

# CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.507  
27 April 1989

ENGLISH

---

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Thursday, 27 April 1989, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Harrison Gicheru (Kenya)

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 507th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

The Conference will conclude today its further consideration of outstanding matters. However, in conformity with rule 30 of its rules of procedure, any member wishing to do so may raise any subject relevant to the work of the Conference.

As this is the last plenary meeting of the first part of the 1989 session, I intend to put before the Conference the question of the opening date for the second part of the session once the list of speakers is exhausted.

I have on my list of speakers for today the representatives of Czechoslovakia, France and the Germany Democratic Republic. I now give the floor to the first speaker on my list, the representative of Czechoslovakia, Ambassador Vajnar.

Mr. VAJNAR (Czechoslovakia): In the first instance, Mr. President, let me congratulate you and the Kenyan delegation on the assumption and effective execution of the presidency of the CD in the month of April. Let me also express my sincere thanks to Ambassador Yamada of Japan for his efforts in the same function in March, which brought some evident positive results.

It is not my intention today to give a comprehensive evaluation of the results of the spring session. This will be done later in the meeting by Ambassador Dietze of the German Democratic Republic on behalf of the Group of Socialist Countries, which means also on behalf of my delegation. In my statement today I will touch on some questions of particular interest to my delegation. I will start, naturally, with item 1 of our agenda, with respect to which Czechoslovakia submitted a proposal for a mandate for an ad hoc committee last summer.

My delegation regrets that we have failed to address in any constructive way the priority items on our agenda related to nuclear disarmament. While regretting in particular that no practical work on a nuclear test ban has been undertaken, we welcome a certain stepping up of consultations on the mandate for a relevant subsidiary body, initiated by Ambassador Yamada of Japan, especially during his presidency, and still going on. We are encouraged by a certain convergence of views on the mandate of an ad hoc committee on a nuclear test ban, on the basis of the Czechoslovak proposal contained in document CD/863, which has emerged in the course of recent weeks. It appears that the vast majority of delegations share the sense of urgency on the matter, accentuated also by the fact that in a couple of days preparations will start in New York for the fourth review conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty to be held next year.

With the partial test-ban Treaty in existence for more than quarter of a century, and in view of the substantive progress achieved at the bilateral Soviet-American negotiations, the Conference could assign itself more ambitious goals than the ones contained in CD/863. It is appropriate to point out that protracted debates focused on the procedural aspects of our work are

(Mr. Vajnar, Czechoslovakia)

not bringing us any closer to the achievement of stated goals. We submit, however, that the seemingly procedural debate in fact reflects divergences in approaches to the substance.

It is our hope that this year's session will be remembered as the one which managed to launch the work of a subsidiary body on a comprehensive nuclear test ban. Once established, hopefully during the summer session, the committee will have to address the task of agreeing its programme of work. Without having a clear picture of a final mandate I will not venture to set out detailed views on what the programme should look like. But our delegation considers that the committee could deal with the following major issues. Firstly, the scope of a nuclear test ban. It has been widely agreed that the NTBT should be of a comprehensive nature, prohibiting all nuclear explosions. The Czechoslovak delegation fully shares this approach. Secondly, the structure of the verification system. It has been suggested by a number of delegations that, in addition to seismological monitoring, other forms of verification could be applied e.g. atmospheric radioactivity surveillance and remote sensing by satellites as well as on-site inspections. Thirdly, the organizational framework of work on the verification system. The establishment of a group of technical experts to this end has been proposed. In this connection, the possibility of broadening the scope of activities of the GSE might be considered by the ad hoc committee. This group could explore, with the participation of additional experts, practical possibilities of applying individual types of verification measures and the basic requirements for their institutionalization. Fourthly, administrative and organizational aspects of the future nuclear test ban and the establishment of organs responsible for compliance with the test ban.

A number of proposals have been submitted with respect to an NTB. Czechoslovakia was one of the co-sponsors of document CD/756, entitled "Basic provisions of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests". My delegation believes that this document could usefully be studied in the ad hoc committee on an NTB together with other proposals submitted on this subject. In this regard, the proposal made by the German Democratic Republic on verification of an NTB (CD/902) is of particular interest.

With respect to the prevention of an arms race in outer space - another high priority item on our agenda - the Czechoslovak delegation regrets that the activity of the Ad hoc Committee was unduly delayed. When it finally resumed in April however, it became quite obvious that the method of work imposed upon the Committee does not allow for a goal-oriented discussion. We are addressing a whole panoply of subjects at the same time, without moving forward on any of them. Perhaps some measures are not within our reach. The reason for that, however, is not that these measures are not yet ripe for solution, or that the majority of us are misreading the existing legal régime for outer space, as one or two delegations would have us believe. The true reason is that some countries are not prepared to negotiate on measures which could effectively limit and compromise their present military programmes in outer space.

(Mr. Vajnar, Czechoslovakia)

Obviously, the Ad hoc Committee cannot deal effectively with all subjects at the same time. Our delegation thinks that it should concentrate on some of them, in order to come to some common conclusions and decisions. We prefer strongly that it should focus on measures aimed at actual prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space. However, if that is not a feasible task now, the Ad hoc Committee could start some practical work on measures which might be described as confidence-building, aimed at more openness in activities related to outer space, or simply regulating the movement of objects in outer space. A number of proposals have been submitted in this regard, and some benefit could be drawn from their implementation. It might be useful if, during the summer session, the three items forming the programme of work were not treated in a general and all-embracing way, but the Ad hoc Committee instead concentrated its attention on some issues of wider interest. In full accordance with the three-layer pattern of the programme of work, the Ad hoc Committee could first identify clearly the nature of these issues or an issue, then consider to what extent they are or are not already treated within the existing legal régime and, finally, examine how the existing relevant proposals could be implemented most effectively. For the purposes of moving to more goal-oriented work, the Czechoslovak delegation would be prepared to display the utmost flexibility in selecting issues for more active consideration in the summer. By no means are we proposing the establishment of permanent priorities, since consensus on them cannot be achieved now.

Many delegations, including mine, have asked for more active participation by experts in our proceedings on item 5. We disagree with the view that our work has not sufficiently matured yet to benefit from the organized presence of technical experts. We consider that it is precisely organized debate with wider expert participation that we are lacking most. Moreover, the delegation doubting the utility of the presence of experts in our work praised some of their specific past contributions and claimed that issues under discussion were not understood sufficiently, and that proposals advanced were not based on clear technical knowledge of the matter. One would expect that this delegation would be the first to favour involvement by experts and would contribute actively to bringing it about.

A number of delegation have pointed out the importance of the bilateral Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms and their relevance to our work in the CD. We fully share this view. At the same time, we have heard that these bilateral talks place certain limitations on our deliberations. We do not think that is right. Multilateral and bilateral negotiations on disarmament are mutually complementary, not mutually limiting or exclusive. Any measures agreed bilaterally and aimed at prevention of an arms race in outer space can only contribute to our multilateral efforts. What indeed might be limiting is only the slow pace of bilateral negotiations or their absence. Czechoslovakia hopes that the Soviet-American bilateral negotiations on strategic nuclear and space arms will resume soon without further undue delay.

The Czechoslovak delegation welcomes the intensification of work in the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. It represents a precondition for fulfilling the mandate of the Paris Conference, to which we still owe a lot.

(Mr. Vajnar, Czechoslovakia)

A number of issues have been discussed thoroughly, and on some of them certain progress has been achieved. In particular the material included for further consideration in the annex on chemicals seems to lead us towards progress on some technical issues which have either not been discussed or have been considered without much success in recent years. Our delegation supports active continuation of this work and hopes that the results, once agreed, will be incorporated into the structure of the "rolling text" in a way which will not weaken but rather streamline and strengthen it.

The discussion on the "verification pattern" can hardly be described as conclusive. However, it was useful in so far as it confirmed, in our opinion, that sufficient clarity regarding the whole verification concept of the chemical weapons convention can only be achieved when basic types of control activities which have been suggested and discussed for years are finalized and subscribed to by all participants to the negotiations. We expect that the national and international trial inspections now under way will soon contribute to the completion of procedures for systematic routine inspections. Czechoslovakia is prepared to offer a facility for such an inspection. While we agree that such inspections should be well prepared, we do not think that certain divergences in approaches to individual MTIs will necessarily be detrimental. We suggest that there is no need to be afraid of possible conflicting situations. Their identification and thorough evaluation afterwards might be more useful for the accurate completion of the chemical weapons convention than scrupulous avoidance of problem areas during the stage of multilateral trial inspections. We therefore do not favour unduly postponing MTIs, and my country would be prepared to accept an international team of inspectors as early as during the CD's summer session.

Challenge inspections also require our attention during the summer session. Some consider this kind of inspection to be confrontational and politically charged; others maintain that they will constitute just another form of verification, which could be regularly applied. In some cases, perhaps in most of them, these inspections might operate in an ordinary and smooth way. In other cases elements of confrontation may be present, depending on the rationale justifying a request, the participants in the challenge process or the conclusions of the inspection. However, what is important is an agreement on all the procedures, so that they stipulate clearly the rights and obligations of the States parties, the role and activities of inspectors, and the process after the conduct of a challenge inspection.

At the same time we would not like to underrate the complexity of article IX. A number of approaches have evolved in recent years, and a lack of clarity is evident in the positions of more than just a couple of delegations. Indeed, it would be interesting to know whether the authors of CD/500 still subscribe unconditionally to all the relevant provisions contained in this document, or whether their approach to some of them has been modified. Occasionally we are under the impression that the mandatory nature of such inspections would not necessarily mean an unconditional obligation to accept such an inspection at the request of any of the States parties without the right of refusal. Our delegation also wonders whether inspection on challenge is regarded by the United States delegation as applicable to any

(Mr. Vajnar, Czechoslovakia)

place or facility without any limitations. We consider it important that these basic questions be cleared up before making a final assault on article IX.

During the spring session quite considerable effort went into discussion of the concept of ad hoc checks or inspections. The delegation of the United Kingdom submitted a proposal in this regard, which we consider useful and interesting. Further discussion on this approach, as well as on previous relevant proposals, might be useful. Our delegation would be pleased if more clarity could be achieved during the summer session on the scope of application of ad hoc inspections as well as on procedures. Further clarifying of this verification concept could also contribute to the discussion on other forms of verification, including inspections on challenge.

My delegation shares the view that the equitable composition and effective decision-making procedures of the Executive Council will be important for smooth implementation of the CW convention. In order to ensure that the Executive Council is in a position to take effective action whenever necessary, this body must inevitably have limited participation. Such action should be based on considerations taking into account the views and interests of all regions and groups of States. The representative nature of the Executive Council should be ensured through the principle of rotation of its membership and through its composition, which should be based primarily on geographical and political criteria. The level of development of the chemical industry in individual States is also of relevance for the composition of the Executive Council. While a spirit of compromise and co-operation should prevail in the decision-making process, the functioning of the CW convention would be hampered if the composition of the Executive Council made it possible for decisions to be imposed unjustifiably.

This will be the last plenary meeting of our Conference attended by Ambassador Nazarkin of the Soviet Union, who has been entrusted with new responsible functions. Personally, I regret that after years of co-operation with him a few years ago, I have now had an opportunity to enjoy Ambassador Nazarkin's co-operation for only a couple of weeks. However, I am pleased to know that his future work will often bring him to Geneva and that, in his new capacity, he will become - if I may say so - a symbol of the interrelationship between multilateral and bilateral negotiations on disarmament. I wish him all success in his upcoming efforts, which may also create more favourable conditions for the work of our Conference. Let me also welcome Ambassador Nazarkin's successor, Comrade Batsanov, in his new assignment. I wish him success in it and pledge him the full co-operation of my delegation. Let me also welcome in our midst the new Ambassador of Algeria, Mr. Ait-Chaalal.

Before concluding, I would not like to miss this opportunity to express my thanks to the Government of Japan and the United Nations Department of Disarmament Affairs for having organized last week in Kyoto a seminar on a number of important priority programmes of disarmament. In my opinion, it was a very useful exchange of views, and I would like to express to all the organizers of this seminar my sincere thanks for creating excellent conditions for its smooth running.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Czechoslovakia for his statement and for the kind words that he addressed to me. I now give the floor to the representative of France, Ambassador Morel, who will speak in his capacity as Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons.

Mr. MOREL (France) (translated from French): Before I address you in my capacity as Chairman of the Conference's Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, allow me, Mr. President, to inform you of my country's satisfaction at seeing Kenya occupying the Chair for the month of April in such an outstanding way. I do so with particular satisfaction as the French Prime Minister, Mr. Michel Rocard, is beginning an official visit to your country today. I should also like to take this opportunity to thank the presidents who preceded you, Ambassador Puqliese in February and Ambassador Yamada in March. As I have not yet spoken in this part of the session, allow me also to welcome the colleagues who have taken up their duties since the end of last year's session - Ambassador Houlliez of Belgium, Ambassador Dietze of the German Democratic Republic, Ambassador Hyltenius of Sweden, Ambassador Reese of Australia, Ambassador Kikanke of Zaire, Ambassador Kamal of Pakistan, Ambassador Ait-Chaalal of Algeria and Ambassador Vajnar of Czechoslovakia. I should also like to welcome the new head of the Soviet delegation, Mr. Batsanov, and say a very friendly au revoir - but only au revoir - to Ambassador Nazarkin, offering him our best wishes for the very important work that awaits him.

The purpose of my statement as Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons is to try to give an overall assessment of the work of the Committee, a personal assessment which reflects only the Chairman's view. That was done specifically yesterday, in the Committee, through the introduction of a "statement by the Chairman" which all the delegations are familiar with. Today I would like to try to take a more detached view and consider the main elements of a political nature which may concern the Conference in its plenary meeting. I would like to say on this occasion that I was unable to produce a typewritten text of this statement, for which I would ask all delegations to excuse me. The main points are in the statement that I introduced yesterday in the Committee. It was designed to summarize the work done during the first part of the 1989 session, and it was drawn up in conjunction with the chairmen of the five working groups. It is an informal interim report on the deliberations of the Committee and the working groups, and the aim is to help delegations to do further work in their capitals during the recess on the questions taken up so that they can be settled during the second part of the session. In this statement, then, I will deal with the following three points: first of all a general assessment of the results of the work in the groups, to see how it stands today; next, an overall political evaluation of the state of the negotiations; and finally some comments on working methods.

With regard first of all to the results of the work in the groups, I will begin with Group No. 1, chaired by Mr. Lüdeking, which has undertaken an overall review of the verification machinery under the convention. I consider that sooner or later an integrated approach will have to be arrived at. The Committee in general, and Group No. 1 in particular, are still searching on this central issue, reconnoitring and identifying the key elements in the

(Mr. Morel, France)

convention's verification system; in doing so they have to comply with a double imperative: first of all, to consider verification as a whole, because we need a coherent overall system, and secondly, to consider very closely each of the parts of this whole which have been submitted for consideration by delegations and will have to be finalized in the "rolling text": - routine inspections, of course - and in this regard we have to incorporate all the lessons of the national trial inspections which have begun - the question which has been raised, and which is as yet unanswered, of the possibility of additional measures, and the well-known issue of challenge inspection, as well as clarification procedures under article IX, which have been re-examined in the Committee. Thus it is an essential element of the future convention which has been the subject of difficult but detailed work.

Group No. 2, chaired by Mr. Gomaa, dealing with legal aspects, similarly considered the problems in an integrated way. It dealt, on the one hand, with what we might call an external aspect, a very important one, the relationship between the 1925 Protocol and the convention, and also the relationship between the convention and other international agreements, an issue which is not yet settled, and one on which there are strong differences of opinion. However, in many ways this situation is understandable and natural, and choices will eventually have to be made. The Group also dealt with the internal aspects of the legal system of the convention, namely amendments, for which a specific draft article has been prepared, final clauses and the question of the settlement of disputes, which had not been taken up so far.

With regard to Group No. 3, chaired by Mr. Sood, dealing with institutions, its activities generally involved consolidating the fundamental tripartite structure of the convention, as it has already become familiar. This concerns primarily the Conference of States Parties, on which specific work has been done. Next it concerns the Executive Council, on which consultations have been initiated in two stages, first in the Group and now under the aegis of the Chair of the Ad hoc Committee; I think the work on this subject is promising because it is very progressive. Lastly, it concerns the Technical Secretariat, which has already been considered carefully through the intermediary of the Preparatory Commission, which has in a sense been entrusted with prefiguring the establishment of the organs, and in particular the operational organ of the Technical Secretariat. In addition, this Group held an initial exchange of views on the question of the scientific advisory council, which is not viewed as a separate organ and will have to be discussed again. It also studied the very important question of the articulation between this tripartite institutional arrangement and the national authorities in each country. The entire problem of national implementation measures under article VII has thus been organized and in a way updated after a long period without change. I think on this chapter genuine progress was made, considerably facilitated by the work done in the national trial inspections.

As far as Group No. 4 is concerned, chaired by Mr. Molander and dealing with the technical aspects, the activities covered two major aspects. The first concerns what the delegations now routinely call the chemical annex, or the annex on chemicals, and the review permitted a reordering with the very valuable help of experts from capitals, of an entire series of technical provisions which were scattered throughout the "rolling text", to produce a



(Mr. Morel, France)

clearer and more coherent and usable presentation of the lists and the guidelines for each of them. This work is encouraging in particular in making it possible to incorporate in the overall consideration of the problem of lists the old and difficult question of "schedule [4]", and also to develop more coherent, better structured and more accurate schedules, in particular by deleting the products which hitherto appeared in the "rolling text" (CD/881) under the heading "to be discussed". The other aspect of the work of Group No. 4 dealt with the devising of a simplified structure for the presentation of the annex to article VI [1]. Two successive reviews were carried out in this regard, so that the question came before the Group twice for in-depth work, and the latest result offers in particular a possible solution for the very sensitive question of the production of schedule [1] chemicals outside the single small-scale production facility.

Group No. 5, chaired by Mr. Krutzsch, dealt with the transition, a topic which at the outset may have seemed less familiar and less conventional, but one which quickly found its place, I think, because it met a need. The Group accomplished very useful work in this regard, which comprised two components. The first concerns assistance and protection against chemical weapons, and here there are two aspects: on the one hand, the text, on which substantial work was done in an endeavour to move beyond the two alternatives that at present appear in the "rolling text" in order to prepare a draft - and the work that has begun on this, notably a draft on the provision of assistance at the request of a State party, is well under way and should be continued. In addition, and above and beyond the text, there is the question of the very principle of assistance, which now, thanks to the contributions from many delegations and a very lively debate, enjoys much clearer understanding among all delegations as to the *raison d'être* and the role of this essential assistance machinery during the 10-year period. The second component of Group No. 5's work covered the question of the preparatory period. Here too, the concept was perhaps a little vague, but it has become familiar and has proved very useful by making it possible in particular to identify and examine closely the question of confidence-building measures and the role that they can play even before the convention comes into force to achieve true universality in accession to the convention. The Group has also been concerned with economic and technical development, and here it has run into a familiar difficulty which may be summed up in a question: Should we seek a compromise on a text which may seem to be almost ready, or should we go back into substantive issues? The question has been asked, and it will be taken up again during the summer part of the session. Of course, the Group also had consultations on the vital question of undiminished security during the transition period, which were conducted with a view to the methodical treatment of this issue during the next part of the session.

How can the work accomplished so far best be described? In a word, I would say that it was work in depth. We worked on the foundations, and if we have not really seen the building rise into the sky, it must be said that without solid foundations, nothing can be done.

In this way I come to the second aspect, the general assessment of the state of the negotiations. The rapid outline I have given of the activities of the Ad hoc Committee and the working groups might seem to fall short of the ambitions set forth by the Paris Conference at the beginning of the year,

(Mr. Morel, France)

which have been reaffirmed by many delegations here at the Conference on Disarmament since the beginning of the session. However, from the viewpoint of the Chair, we should not misjudge the present situation. The involvement of a larger number of delegations and the detailed consideration of all aspects of the future convention constitute necessary groundwork for tangible and suitable progress. The Committee - and I mean all delegations as well as the Chairman of the Committee, the chairmen of the groups and the secretariat - has worked in an unprecedented way, I think one can say, and thereby it is taking fully into account the resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations and the Final Declaration of the Paris Conference. Subjects which had been somewhat pushed aside have been taken up again. New topics have been introduced or developed, for the first time in the case of some of them. Others, high on the agenda for several years, have been subjected to intensive consideration. Furthermore, more than half of the delegations in the Conference on Disarmament - I think this must be stressed and re-emphasized - have been involved in the demanding work of carrying out national trial inspections. There has thus been considerable mobilization of delegations, but this cannot of course be an end in itself. The new pace and the new methods of work are necessary stages which should lead to real progress, and this will be the goal of the second part of the 1989 session. All the members of the Committee can now concentrate their attention in the most specific way on clearly identified difficulties and prepare themselves thoroughly for the search for suitable solutions. As has been the case since the beginning of the session, this will need careful scheduling of the Committee's work. The tentative programme submitted yesterday in the Ad hoc Committee for indicative purposes gives a first outline. It will be formally introduced at the beginning of the next part of the session in a revised and enlarged version incorporating delegations' reactions and suggestions, and it will then be submitted to the Committee for its approval. In the Chair's opinion, the co-operative attitude of the delegations that took part in the Committee's work is an encouraging sign for the second part of the session and should lead, especially in view of the very little time available, to even greater willingness during the summer. After covering very extensively the topics identified in CD/CW/WP.222, which is the Ad hoc Committee's work programme for 1989, the time has come to get down to intensive negotiations in earnest. In conformity with the Paris Declaration, the Committee has redoubled its efforts as a matter of urgency. It should now be ready to resolve expeditiously the remaining issues and to conclude the convention at the earliest date.

I would now like to put to the Conference some more specific thoughts about the method of work that we have taken up. There are three points. Firstly, the conversion of the results of the Paris Conference on the prohibition of chemical weapons into real progress in the negotiations cannot be immediate. It is difficult to get some 40 delegations, plus more than 20 delegations of countries which are non-members of the Conference on Disarmament to move still faster. Everyone has his own contribution to make, and that is natural. It should also be noted that the complexity of the treaty is considerable and inevitable. Moreover, we have witnessed a degree of change of perspective, with a greater concern for universality and a better over-view of what is at stake in the convention. Therefore it was necessary and it is necessary, to intensify our efforts, with more participants and more subjects to cover.

(Mr. Morel, France)

Secondly, these problems of method are very important. These are not secondary issues. For each of the major topics and each of the groups that I have mentioned, we can see how important the problem of method is. I have spoken of verification arrangements. We are having to consider verification methods which have no precedent or equivalent, and cannot have any. Hence the importance of dealing properly with these problems of method. Similarly, at the legal level, we have to cope with apparently contradictory arguments, each of which has its own *raison d'être*. We must take them into account. With regard to institutional aspects, all the delegations recognize the complexity of the arrangements to be made for the organization of the Executive Council, for example, each of them, of course, having its own preferences; but at least one thing is clear - that everybody recognizes the complexity of the method that we must find to ensure suitable representation, and satisfactory decision-making procedures in the Executive Council. As for the chemical annex, let me sum up the problem. It is a question of managing to combine the constraints relating to the security of States with those relating to industrial production. Two separate worlds, two value systems, two series of criteria to be put into a single document in a compatible way.

Finally, with regard to Group No. 5, security and trust among partners cannot be determined and decided upon in a day. We have to proceed by stages. The idea of the period of transition is obviously a key element of the convention, and there too we will have to determine very precisely the best method. It is therefore important, on the methodological level, not to minimize the differences between delegations, but to note that it is a question of jointly taking charge of a situation which is difficult to grasp.

My last comment concerning method will be as follows. I think that the common search for common solutions to unprecedented problems is already well under way - that is the general spirit of the assessment I have tried to give you. Simply, we must base ourselves on the actual situation and not on ready-made formulae; it is better for things to be stated clearly, since it is from that moment that the real negotiating work begins. In conclusion, I am tempted to quote a well-known Latin tag, labor omnia vincit improbus - "never-flinching labour proved lord of all", as Virgil put it in the *Georgics*, which constituted in a way his hymn to the land. But man is more changeable than the land, and negotiation is less predictable than ploughing. Nevertheless, I believe that while taking into account the element of unpredictability and the difficulty of the common effort, we have, with the general political guidelines, everything we need to demonstrate the political will of the international community. In these circumstances never-flinching labour should indeed enable us to achieve a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. There is much at stake; this is one of the means whereby we must jointly seek to master one of the aspects of the evolution of the contemporary world at the frontier of technology and security. We must continue the work under way and commit ourselves more and more to negotiation. This will clearly have direct consequences for the future organization of international security.

In conclusion, I would like to thank all the delegations, the group chairmen and the secretariat, in particular Mr. Abdelkader Bensmail, as well as all the services in the Palais des Nations for the help they give us, and on behalf of my delegation I express my very sincere thanks to them.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of France for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of the German Democratic Republic, Ambassador Dietze.

Mr. DIETZE (German Democratic Republic): I have taken the floor today to offer a few observations on behalf of the Group of Socialist Countries in connection with the conclusion of the first part of the 1989 session of the Conference on Disarmament. The session was held against the background of propitious international circumstances. Important international events, such as the Paris Conference on the prohibition of chemical weapons, the completion of the Vienna meeting and the beginning of the 23-party and 35-party negotiations on the reduction of conventional armed forces and further confidence-building and security-building measures in Europe, the continued implementation of the INF Treaty and the Stockholm agreement, are assuming special significance in this context. Despite the fact that the international situation continues to be complicated and contradictory, we think all these moves testify to the sustained development of the processes of arms limitation and disarmament and the enhancement of international security. The countries on whose behalf I am speaking are making a considerable contribution to these processes, inter alia, by means of unilateral measures to reduce armed forces, armaments and military expenditure, by giving their armies a pronounced defensive structure.

We share the opinion frequently expressed in the course of the present session that the Conference on Disarmament should not remain outside the positive trends in the field of arms limitation and disarmament, and that it should complement bilateral and regional achievements by the results obtained in the elaboration of multilateral agreements, especially since the Conference is the single multilateral negotiating body in this field.

More and more statements delivered by foreign ministers and other high-ranking officials in this forum attest to the importance attached to the work of the Conference. Among these statements made at the current session are also those delivered by representatives of socialist countries. Furthermore, we take note of the fact that a constructive atmosphere has prevailed during the spring part of the session, which made it possible to conduct an open dialogue on the most crucial issues of disarmament. However, we also have to note that no decisive breakthrough has been achieved to date in the work of the Conference on Disarmament. No headway has been made on the nuclear items, and the Conference's work on item 5 has not yet been action-oriented.

As in previous years, the Conference mainly concentrated this year on elaborating the convention on the complete prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. This corresponds to the current state of affairs in the area of multilateral disarmament and to the appeals launched by the Paris Conference to this forum to redouble efforts to resolve expeditiously the pending issues and to conclude the convention at the earliest date. We note that under the effective guidance of the distinguished representative of France, Ambassador Pierre Morel, the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, making use of the advantages resulting from the organizational structure of the Committee, has succeeded in intensifying its work. Certain strides have

(Mr. Dietze, German Democratic Republic)

been made concerning a number of issues, in particular the annex on chemicals, the régime for laboratory synthesis of schedule [1] chemicals, the confidentiality annex, a number of issues regarding the future organization, assistance for protection against chemical weapons, as well as some final clauses. Furthermore, the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons has at this session for the first time engaged in substantive discussion on a number of issues which objectively existed also before, but for some reason remained in the background. This has become possible largely due to the chairmen of the five working groups which were established within the Ad hoc Committee.

The socialist countries on their part made an active contribution in submitting a proposal on the laboratory synthesis of schedule [1] chemicals as well as in displaying their readiness for compromise regarding a solution for super-toxic lethal chemicals not included in schedule [1]. Another proposal provided for testing the challenge inspection procedure in multilateral trial inspections. Four countries of our Group reported on the results achieved during trial inspections carried out by them. We call for an early start of well-prepared multilateral trial inspections.

It is deplorable that no noticeable progress has been reached on the outstanding key problems. Therefore, we appeal to all delegations to conduct serious work in a spirit of accommodation during the summer part of the session. We hold that a real breakthrough must be achieved in the CW negotiations, first and foremost in such areas as challenge inspection, the overall system of verification, the régimes under article VI, the composition and decision-making of the Executive Council as well as the order of destruction of chemical weapons and CW production facilities. Reaching agreement on articles X and XI of the "rolling text" would contribute to ensuring global adherence to the convention. We believe that the present stage of negotiations calls for endeavours aimed at finding solutions rather than creating new difficulties.

The countries on whose behalf I am speaking take the view that centring efforts on the negotiation of a CW ban, which is justified in itself, should not impede the Conference's work on other key items of its agenda, in particular with respect to the elaboration of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, measures providing for nuclear disarmament and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Our countries advocate that the Conference should commence its practical work on a CTBT at the earliest date and set up an appropriate ad hoc committee for this purpose. As far as the mandate is concerned, we have indeed displayed a flexible approach. At the end of the previous session one of the countries in our Group, namely Czechoslovakia, introduced a draft mandate which, we hope, will facilitate at long last resolving the issue of setting up an ad hoc committee. Our delegations highly appreciate the activities undertaken by the distinguished representative of Japan, Ambassador Yamada, in order to find a compromise formula acceptable to all.

As for agenda item 1, the present session produced a significant outcome, which is the fifth report of the Ad hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events. The report contains a concept of a global system for international seismic data exchange, taking into account the current level of development of

(Mr. Dietze, German Democratic Republic)

seismic science and technology. This successful step underscores, above all, that it is appropriate to proceed to the elaboration of a comprehensive system of verification of the non-conduct of nuclear tests with the scientific experts participating. During this session the German Democratic Republic introduced detailed and specific proposals to this effect. We hope that during the summer part of this session it will at least be possible to reach agreement on setting up an ad hoc committee on agenda item 1, on its mandate and on the elaboration of proposals by experts for the verification system.

Noting with satisfaction the re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space, the delegations of socialist countries regret that too much time was spent on settling organizational questions, thus limiting scope for carrying out substantive work. Our delegations believe that an important task to be addressed by the Ad hoc Committee now is to search for common ground in terms of systematic and action-oriented work by the Conference with a view to preventing an arms race in space. This, by the way, was mentioned by many other delegations as well. The assessment of the results of the outer space Committee's work clearly shows that there exists a sound basis to build on. This is borne out by the working paper submitted by the delegation of Mongolia (CD/905), encompassing a review of the proposals presented to the Ad hoc Committee in recent years. The socialist countries endorse both global and partial solutions which lead to a comprehensive ban on space weapons. In the past they have advanced relevant moves to this effect. During the Ad hoc Committee's meetings this year, the socialist countries outlined their position, supporting the concept of devising "rules of the road" in space. They aired concrete thoughts on how to enhance confidence and openness as regards space activities. We hope that the thorough analysis of existing proposals will be continued in a more systematic way at the forthcoming summer session. The countries of our Group have also come out in favour of holding discussions among scientific experts in the framework of the Ad hoc Committee, and offered concrete ideas to this end.

The delegations of socialist countries also deem it essential that during the summer session the Ad hoc Committees on negative security assurances and radiological weapons should continue to identify solutions to the problems they are facing. We think intensified efforts need to be undertaken to conclude the elaboration of the comprehensive programme of disarmament in accordance with the corresponding resolution of the United Nations General Assembly.

The Group of Socialist Countries regrets that the Conference has not yet been able to agree on a format for the consideration of issues of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war. We consider it to be a matter of principle and importance that the dialogue on the complete elimination of nuclear, chemical and other weapons of mass destruction should be held at the international level. The range of participants must be broadened in the negotiating process dealing with nuclear weapons. All nuclear States must participate in it, thus creating conditions for shaping new international relations which should commit every State to strengthen universal security. We expect that at its summer session the Conference will address these important issues in principle, too.

(Mr. Dietze, German Democratic Republic)

As I have the floor I should like to place on record a very personal note. Since my friend and our colleague, Ambassador Youri Nazarkin, is to relinquish his post as head of the Soviet delegation to the Conference on Disarmament, I would like to express my appreciation for the outstanding contribution he has made at the Conference on Disarmament. Moreover, I would like to thank Ambassador Youri Nazarkin for the co-operation I personally enjoyed with him. In taking leave of our friend, we wish him sustained success in the performance of his new functions in the service of disarmament, as well as good health and well-being. At the same time, I would like to welcome wholeheartedly our new colleague, the head of the Soviet delegation, Serquei Batsanov, and wish him success in our work here in Geneva, and I should like to assure him of my delegation's readiness for continued and close co-operation.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the German Democratic Republic for his statement. That concludes my list of speakers for today. Does any other member wish to take the floor at this stage? I recognize the representative of Egypt.

Mr. ELARABY (Egypt): I do not want to delay the proceedings of this meeting but, as Co-ordinator of the Group of 21 and on behalf of the Group, I would like to express to Ambassador Nazarkin our pleasure, happiness and full satisfaction at having worked with him during these years, and to wish him luck in the very important post which is awaiting him. By the same token, I would like to welcome Mr. Batsanov, his successor.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): I too would like to join with our colleagues here today in mentioning the departure of our friend and colleague, Ambassador Youri Nazarkin. I have worked closely with Ambassador Nazarkin not only in the Conference on Disarmament but in many many hours of bilaterals and, of course, in New York at the United Nations at the General Assembly, in the First Committee and the special session. Ambassador Nazarkin is an able diplomat with sound judgement who has approached his work constructively and imaginatively. During his tenure as Ambassador of the Soviet Union at the CD, we have witnessed the transition of our negotiations from what was largely polemics and acrimony to a serious approach to our negotiations. We attribute much of the improvement in the CD atmosphere to Ambassador Nazarkin's personal approach and his diplomatic skills, and on behalf of our delegation we wish him all success in his new undertaking and responsibilities. Our past excellent relationship with Ambassador Nazarkin's successor, Mr. Batsanov, assures us that our constructive relationship with the Soviet delegation will continue.

Mr. FAN (China) (translated from Chinese): I would also like to join my colleagues who spoke before me in expressing my pleasure at having worked with Ambassador Nazarkin for so many years. I have co-operated with him in the Conference on Disarmament and other forums. He personally made arrangements for us to visit the Soviet Union. All this leaves us with a memory to cherish. I also know that his departure is only temporary, and that he will soon come back to take up an important post in the field of disarmament. I hope that his work will result in better co-ordination of the multilateral disarmament efforts in the CD and the bilateral negotiations. I also wish him

(Mr. Fan, China)

greater success in his future post. At the same time, I should like to welcome his successor as head of the Soviet delegation, Mr. Batsanov. I am sure that the Chinese delegation will continue to enjoy co-operation with the Soviet delegation.

Mr. NAZARKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): First of all I should like to express my satisfaction at the chairmanship of the distinguished representative of Kenya, Ambassador Bullut, and the Kenyan delegation, in the concluding month of the spring part of the session of the Conference on Disarmament. I should also like to express gratitude to the distinguished representative of Japan, Ambassador Yamada, for his efforts as President of the Conference on Disarmament in guiding our work during the previous month. I welcome the new distinguished representative of Algeria, Ambassador Ait-Chaalal, and wish him success in his work.

Today's meeting is a farewell meeting for me, since I am leaving my post as representative of the USSR at the Conference on Disarmament for a new assignment. It gives me satisfaction to recognize that in the two years and three months during which I have represented my country at the Conference, the international situation has undergone important positive changes. They have had a tangible effect on the work of the Conference on Disarmament. In the negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons, major advances have been made which have brought us closer to the conclusion of the convention, although progress in the negotiations has alternated with a slowing of the pace of work. I do not intend in today's statement to analyse the status of the negotiations. An assessment has been provided today on behalf of the Group of Socialist Countries by its co-ordinator for this month, the distinguished representative of the German Democratic Republic, Ambassador Peter Dietze. I would like in a purely personal way to express my regret that I did not manage to take part in the completion of the draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons, including its final drafting. I hope that this stage is not far distant. I also regret the fact that during the period in which I occupied the post of representative of the USSR at the Conference, we were not able to set up a working body on a nuclear test ban. I think that it has finally become possible for the Conference to begin practical work in earnest on this problem, which for many years has been item 1 on its agenda. This work must bring us closer to the achievement of a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests, an important measure to curb the arms race.

I felt the need for these measures particularly strongly having seen Hiroshima, the victim of a nuclear attack, with my own eyes. I am grateful to the mayor of Hiroshima, who gave me an opportunity, together with other participants in the United Nations conference on disarmament issues held in Kyoto, to visit that tragic place. I would like to express my gratitude to the United Nations Department of Disarmament Affairs, headed by Under-Secretary-General Akashi, the Japanese organizers of the conference and the visit to Hiroshima, and above all the distinguished representative of Japan to the Conference, Ambassador Yamada. The efficient organization and the consideration shown to us undoubtedly contributed to the success of the entire undertaking.



(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

For me, my work here at the Conference on Disarmament became an extensive and useful learning experience, because I found myself working with exceptionally competent, extremely intelligent and very well-disposed colleagues. Co-operation with them and personal relations were exceptionally useful and pleasant. I believe that the Conference will play a yet more important role in the noble cause of arms limitation and disarmament. This task can be accomplished only by working at all levels and pursuing all avenues, multilateral, regional and bilateral. I think the experience I have acquired here will help me in my new functions, which are also related to disarmament, but this time of a bilateral nature, because I have been appointed to lead the Soviet delegation to the negotiations with the United States on nuclear and space weapons.

In conclusion I should like to express my gratitude and appreciation to all my colleagues for their co-operation and friendship, and for the exceptionally kind words and good wishes which have been addressed to me in connection with my new appointment. I have been deeply moved by these expressions of good will towards me, and I expect to continue our friendly personal contacts in the future. Of course, I will take with me very warm memories of the period of my work here with you. I would like to thank the Secretary-General of the Conference, Ambassador Komatina, his deputy, Ambassador Vicente Berasategui and also all the members of the secretariat, including the interpreters, who have provided the most favourable possible conditions for us to work in. I wish you all every success in your difficult, responsible and essential humanitarian work. I wish you good health and happiness. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for his statement, and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I should like, on behalf of the Conference, to extend to him our warmest congratulations on his important assignment as leader of the Soviet delegation to the nuclear and space arms talks in Geneva. While we are very happy to learn that an esteemed colleague has been given such an important assignment, at the same time I am sure that all of us regret the fact that we will not be seeing him as frequently as before. Youri Nazarkin is an outstanding professional with deep knowledge, experience and diplomatic skill, who has represented his country with distinction in this Conference. I take particular pleasure in recalling that his professional life has been associated with the multilateral disarmament negotiating forum since 1967, when he joined the Soviet delegation to the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee as Second Secretary, until now, when he culminates his career in this body as leader of the Soviet delegation at a time when new Soviet approaches are being formulated in the field of disarmament. This important and difficult task he has accomplished, leaving behind many new friends. I should like to wish him and Mrs. Nazarkin all the best in their personal and professional activities and to express the hope that, as they will be staying in Geneva during at least part of the year, we will be able to remain in contact with them. Allow me also to extend a warm welcome in the Conference to the new leader of the Soviet delegation, Minister Serguei Batsanov, to whom I pledge the co-operation of my delegation in the performance of his new important responsibilities.

(The President)

As announced at the opening of this plenary meeting, I intend now to put before the Conference the question of the opening date for the second part of the session. As you know, rule 7 of the rules of procedure provides that we should take a decision concerning the opening date for the second part of the annual session. Consultations have been proceeding up to now and I believe that, in accordance with our practice, we should first consider this question at an informal consultation and then resume the plenary. The plenary meeting is now suspended, and in five minutes' time I shall convene an informal consultation of co-ordinators in room C-108. We shall resume the plenary in 45 minutes' time.

The meeting was suspended at 11.55 a.m. and resumed at 2.05 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The 507th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament is resumed.

I am happy to inform you that we have reached agreement concerning the opening date of the second part of the annual session. As my delegation will be serving in the presidency until 13 June, in accordance with past practice and the rules of procedure of the Conference on Disarmament, and in order to prepare actively for the proper discharge of the presidency, in his capacity as incoming President, Ambassador García Robles of Mexico will a week earlier hold such consultations as he deems necessary prior to the official opening date, which will be 13 June at 10 a.m. I trust that this is acceptable.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform you that the Ad hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament will meet this afternoon at 4 p.m. instead of 3 p.m.

I have no other business for today. I now intend to adjourn this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on 13 June at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 2.10 p.m.