no objection, in principle, within the Committee on Disarmament to the idea of an international convention. The Group welcomes the establishment of the Ad Hoc Working Group to consider and negotiate on this subject.

The Group believes that negotiations should be continued at the next session of the Committee, in 1980, and that the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group should be renewed so as to continue the search for a common approach which could be included in an effective international instrument to assure the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

The thirty-third session of the General Assembly had, as a matter of high priority, requested the Committee on Disarmament to undertake at the beginning of its 1979 session negotiations with a view to elaborating an agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and for their destruction. As apparent from the resolution of the General Assembly, the conclusion of the bilateral negotiations on the subject between the United States and the USSR should not be a prerequisite to the initiation of negotiations in the Committee on a CW convention. In conformity with the General Assembly's request and in view of the great importance it attaches to the matter, the Group early in 1979 session of the Committee on Disarmament submitted a proposal to set up an Ad Hoc Working Group so that negotiations could be initiated. A number of other delegations made similar suggestions.

The Group regrets that despite near unanimous support in the Committee it was not possible to reach an agreement to set up the Ad Hoc Working Group in order to begin concrete negotiations on a CW convention without further delay.

The Group notes the relatively detailed information on the present status of the bilateral negotiations contained in the joint statement by the USSR and the United States. This information, as well as the contributions of other members, strengthens the conviction of the Group that there is need and sufficient basis for real and immediate negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament on a CW convention.

The Group reiterates that an Ad Hoc Working Group should be established at the beginning of the next session to negotiate on a CW convention.

The Group notes with satisfaction the submission of the Agreed Joint United States-USSR Proposal on Major Elements of a Treaty Prohibiting the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Radiological Weapons. However, the Group felt that meaningful negotiations on the joint proposal should be initiated at an appropriate stage, since adequate time was necessary for examination of the text by their respective Governments.

In evaluating the first session of the Committee, the Group expresses its concern that despite intensive work in the Committee on some items, the Committee on Disarmament was unable to achieve concrete progress on the main

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

items on its agenda. It is also disappointed with the way in which certain important questions were approached in this multilateral negotiating body.

The Group believes that the Committee on Disarmament should be engaged in concrete negotiations, rather than to limit itself to general discussions. Any negotiations which are conducted outside the Committee should not in any way constitute an impediment to multilateral negotiations within the Committee. Moreover, the Committee on Disarmament should be directly involved in all stages of negotiations on the issues on its agenda.

The Group would emphasize that since questions of disarmament are of direct concern to all States, with special responsibilities on the nuclear-weapon States and militarily significant States, a new approach in the multilateral negotiations within the Committee on Disarmament is necessary. This new approach should ensure full participation of all member States to enable the Committee on Disarmament to effectively discharge its responsibilities. The Group looks forward to co-operating with all other delegations in the future work of the Committee to achieve that objective."

MR. FISHER (United States of America): Speaking on behalf of the United States delegation, I was quite impressed by the original Australian suggestion which was supplemented today by the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, on the way to go about a seminar on chemical weapons. I agree that we cannot take a decision on that now, but we are prepared to consider it favourably at the beginning of the 1980 session. We were particularly taken with the suggestion made by my neighbour, the distinguished Ambassador of the United Kingdom, that one of the things to be explored is the possibility of demonstrating defensive equipment. We will be prepared to take quite a co-operative attitude on that subject when we meet here in 1980.

MR. SUJKA (Poland): Mr. Chairman, last Tuesday, responding to your appeal for written amendments to our draft annual report my delegation handed to you, on behalf of a group of socialist countries, texts for inclusion in specific parts of the draft report.

My delegation would now like to request that you kindly arrange to have these suggestions circulated as an official document of the Committee.

MR. PONSEKA (Sri Lanka): Mr. Chairman, may I begin by apologizing for beginning my remarks at this hour, five minutes before you might wish to end. I am obliged to do so because I do think it would not be a complete revelation that some of the remarks made by delegations this morning, when put together, had application to the statement which I made on 31 July. If I am speaking at the end, it is only because it was necessary for me to try, within the time available to me, to collect my wits, after those very penetrating remarks had been made by certain delegations.

I do not propose to take too much of the Committee's time, because the distinguished delegate of India made a statement which represents the views of the Group of 21, to which I also belong. I shall not run over the same ground, but I shall try to confine myself to those elements of the statements made by certain delegations which may have, or do have, applicability to my own remarks of 31 July.

The distinguished delegate of the Soviet Union, the distinguished delegate of Poland and, I believe, the distinguished delegate of the German Democratic Republic made a reference to their willingness to have continued the work of this Committee and to this not having been possible, because of the attitude of certain delegations. Those of us who were at the informal meetings of this Committee will recall the circumstances under which certain delegations thought it more appropriate to bring the work of this Committee to an end on 10 August. If I were to go back to all that it would be a needless waste of the Committee's time. Suffice it to say that at the precise moment when the question of extending the programme of work of this Committee, whether it is to end on the 10th, the 17th or the 24th, was discussed, delegations did know that important statements, documents which were relevant for the continuation of the work of this Committee, were still not available. If I say, as the Committee does know, that those statements, those documents, were made available to the Committee at the very end of the time-table in the programme of work set out by this Committee. At that particular moment, it would not have been possible for members of this Committee, certainly for those certain delegations, to contribute in any substantive way when the reports of the trilateral and bilateral negotiating parties were not available. At the time when those members of this Committee thought that they should end their work on 10 August, this was clearly in their minds.

I do not wish to go back to a recounting of what I said the other day, but I would be less than intelligent if I did not interpret or understand the statements that were made this morning as stating very specifically, not merely implying, that

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

this Committee has achieved much more than certain delegations, and among them my delegation, thought it has achieved. I do not wish to enter into a debate on that, but I would like to say that in the statement I made on the 31st I did refer to certain substantive achievements of this Committee. One of them was the adoption of the rules of procedures, and, at the cost of repeating myself, I did say that a Committee which functioned, or a Committee whose predecessor functioned, without rules of procedure for 17 years did achieve something in producing that in a month. Now, needless for me to say, in the process of defining or drawing up those rules of procedure, there was a very definite desire on the part of certain members of the Committee to maintain certain positions and on the part of other members of the Committee to maintain other positions. This is a process that naturally takes time, and if it is something that could be realized for the first time after 17 years, it was an achievement.

The other matter was the agenda we adopted. My remarks on the 31st made it very clear that that was a substantive achievement. We have set out what is known as a decalogue which is going to serve us, as far as my delegation can see, for all time. If that was accepted, well, it was an achievement.

The distinguished delegate of Poland gave a definition of "negotiation". I find no difficulty in agreeing with that definition. It has been well thought out and perhaps there might be some possibility of further refinement, but that is good enough a definition. But, as I understood his remarks, negotiation should take place only when a convention has reached its final stages of drafting. That is precisely the point that my delegation made in this Committee. And if I interpret correctly the remarks made by the distinguished Ambassador of India on behalf of the Group of 21, that is a position which certain members in this Committee, including my delegation, find it very difficult to accept: that this Committee has no competence to negotiate except when a draft treaty is placed before it. In my remarks on the 31st I made it a point to enquire, and other delegations have enquired, why not? Is it not possible to hold parallel negotiations? Now if, as I understand, I do not know, I understand, the practice in the past, in the predecessor of this Committee, has been to wait until a treaty is presented by bilateral, trilateral, quadrilateral negotiating parties and then only to commence negotiations -- if that is going to be the arrangement, perhaps it might continue, but certain members of this Committee think otherwise. It is not

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

over the definition of "negotiation" that there is a problem, it is rather on whether this Committee has a role other than to wait for a draft treaty. I might come back to that a little later.

The distinguished delegate of Poland also made a very, very appropriate reference to a remark I made in my statement of the 31st about our respective "constituencies". Now, very briefly to recall, I spoke of two constituencies. We each have (1) our Governments and (2) the General Assembly. The context of that remark, I believe, was in the background of the report we were going to make to the General Assembly. The distinguished delegate of Poland very rightly said that he knew what he was going to tell his "constituency", namely his Government. I would not wish to go over all that, I think both of us were speaking first to this Committee and second to our "constituency" or Government, and we are each entitled to make that reference or that report to our respective "constituencies". But what did strike me in the remarks he made was a very pointed reference to constituency one, our respective Governments. However, there was no reference to the other constituency to which I referred, and that was the General Assembly. Need I go through it all over again and say why that particular reference was absent?

The other remark made in the course of the statements this morning was by the distinguished representative of the German Democratic Republic commenting on the proceedings of this Committee, on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. It was particularly heartening for my delegation, as I believe, for other delegations in the Group of 21, that he approved in general the statement made by the Group of 21 on this subject. What I would like to take up here is a very useful suggestion he made, taking off from a suggestion made by the distinguished representative of Nigeria, about "freezing" the nuclear arms race. That is what I heard. The statement has since been distributed. It is a thought which he has welcomed and which he proposes to take up next year. He has even suggested the possible time and place and the range of participants for substantial negotiations. May I say, Mr. Chairman, it does indicate a very positive trend, and all credit to the distinguished delegate of Nigeria, who first made this suggestion.

But it does occur to me at the same time that whereas the delegation of the German Democratic Republic is prepared to contemplate or pursue the idea of "freezing" the nuclear arms race, there has been no reference to, or no willingness to

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

accommodate a comparable idea on, another subject, and that is a nuclear test ban, let alone the question of a treaty or a convention -- that is very complicated. We know what happened. But there has been another suggestion, which has been the subject of an Assembly resolution, that we might have a "moratorium" on nuclear testing. I would have wished that his thinking on the question of freezing nuclear weapons at their present level might be applicable to a moratorium on nuclear testing.

I say this with good reason. In my statement of the 31st I made the remark that the distinguished delegate of Sweden had brought to the attention of this Committee that there had been 48 nuclear explosions last year -- 48 nuclear explosions. May I say that at no time in the deliberations of this Committee has that been contradicted. I am not saying that because the distinguished delegate of Sweden told us that there were 48 nuclear explosions it is true. I say it was not contradicted. May I only add this, that 48 nuclear explosions is a fairly good batting average in a year that has 52 weeks.

The distinguished delegate of the Soviet Union, asked me, I say no because I made the remark, as to what has my delegation, or what have certain delegations, contributed to the substance of the work of this Committee. I have an answer, Mr. Chairman, I gave it already, as far as my delegation is concerned. It is that we have been doing a great deal of listening, and I think that I am in the company of a fairly large number of delegations here. That is inevitable. A delegation that does not know, is well advised to listen, but occasionally, if it does speak out, it must also expect to get an answer, which I have received today. I am sure, however, that no delegation would think that because another delegation is in the process of learning it should have nothing to say.

I think my last comment about what my delegation has contributed might be of relevance, because we have not contributed significantly on any subject of substance. So I give the answer to the question that has been asked as far as my delegation is concerned. I shall, however, try to offer a plausible reason, not an acceptable one, only a plausible reason: Countries which do not manufacture chemical weapons, that do not manufacture nuclear weapons, let alone radiological weapons or anticipate radiological weapons, cannot reasonably be expected to contribute substantially to those subjects unless the suggestion is that we start making them so that we can contribute.

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

I spoke a moment ago about CTB, I am now coming to radiological weapons, because I did speak about them in my last statement. We have been told that among the substantive contributions which have been made in this Committee, during this session, was the draft treaty on radiological weapons. I made it quite clear the other day that we have no quarrel with any process that hastens disarmament or places an upper ceiling on it. That is welcome. I made an analogy which might have been, which was perhaps exaggerated but which had relevance -- it was intended to put these things on a simplified plane understandable to other members -- but let us speak of the importance attached to two other matters which came up before this Committee and at the special session.

On radiological weapons, the special session had this to say in paragraph 76: "a convention should be concluded prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons". Do I need to repeat to the Committee what the special session said about nuclear weapons testing? Do I need to repeat it, Mr. Chairman, or go to the length of repeating paragraph 51, which applies to the nuclear test ban? I do not have to do that, Mr. Chairman.

I may have been somewhat more vehement in what I am saying than I should be, but the statements made today did have relevance to what I said on the 31st. As I said earlier, the Group of 21 has given an answer to a number of these questions, and I do not wish to repeat these myself. I would like to end my comments by expressing my apologies to the delegations that have already responded rather strongly to the remarks I made, but my remarks were those of a fairly average delegation in this Committee. I would also like to thank those members of the Committee who have contributed today to my education and I can assure them that their correction is well taken.

What remains for me is a little personal duty and that is to extend my good wishes and thanks to the distinguished delegate of Hungary, whom I have known well, and whose departure is something I shall personally regret.

The CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Committee I would like to convey to the distinguished representative of Hungary, Ambassador Domokos, our best wishes in his new important function. At the same time, I must say that we will miss Ambassador Domokos, whose outstanding personal and professional qualities are well known to all

(The Chairman)

of us. We hope, however, that he will continue to be in contact with our work, so that we may continue to benefit from his co-operation in the Committee. He is leaving in this body an excellent record of achievement, of which he should be proud.

Distinguished delegates, I will be very brief at this late hour. You will recall that we agreed in our programme of work for this week to schedule a plenary meeting on Friday at 10 a.m. Since Monday, we have continued our consideration of the draft report in the expectation that we would complete our work by tomorrow morning. We also scheduled, if necessary, an additional meeting on Friday afternoon. I am sure that all members of the Committee are aware that much remains to be done in connexion with the draft annual report to the General Assembly, and I believe that it is obvious that we will not be able to finish our work on Friday morning. Even though we might make substantial progress today, the secretariat will need to process the final text of the report. Under these circumstances I see no alternative but to cancel our plenary meeting tomorrow morning and to re-schedule it for tomorrow at 3 p.m. in the afternoon, on the understanding that by then we would either adopt the report or decide to postpone the closing date of the Committee's work. This afternoon at 3.30 p.m. I propose to convene an informal meeting to continue our consideration of the draft annual report.

At 2.45 p.m., the distinguished representative of Canada will be in room C.108 for informal consultations. Depending on the progress achieved in our informal meetings this afternoon, we could convene an informal meeting tomorrow morning also. I would finally like to express our thanks to the interpreters for their patience, during these long working hours.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.