

CD/PV.52  
14 August 1979  
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIFTY-SECOND MEETING  
held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Tuesday, 14 August 1979, at 5 p.m.

Chairman:

U SAW HLAING

(Burma)

## PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria:

Argentina:

Mr. A. DUMONT

Miss N.F. PENABAD

Australia:

Sir James PLIMSOLL

Mr. A. BEHM

Ms. M. WICKES

Belgium:

Mr. P. BERG

Brazil:

Mr. S. DUARTE

Bulgaria:

Mr. I. SOTIROV

Mr. H. HALACHEV

Burma:

U SAW HLAING

U NGWE WIN

Canada:

Cuba:

Mr. L. SOLA VILA

Mrs. V.B. JACKLEWICH

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. V. TYLNER

Egypt:

Mr. O. EL-SHAPEI

Mr. N. FAHMY

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. TERREFE

Mr. G. ALULA

France:

Mr. F. DE LA GORCE

Mr. M. COUTHURES

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. G. HERDER

Mr. R. HECKEL

Germany, Federal Republic of: Mr. G. PFEIFFER  
Mr. H. MÜLLER

Hungary: Mr. A. LAKATOS

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

Indonesia: Mr. M. SIDIK  
Mr. D.B. SULEMAN

Iran: Mr. D. AMERI

Italy: Mr. FOLCO DE LUCA

Japan: Mr. T. NONOYAMA  
Mr. R. ISHII  
Mr. TSUNOO

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

Mexico: Mr. M.A. CÁCERES

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. MARKIER  
Mr. M. AKRAM

Peru:

Poland: Mr. B. SUJKA.  
Mr. M. KRUCZYK

Romania: Mr. C. ENE  
Mr. V. TUDOR

Sri Lanka: Mr. I.O. FONSEKA  
Miss M.L. NAGANATHAN

Sweden: Mr. L. NORBERG  
Mr. S. STRÖMBÄCK

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN  
Mr. A.I. TIOURENKOV  
Mr. N.P. SMIDOVICH

United Kingdom: Mr. D. 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. DUNLOP  
Mr. M. DALEY

Venezuela: Mrs. R. LISBOA DE NECER

Yugoslavia: Mr. M. VRHUNEC  
Mr. D. DJOKIĆ

Zaire: Mr. MULONGANDUSU ESUK

Secretary: Mr. R. JAIPAL

The CHAIRMAN: I declare open the 52nd plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament. The Committee has before it document CD/L.4 which has been circulated in the official and working languages being used at present and which contains the second version of the draft report to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The Secretariat has also distributed addendum 1 to the index of statements made at plenary meetings, which was circulated to the Committee last week. That addendum contains the statements made at the 49th plenary meeting, which was held after the index was circulated. I would appreciate it if any suggestion for additions to the index could be transmitted by delegations to the Secretariat not later than 11 a.m. on Thursday, 16 August.

You will recall that there were some questions pending regarding section C of CD/L.4, on page 16, on the subject of negative security guarantees. As a result of informal consultations, a text has been produced and will be circulated shortly. In the meanwhile, we may consider the rest of the text of CD/L.4. But before that, I give the floor to the distinguished representative of the Netherlands, who wishes to introduce document CD/52.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): Members of the Committee are aware of the fact that a working paper on CW was circulated yesterday under the symbol CD/52 in the name of France, Italy and the Netherlands. I should now like to explain, very briefly, the reason why the Netherlands is submitting this paper at this stage, and also mention some other factors which give us some concern.

As you are aware, the Netherlands delegation has made an effort, from the beginning of this session of the CD, to arrive at substantive results in respect of a CW ban. I need not enumerate the various statements and papers submitted both in formal and informal meetings. But towards the end of this session we attempted to condense, in an agreed text, the main elements of a future CW convention. This agreed text would indicate both the areas of agreement and the areas where further work needed to be done. With this in view we entered into consultations with a large number of interested delegations from all three groups. These consultations confirmed our conviction that there is, in fact, the beginning of the basis for consensus on substance, at least in so far as delegations have been willing to express themselves on substance. It is to be regretted that there are a number of delegations that, for one reason or the other, have avoided doing so.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

Nevertheless, we succeeded in establishing as a fact that a wide range of member States agreed with the substantive text which we, together with several others, developed. But when we attempted to enlist some co-sponsorship for this paper from the various groups, we found that even members who had co-operated in the drafting of it, and who had no problem with the contents, did not see their way clear to giving their name to this paper. This may have been partly due to lack of time for obtaining clearance from their respective capitals, but it appeared that there was also a more disconcerting tendency which prevented co-operation. I am referring to an increasing tendency of certain members to act only together with a certain number of other States members, that is, to operate as a group and only as a group. This is a phenomenon at which we must take a very careful look.

While my delegation would be the first to admit, and even to stress, that in certain matters the fact that a particular country belongs to a military, security alliance, imposes certain obligations and may restrict its freedom of action, at the same time we could not accept the proposition that this block solidarity covers all fields of disarmament negotiations. If such were the case I fear that the progress we can make in the future will be severely limited.

I cannot conceal from you the fact that while I was dismayed at the restrictions which the two bilaterally negotiating powers imposed on multilateral negotiations on CW in the CD, I was also disappointed by the lack of effort on the part of others to help us break this embargo and join with us in a discussion on the substance of CW.

The two negotiating Powers did at least respond to our request by making valuable contributions in discussing substantive issues, and those two Powers did submit an interesting joint statement.

It is in this light that my delegation, together with the delegations of France and Italy, has tabled working paper CD/52. We hope that it will serve as a point of departure at our next session, and that it will then be possible to proceed in a spirit of co-operation and mutual accommodation. We hope that delegations will draw the attention of their Governments to the contents of this paper and invite them to contribute to a discussion on the merits or demerits of elements identified in it.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (translated from French): I naturally wish to associate myself fully with the statement just made by our distinguished colleague from the Netherlands. We attach great importance to the discussion we have had on disarmament in the area of chemical weapons. We consider that it has produced results, very preliminary ones perhaps, of a very general nature, but which it was worth attempting to record, and we would have been glad if the Committee had been able to take note of them in one of its documents, for example, in its report.

In any event, we consider that these results exist and we wished to see them recorded in a document which has now been approved, as our distinguished colleague from the Netherlands has pointed out, by more delegations than are listed as sponsors. We hope that this record of points of convergence and divergency and of matters which were considered will be useful for our future work on this subject, which all the delegations represented in the Committee regard as one of the most important ones before us.

The CHAIRMAN: As I have mentioned, we shall go through the draft report contained in document CD/L.4 except section C on page 16. This will be the final reading, after which we should adopt the report. We will now go through section I entitled "Introduction", starting with paragraph 1.

If there is no comment we shall proceed to paragraph 2.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no comment we shall proceed to paragraph 3.

It was so decided.

Mr. EL-SHAFEI (Egypt): I wonder if we could be more specific in paragraph 3 as to which session of the General Assembly we shall submit this report of the Committee on Disarmament. We could, for example, add "The Committee on Disarmament submits to the thirty-fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly...". I am not very insistent on this point, but if this correction improves the text and adds more precision then I would welcome its inclusion.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments on this point?

I would therefore agree to the inclusion of the correction suggested by the distinguished Ambassador of Egypt.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now proceed to paragraph 4.

If there is no comment we shall proceed to paragraph 5.

Mr. EL-SHAFEI (Egypt): I have a very minor correction to suggest. I remember that I introduced the notion of "opening statements" instead of "statements of a general character" -- if this corresponds to customary usage. The statements made were "opening statements" and not simply of a "general character".

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic): I have doubts whether it would be right to change the notion of "general character" to "opening statements" because, if I remember correctly, the statement I made on behalf of the German Democratic Republic was not an opening statement. I did not make this statement in honour of the opening of the session but in order to explain certain general principles of our approach to the future work of this body. That is why I think it would be better to leave this sentence as it is, as it really reflects better the intention of the statement of my country.

Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka): May I say that I am inclined to agree with the amendment proposed by the distinguished representative of Egypt. Throughout paragraph 5 there are references to the names of leaders of delegations of the countries that made statements on that date. This was a meeting of the CD, and I do not wish to get into philosophical arguments whether this is a new body or a continuation of the old, as it creates problems, but at a meeting such as this, when there is representation at a higher level than that to which one is ordinarily accustomed -- and I know that certain delegations meant to be represented at a higher level but could not for a variety of reasons do so -- we tend to regard such statements as opening statements. I do not think there is any doubt that this was the opening of the CD and that these were opening statements made by delegations. I would personally prefer the adjective "opening" statements rather than "of a general character". This is a novel term used to describe the character of a statement and I would prefer the words "opening statements".

Mr. SOTIROV (Bulgaria): I should like to support the suggestion of the distinguished Ambassador of the German Democratic Republic that the paragraph should be left as it is. I would remind members of the Committee that when the distinguished representative of Morocco introduced his amendment to include the statements of the representatives of Morocco and Czechoslovakia, which were made a



(Mr. Sotirov, Bulgaria)

little after the opening week of our annual session, we all agreed that the notion of statements made at the beginning -- at the opening -- of the session could be extended. I therefore think we should leave the paragraph as it is.

The second point I would like to make is, I must confess, rather delayed. I wonder if we could reverse the order of paragraphs 5 and 6. Logically, paragraph 4 of our report deals with messages, such as that of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Paragraph 6 also deals with messages, but paragraph 5 starts with the words "During the first days of the session ..." and paragraph 7 begins with the words "Later during the session ...". I therefore think that there is a certain logic behind my proposal to reverse the order of paragraphs 5 and 6. The report will only gain from such a small amendment.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): I would like to support the rearrangement proposed by the distinguished representative of Bulgaria.

Concerning the discussion about statements being of a general or opening nature, I would venture to suggest another formulation that might meet the concerns of our friends from Egypt and Sri Lanka. Could we say "During the opening days of the session statements were made by ....". If you say "opening statements" that means you are opening something and you can have only one opening statement for any particular conference. But, one could say, "During the opening days of the session statements were made by representatives of ....".

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): The suggestion of the distinguished Ambassador of India will not resolve our dilemma because there can be only one opening day of the session. May I therefore suggest that we say: "During the first days of the session, general statements were made by representatives".

The CHAIRMAN: I should now like to give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to explain this point.

Mr. JAIPAL (Secretary of the Committee): I thought I might inform members of the Committee -- some of whom will already be aware of this practice which is followed in the General Assembly of the United Nations -- that when foreign ministers and other ministers make their statements, it is customary to characterize such statements as important; perhaps we could use the term "important" here, if that would meet the wishes of delegates.

Mr. LAKATOS (Hungary) (translated from French): My delegation would have some difficulty in accepting this proposal concerning the importance of certain statements made during this period.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I would suggest we say "Statements were made..." One was made by myself, on behalf of the United States of America, and I did not think it was terribly general; I think it was quite precise, but I would not ask this group to characterize it was important because many of you may have different views. Why not say "Statements were made..."?

Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka): Mr. Chairman, I would like to help you finish this, and agree with the statement of the distinguished Ambassador of the United States, that we say "statements". But I do not agree with his modesty. My own recollection was that the statement in question was to have been made by somebody else and because he did not come the distinguished Ambassador of the United States made it. With an abundance of modesty he therefore said that it was unimportant. But I do, however, still agree with his suggestion.

Mr. MARKER (Pakistan): I support the views expressed by the distinguished Ambassadors of the United States and Sri Lanka, and I particularly agree with the distinguished Ambassador of Sri Lanka.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it is now the general view that we put "statements" and delete "of a general character". Is there any objection? I see none.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Secondly, if there is no objection we will reverse the order of paragraphs 5 and 6.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 7?

If there is no objection we will now adopt section I, entitled "Introduction".

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We proceed now to section II, entitled "Organization of the Committee".

Paragraph 8?

Of course the blank will be filled in as "14 August", followed by "52 formal plenary meetings".

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 9?

Here we should indicate that the Committee held "50 informal meetings".

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 10?

Paragraph 11?

Paragraph 12?

Paragraph 13?

Paragraph 14?

Paragraph 15?

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I hope you will not rule me out of order, but it is hard to make references to paragraph 15 without also making references to paragraph 16, because the two are very closely related. Our terminology seems a little confused here. We have annexes to annexes to annexes, and it is not wholly clear to what we are referring. Now, I see that in an agreed addendum dealing with another item we have referred to an appendix, which is an integral part of the report. If you will permit me, Sir, I would like to read out changes in paragraphs 15 and 16 which are themselves integral. Firstly, the second line from the bottom of paragraph 15 would read: "made an interpretive statement contained in appendix 1" rather than "annex 1". Secondly, the last line of paragraph 16, that is, the whole last sentence, would read "The text of the rules of procedure and its annex I appear as appendix I to this report which is an integral part of the report of the Committee". This conforms to the decision recommended to us -- and which I hope we will adopt -- on security assurances. Either we have annexes or appendices. If we have annexes to the annexes, I think we would have an understandable problem in adopting this terminology. To recapitulate, I recommend that the last two sentences of paragraph 15 should read, "In reference to these rules and before their adoption, the Chairman, as a result of consultations with the Committee, made an interpretive statement contained in appendix I. Interpretive statements were also made by a number of delegations in connexion with the text adopted." Paragraph 16 would read "At its 26th plenary meeting the Committee also

(Mr. Fisher, United States of America)

adopted annex I to its rules of procedure. The text of the rules of procedure and its annex I (document CD/8) appear in appendix I to this report which is an integral part of the report of the Committee".

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no comments, we shall adopt the following amendments proposed by the distinguished Ambassador of the United States of America: In paragraph 15 we shall amend the second sentence to read "contained in appendix I" and delete "annex I", and in paragraph 16 we shall reword the last sentence to read "Appendix I to this report which is an integral part of the report of this Committee".

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 17?

Paragraph 18?

Paragraph 19?

Paragraph 20?

Paragraph 21?

Paragraph 22?

Paragraph 23?

Paragraph 24?

Paragraph 25?

Paragraph 26?

Paragraph 27?

Paragraph 28?

If there is no objection, section II entitled "Organization of the Committee", is adopted.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Now we should turn to section III, "Work of the Committee during its 1979 session."

Paragraph 29? Here, in the second sentence, annex I will become appendix I, and the second sentence will read "the rules of procedure are in appendix I".

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I am terribly embarrassed at having to go back, but in paragraph 26 we said "having received requests", I think the point was made earlier that we should say "having considered the request". I would not object to "having received and considered", as we obviously had to receive them before we could consider them. But, there are two rules, and rule 35 in particular is not an automatic rule -- it implies a decision by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: We could amend this phrase if there is no objection, and say "received and considered".

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 30?  
Paragraph 31?

Mr. RAHHALI (Morocco): Mr. Chairman, I apologise for asking to go back to paragraph 29 but, with your permission, I have a small remark. In the last line there is a reference to "annex III", because we thought that annex I would be the rules of procedure, and annex II a second document. I do not think that this annex III will be annex III.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to state at this point that such consequential changes will be made by the Secretariat.

Paragraph 31?

Paragraph 32?

Paragraph 33?

Paragraph 34?

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, a very brief point: in the opening line of paragraph 34, I think we should say "The Committee received the following documents", rather than "has received".

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no comment we shall delete "has" in paragraph 34.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any further comment on paragraph 34?

Paragraph 35?

In paragraph 36 we have a slight correction: at the end of the first sentence the symbol CD/18 should be in brackets, and "5 to 9 March" should read "19 February to 2 March".

Paragraph 37?

Paragraph 38?

Paragraph 39?

Paragraph 40?

Mr. NAZARKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian):

It seems that paragraph 40 repeats what is said in paragraph 38, as it refers to the decision of the Committee to extend the mandate of the Ad Hoc Group. I therefore consider that we could perhaps delete the last sentence of paragraph 40.

There is also a second repetition in paragraph 40, in that it refers to the approval of the second report of the Ad Hoc Group. In paragraph 38 that report had already been adopted and approved, and therefore this reference could also be deleted from paragraph 40.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no further comment we will amend paragraph 40 as suggested by the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union as follows.

The first sentence will read: "Within the framework of the discussion of this agenda item the Committee examined the work of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events."

The last sentence of this paragraph, reading "The Committee decided to extend the mandate of the Ad Hoc Group", will be deleted.

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic): It seems to me that, logically, what remains of paragraph 40 should follow paragraph 38, as this paragraph is directly concerned with the work of the Ad Hoc Group. We should then continue with paragraph 39 concerning the tripartite negotiations and their assessment and conclusions.

Mr. DE LA GORCE (France) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, what I have to say is exactly the same as what has just been stated by our distinguished colleague of the German Democratic Republic. I wonder, however, whether we should not begin paragraph 40 by saying "Within the framework of the discussion of this agenda item the Committee examined the work... The Committee expressed its appreciation to the Ad Hoc Group", and then conclude this paragraph concerning the Ad Hoc Group of Experts by stating that the report was approved, that the Group's mandate was continued, and that an invitation was extended to the World Meteorological Organization. I believe it would be more logical to end with paragraph 38 and, of course, to combine the two paragraphs. We would take paragraph 40, amended as proposed by our distinguished colleague of the Soviet Union, and we would add to that paragraph -- which would then be the only one concerning the work of the Ad Hoc Group -- the present paragraph 38. These two paragraphs, combined, could then appear either before or after paragraph 39. There must obviously be a single paragraph devoted to the Ad Hoc Group of Experts, and a different paragraph number should be given to what follows, namely, the second part of paragraph 40, because this refers to the general question of a nuclear test ban. The second part of paragraph 40, which begins "The highest priority..." should clearly come immediately after paragraph 39, which deals with the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the negotiating Powers.

Mr. BERG (Belgium) (translated from French): I should like to revert for a moment to paragraph 36, having read the French version a little while after the English version. The French text begins "Le Comité était saisi d'un rapport intérimaire sur la septième session du Groupe spécial d'experts scientifiques...". This is obviously a literal translation of the English wording "The Committee had before it a progress report on the Seventh Session". I believe that it would be more appropriate for the French version to read "...un rapport intérimaire concernant la septième session".

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands): I completely agree with the proposal made by the distinguished delegate of France concerning paragraph 38. However, when the decision was taken to renew the mandate of the Ad Hoc Group, I do not think that it was announced in a formal meeting, which means that it is probably not in the record itself. If this is the case, I should like to know whether the Secretariat could not have it included in the records of the 48th meeting. Otherwise it would be very difficult to find, as we will be obliged to look through the records of that meeting only to discover that the mandate is contained in document CD/46.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no further comment, I would suggest that paragraph 39 should become 38 and that paragraph 40 should become 39, beginning with the words "Within the framework...". We should therefore delete, as suggested by the distinguished delegate of the Soviet Union, the words "and approved the second report of the Ad Hoc Group". The whole of paragraph 38 should be inserted after "data is implemented in practice" and the last two subparagraphs will become paragraph 40. If there is no further comment these changes will be adopted.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 41 in section B should read "the Committee held 6 informal meetings."

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 42?

Paragraph 43?

Mr. SOLA VILA (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): In the first line of the third subparagraph of paragraph 43, which reads "While the exchanges of views on this item were most useful", I think the word in Spanish should be "useful" rather than "utilísimos". I would therefore suggest that this should be amended to say that the exchanges of views were "useful". The word "utilísimos" is not correct, as it implies that it was the most useful exchange we had during the entire session.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments on the suggestion of the distinguished representative of Cuba to delete "most" from this paragraph? If there is no comment, we shall delete "most".

It was so decided.



The CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 44?

Paragraph 45?

Paragraph 46?

Paragraph 47?

Paragraph 48 is replaced by CD/L.4/Add.1, which has just been circulated in English only by the Secretariat. Paragraphs 49 and 50 are also contained in this document.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to point out in the introductory part of paragraph 51 when the Committee approved this report. As we did approve the report, that fact should be reported in a way that makes it as simple as possible to find it. I therefore see no substantive objection to saying "At its 48th meeting on..., the Committee...".

Mr. MARKER (Pakistan): As before, I have just been pre-empted by the distinguished Ambassador of the United States. I wanted to make the same comment.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no other comment, we shall say "At its 48th meeting on 7 August 1979, the Committee approved the report...".

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now continue with section D, Chemical Weapons.

Paragraph 50 in CD/L.4 will become paragraph 52; the insertion will be made by the Secretariat.

Mr. NAZARKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Mr. Chairman, I apologise but would like to request that we revert to paragraph 43. The distinguished representative of Cuba proposed that we should delete the word "most", as in his view its retention would imply that the discussion on this particular question was in fact the most useful of all our discussions. My distinguished

(Mr. Nazarkin, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)

English-speaking colleagues can correct me if I am wrong, but it does not mean that. Perhaps we could solve the problem if we corrected the Spanish translation; I would, however, request that we do not change the English text, because it was the result of a great deal of long and complicated consultation. Every word was carefully balanced and weighed, and I think that any change would make the position of the Soviet delegation difficult.

Mr. SOTIROV (Bulgaria): I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to go back to paragraph 43, and enquire whether it is correct to say "The documents relating to the SALT II Agreement.." I think the last word should be in the plural -- but of course I am not very certain -- as we were presented with a set of agreements, including principles for future negotiations. This was the minor point I wanted to make. Another point I should like to make is that, as we are going to renumber a lot of paragraphs because of paper CD/L.4/Add.1, would it not be possible to change the position of this subparagraph that deals with the SALT II Agreement, which is now sandwiched between paragraphs that deal with nuclear disarmament as a whole? I think that this subparagraph deserves to be a separate paragraph in this report.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I would merely like to support what was said by my distinguished colleague representing the Soviet Union concerning the English text of this paragraph; although I am not completely satisfied with it, it does represent a deal. I therefore think we ought to keep it as it is.

Mr. SOLA VILA (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): In my previous statement I was referring to the Spanish text which uses a superlative. However, in view of the wording used in the English and French texts, we could say "muy útiles"; that would not spoil the results of the negotiations. The word "utilísimos" is a superlative, and if the Spanish is to correspond to the other texts we should use "muy útiles". We should therefore use "muy útiles" in Spanish and leave the English text as it is.

Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka): I am assuming the role which should be taken by the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom. What has happened in point of fact is that the Spanish version uses the Spanish word that corresponds to the English "the most useful", which it does not. It said here "most useful", and that is it. I think for that reason we can leave the text as it is.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, if there is no further comment we will leave the English text as it is; the Spanish text will be amended accordingly.

I wish also to confirm with the distinguished Ambassador of the United States of America that paragraph 43 includes the point raised by the distinguished delegate of Bulgaria about "Agreement" and "Agreements".

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): Well, my feeling is that if we opened this discussion there would be a lot of points that I would like to change; but we negotiated this text and, as my distinguished colleague from the Soviet Union pointed out, it was negotiated with considerable difficulty, and while I have absolutely no objection to the problem of "most" as opposed to "the most", as suggested by my distinguished Cuban colleague, I would rather leave the English text of this paragraph as it is.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection from the distinguished delegate of Bulgaria, we shall leave this paragraph as it is.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 50?  
Paragraph 51?  
Paragraph 52?  
Section E. Paragraph 53?  
Paragraph 54?

(The Chairman)

Paragraph 55?

Section F. Paragraph 56?

Paragraph 57?

Paragraph 58?

I see no objection. I therefore suggest that we adopt Section III of the draft report entitled "Work of the Committee during its 1979 session".

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no further comment I will submit this draft report in the form in which we have agreed to amend it. I therefore submit for adoption the text contained in document CD/L.4, as amended.

Mr. AMERI (IRAN): Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to oppose your suggestion, but would like to make a general remark. I have noticed that in some parts of the report when a specific date is referred to the year is also mentioned, and in some cases not. I refer, for example, to paragraphs 52, 44 and 35. For the sake of consistency, I would like to propose that each time a date is mentioned, the year is also indicated.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no comment we could agree to put the year each time we give the date. If there are no objections, I will consider the Committee's report to the United Nations General Assembly adopted.

It was so decided.

Mr. DE LA GORCE (France) (translated from French): Since I have this opportunity, and although I have not prepared the statement which I did not expect to make until tomorrow morning, I should simply like to say a few words concerning the present session. A variety of views have been expressed about the results of our work, views which are in some cases contradictory and in many cases marked by some pessimism. We have noted that several of our colleagues expressed disappointment at this assessment of the results that can be placed on record.

As far as my own delegation and, I presume, my Government are concerned, I believe that the assessment must be a qualified one. Undeniably, as far as practical results are concerned, we have a rather scanty list of decisions. When we discussed our report and decided to include only decisions and conclusions, some of us pointed out that very few had been taken. The only

(Mr. de la Gorce, France)

really specific actions we took were, in fact, the adoption of the report of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts and the extension of its mandate. That is about all we have for the out tray at this session, if we disregard our resolve to continue our deliberations and negotiations on a number of points at the next session.

I wonder, however, whether the results could in fact have exceeded those which we have noted. Probably not. It is quite clear that on several matters, such as the cessation of nuclear tests and the proposed consultations with a view to negotiations on nuclear disarmament, the situation did not enable us to go further than the exchange of views which we had. It is in the field of chemical weapons that we could probably have gone further. We had, of course, no illusions. We were aware of the enormous difficulties of this subject and, in view of those difficulties, we certainly could not have moved on to negotiations proper. We had hoped -- and I believe that, for many of us, this was the true reason for the disappointment that was sometimes expressed -- that we might, as it were, embark upon this topic with an agreement or consensus on some preliminary points for negotiation. We sought to contribute to such a result; but this result was not achieved, a fact which we regret.

It is our hope that when the discussion resumes next year the Powers engaged in negotiations will agree to open their dossier, or at least certain parts of it, so that we will be able to commence discussion of specific questions -- as we attempted to do, but with insufficient time -- with the aid of experts, and to explore areas of agreement or disagreement, in such a way that the Committee will be really associated with these negotiations as a full participant and not merely as a more or less subordinate or subsidiary one.

That is what I wished to say, Mr. Chairman, concerning our accomplishments. Nevertheless, I would add that we also have some grounds for optimism. There was clearly a considerable amount of enthusiasm during this session, I would even say a very strong determination, on the part of the large majority of the countries represented here, really to give the Committee on Disarmament an opportunity, to make a success of this new attempt genuinely to associate the international community, in a relatively restricted but very representative fashion, with the great cause of disarmament. The serious character of our deliberations, the courtesy which was shown, the climate of understanding which generally prevailed and even a certain spirit of compromise, all give reason for optimism regarding the future.

(Mr. de la Gorce, France)

As far as my own delegation is concerned, I believe I can say that we gave full expression to that spirit of compromise and conciliation. I should like to draw attention, for example, to the position of my Government on the cessation of nuclear tests. It is well known here that we are not prepared to assume obligations of this kind in the present phase of international relations, and that we regard this as a matter to be dealt with in the general context of nuclear disarmament. This is not, however, the view taken in the present negotiations. Nevertheless, we have not sought to create the slightest obstacle or raised the least objection to the consensus which has been achieved on this point. On the question of negative guarantees, we have some doubts regarding the possibility of arriving at a single formula and a general convention, in view of the wide variety of regional situations and security requirements. However, we naturally share the hopes of the Governments represented here which desire to achieve such a result, and we will avail ourselves of any opportunity to contribute to the realization of those hopes if it is possible to do so. The consensus principle in general implies that the views of all concerned are not perfectly reflected in the wording that gives expression to the final agreement reached, and I believe that that is the case as far as most of us are concerned. What is important, however, is that a general, over-all aim should be defined which may serve to guide all our efforts in a spirit of understanding and co-operation.

Those were the views which I wished to expound, and it now remains for me only to express our hopes for the success of the next session. I should like to thank and congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, for the manner in which you conducted the last phase of our work, which was obviously particularly difficult and important, and also to thank all my colleagues, who showed a warm spirit of friendship and co-operation in our mutual relations.

Mr. MARKER (Pakistan): My delegation had intended to make a statement giving our views and our reflections on the work of the Committee during the past few months in much the same manner and spirit as the distinguished Ambassador of France. It is a statement which contains words of great wisdom, but I think greater wisdom lies in not imposing further on the valuable time of this Committee, so with your permission, Mr. Chairman, my delegation will circulate the text and request that it be recorded among the documents of this Committee. I would only like to add that my delegation associates itself with

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

the congratulations extended to you, Mr. Chairman, and to your distinguished predecessors, as well as to our colleagues on this Committee, for the spirit of co-operation that has been shown. Above all, my delegation wishes to express its thanks to the distinguished Secretariat and to our very able interpreters for the excellent job that they have done -- I think in some ways they are a little like the air that we breathe, we take it for granted when it is there and feel its absence acutely when deprived of it.

Mr. TERREFFL (Ethiopia): I would like to say a few words about our own reflections on the work of the Committee. In 1979 the CD, with its expanded membership, including four of the five nuclear-weapon Powers, made really serious attempts to come closer, at this time, to initiating negotiations on topics that are considered by the international community to be of vital interest to world peace and general disarmament. In doing so, members worked hard and intensively, and special congratulations go to you, Mr. Chairman, and to your predecessors and the Secretariat for having arrived at such a useful document -- the report that we have just adopted. The conducive international climate created by the signing of the SALT II Agreement has, we believe, provided the necessary impetus to further the course of peace and disarmament. Over 50 plenary and many informal meetings were devoted to the consideration of at least as many proposals and working documents which have a direct bearing on resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and of its special session devoted to disarmament. After long and protracted discussion, the CD has adopted, as I have said, this report to the General Assembly. After careful examination of the proposals presented so far, CD members will, I am sure, come back with full vigour and conviction to negotiate on at least some of them. Expression of some disappointment and concern for not being able to achieve more concrete results at this time should provide the CD with an incentive to draw up a more implementable agenda and programme of work for 1980. The major nuclear-weapon Powers are expected to take bold steps towards creating an even more conducive climate of disarmament negotiations, as all nuclear-weapon Powers have a special responsibility to check the ever-increasing number of nuclear explosions in the world. On the other hand, the non-nuclear-weapon States have to keep their international pledge not to acquire or develop nuclear weapons. It is true that, in 1979, much valuable time has been devoted to procedural questions rather than matters of substance. However, it is also a fact that

(Mr. Terrefe, Ethiopia)

the Committee on Disarmament reached a consensus on decisions concerning these and other matters after long and tedious negotiations, and substantial contributions were made by the group of socialist countries on major items which the Committee decided to consider during 1979. A number of delegations also made valuable contributions by clarifying questions on some important issues which helped CD members to crystallize their positions. The complexity of other issues is such that more serious reflection is needed. The intricate paths that lead to the formulation of a generally agreed framework were explored in working groups, in informal meetings and consultations of the Committee with the participation of experts. These led to the identification of areas of agreement and differences. In some, working methods for arriving at more concrete negotiating issues were established. The Ethiopian delegation will continue to work towards strengthening the negotiating posture that the Committee has now assumed and hopes that those nuclear-weapon States which, for various reasons, were unable to put forward more concrete proposals for negotiations, will manifest their political courage by presenting workable ideas that would enable the Committee to discharge its responsibilities fully in the future.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): I would like to associate my delegation with those which have expressed their appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, for the way in which you have conducted our work during this month. We would like to thank you for your infinite patience and for your spirit of understanding and tolerance to all delegations during this concluding, and other important phases, of our work.

It might perhaps have been better for us to have had a plenary meeting tomorrow morning; that would have enabled delegations to make statements. I raise this question because a suggestion has been made that a statement which has not been made here should be included in the records as a circulated document. Now, I am not sure whether this is a healthy precedent to set. We have always made statements in the plenary meetings which are reproduced in the verbatim records of the Committee. However, if some delegations would like just to circulate their statements for the information of the others, without them being included in the verbatim records of the Committee, that



(Mr. Gharokhan, India)

is a different matter. That is the right of any delegation. But, if the statement is to be included in the records of the Committee, then I think we are setting a rather peculiar kind of precedent, in that a statement is just handed into the Secretariat and then reproduced in the verbatim records of the Committee. I am not sure what the practice is that we are going to adopt on this as well as on future occasions.

Mr. MARKER (Pakistan): My intention was not to prolong this discussion, and I do not intend to do so. The statement in question need not be included in the verbatim record -- obviously that cannot be the case -- but I would request that it be circulated as a document of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, distinguished delegates, at this closing plenary meeting of the 1979 session of the Committee, allow me to express my appreciation and make a very brief review of the state of our work at this session. It would be superfluous on my part if I were to repeat what has been said before me that, as a single multilateral negotiating forum, this Committee's responsibility is unique in scope and nature in subjects so vital to the whole international community. It draws considerable strength from the fact that not only has the membership been enlarged and structural changes made but that, unlike its predecessor, the Committee on Disarmament was created with the single objective of revitalizing disarmament negotiations that would lead to concrete progress, particularly on priority issues. The initial but significant achievement of the Committee was the adoption of its rules of procedure and programme of work, which reflect the consensus of this Committee and the determination of all members, representatives in this forum, to devote their efforts to the fulfilment of the cherished goals of disarmament.

During the last two months we have devoted a major portion of our time to substantive negotiations on the priority items on the agenda. When dealing with subjects as complex and difficult as disarmament, protracted debate, extensive exchanges of ideas and opinions in our efforts to find formulation acceptable to all became an unavoidable aspect of negotiation. As I have said before, for me it is a source of gratification to know that the intensity of debate has been unprecedented and constructive. At the same time we are all

(The Chairman)

fully aware of the specific tasks we are entrusted with by the international community. I am sure that distinguished delegates will agree with me that great efforts have been made to limit our general discussion to only essential matters and transcend them towards concrete negotiations.

In this connexion I should like to note with satisfaction the establishment of an Ad Hoc Working Group on Effective International Arrangements to Assure Non-Nuclear-Weapon States against the Use or Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons, and its ability to submit a report to the Committee. I hope that it will serve us as a good basis for our further negotiations at the coming session.

Similarly, I would also like to mention that the progress report of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events is considered as a step forward in our endeavours towards a nuclear test ban treaty. In my judgement, these two are important achievements in the light of the complex nature of the issues we are dealing with, although our hopes transcend these initial successes. Not to the satisfaction of all, but I think we can say that there is more understanding among ourselves on the progress made in other negotiations on disarmament and related matters outside this multilateral negotiating body. When I say this, I have in mind the bilateral and trilateral negotiations which have been taking place for some years and their results at various stages. The Committee has received an agreed joint proposal of the Soviet Union and the United States of America on major elements of a treaty to prohibit the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons, as well as their joint statement on chemical weapons and the progress report on the trilateral negotiations on a nuclear test ban. I am confident that further progress in these undertakings by the negotiating States will create a favourable atmosphere for disarmament negotiations and complement the work and negotiating process of this Committee.

As Chairman, whose responsibility it is to submit the annual report of this Committee to the General Assembly, I am particularly gratified to note that the Committee was able to arrive at an agreement on a report which truthfully reflects both factual and substantive negotiations and the work of the Committee. That could not have been successfully completed without the full co-operation of all the members of the Committee, and I must express my deep gratitude to

(The Chairman)

Ambassador Harry Jay of Canada for his invaluable contribution to the most complex negotiations concerning the substantive evaluation of our work. I would like to express my entire satisfaction with the way we conducted our work with an amply demonstrated abundance of goodwill, patience and understanding among all delegations. For my delegation, and for myself, it has been a privilege to have had this opportunity of presiding over this eminent and august body. I should like to express my deep gratitude to all of you without exception for your co-operation with the Chair. I would also like to express on behalf of the Committee, and on my own behalf, our thanks to Ambassador Jaipal, and to all members of the Secretariat and the entire group of interpreters and translators, without whose dedication the work of the Committee would not have been so complete.

In conclusion, I would like to reassure you that I shall remain entirely at the disposal of the Committee from now until the beginning of the next session in 1980. I am sure that with the able and wise guidance of the distinguished representative of Canada, who will be assuming the chairmanship then, you will have a good start towards the fulfilment of our cherished hopes in the coming session.

Again I thank you all and I declare closed the 1979 session of the Committee on Disarmament. The 53rd, and opening plenary meeting of the 1980 session of the Committee will be held on 5 February 1980, at 10.30 a.m., in accordance with rule 7 of the rules of procedure of the Committee on Disarmament.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.