

CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

CCD/PV.796  
1 August 1978  
ENGLISH

---

FINAL RECORD OF THE SEVEN HUNDRED AND NINETY-SIXTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Tuesday, 1 August 1978, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. N. Marshall

(United Kingdom)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

<u>Argentina:</u>	Mr. F. JIMENEZ DÁVILA
<u>Brazil:</u>	Mr. G.R.B. ARROIO
<u>Bulgaria:</u>	Mr. P. VOUTOV Mr. I. PETROV Mr. I. SOTIROV
<u>Burma:</u>	U THEIN AUNG U THAUNG HTUN
<u>Canada:</u>	Mr. R. HARRY JAY Mr. J.T. SIMARD
<u>Czechoslovakia:</u>	Mr. E. ZÁPOTOCKÝ Mr. V. ROHAL-ILKIV
<u>Egypt:</u>	Mr. F. EL-IBRASHI
<u>Ethiopia:</u>	Mr. G. ALULA
<u>German Democratic Republic:</u>	Mr. G. HERDER Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI Mr. R. EGGERT
<u>Germany, Federal Republic of:</u>	Mr. G. PFEIFFER Mr. H. MULLER
<u>Hungary:</u>	Mr. M. DOMOKOS Mr. A. LAKATOS
<u>India:</u>	Mr. J.S. MEHTA Mr. C.R. GHAREKHAN Mr. S.T. DEVARE
<u>Iran:</u>	Mr. M. FARTASH Mr. D. AMERI
<u>Italy:</u>	Mr. N. DI BERNARDO Mr. M. MORENO Mr. C. FRATESCHI Mr. G. VALDEVIT

Japan:

Mr. M. OGISO  
 Mr. T. SAWAI  
 Mr. Y. NAKAMURA  
 Mr. S. SUYEHURO

Mexico:

Mr. M. MARIN  
 Miss A. CABRERA

Mongolia:

Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG

Morocco:

Netherlands:

Mr. R. FEIN  
 Mr. A.J. MEERBURG

Nigeria:

Mr. T.S.O. OLUMOKO

Pakistan:

Mr. K. SALEEM

Peru:

Mr. ALVARO DE SOTO  
 Mr. J. AURICH-MONTERO

Poland:

Mr. S. PRZYGDZKI  
 Mr. M. KRUCZYK

Romania:

Mr. C. ENE  
 Mr. V. TUDOR  
 Mr. G. TINCA

Sweden:

Mr. L. NORBERG  
 Mr. U. REINIUS

Union of Soviet Socialist  
 Republics:

Mr. V.I. LIKHATCHEV  
 Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN  
 Mr. N.V. PESTEREV  
 Mr. P.F. SHAKHOV  
 Mr. V. USTINOV  
 Mr. A.I. TIOURENKOV  
 Mr. Y.V. KOSTENKO  
 Mr. E.D. ZAITSEV

United Kingdom:

Mr. N. MARSHALL

Mr. I.R. KENYON

United States of America:

Mr. A. AKALOVSKY

Mr. C. FLOWERREE

Mr. M. DALEY

Mr. C.J. TAYLOR

Mr. R.L. HAGENGRUBER

Mr. J. FELSON

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. LALOVIC

Mr. D. DJOKIC

Zaire:

Mr. BINTU'A-TSHIABOLA

Special Representative of the  
Secretary-General:

Mr. Risto HYVARINEN

Alternate Representative of the  
Secretary-General:

Mr. A. CORRADINI

Communiqué of the meeting

The following communiqué was issued today by the CCD:

The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament today held its 796th plenary meeting at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of Mr. Noel Marshall, representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The representative of the Socialist Republic of Romania (H.E. Ambassador Constantin Ene) made a statement in which he commented on the main conclusion to be drawn from the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

He mentioned the fact that the work and the results of the special session have been closely followed in Romania. In this regard he referred to the analyses made on 10 July by the Executive Political Committee of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party, which viewed the special session as a major step towards a new approach to the cardinal issues of disarmament.

He said that the creation of a more democratic framework for deliberations and negotiations on disarmament issues and the greater responsibility of the United Nations on that line were considered as being highly positive results of the special session.

He emphasized that now, more than ever, there was a need for the concentration and the mobilization of all forces and energies in order to take advantage of the new conditions created by the special session, so that real progress could be achieved in the disarmament field.

Ambassador Ene held the view that the procedures and methods of work of the new multilateral negotiating body on disarmament established by the special session could have a positive impact on the future negotiations. He stressed that the provisions as well as the spirit of the Final Document of the special session should be fully respected, so that the new disarmament machinery could increase its contribution to the mobilization of the political will of States to negotiate and conclude real disarmament agreements.

Ambassador Ene also addressed himself to the current work of the CCD and said that he shared the opinions expressed by other delegations, that the last session of the CCD should concentrate on active negotiations on the priority

items before the Committee. In this context he underlined the fact that the progress of the CCD depended very much on its ability to manifest itself as a collective negotiating body. He said that conditions should be created for its members to act as real partners in negotiations.

The representative of Iran (H.E. Ambassador M. Fartash) made a statement assessing the results of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and its implications for the work of the CCD. Commenting on the changes made in the machinery for disarmament, he welcomed the establishment of the new Committee on Disarmament and the decision of the French Government to join in this Committee.

Mr. Fartash stressed that the strengthening of the disarmament machinery had, however, not been the only or primary purpose of the special session, and that its substantive results had been less satisfactory. The establishment of clear priorities for disarmament negotiations, and the recognition of certain other principles, had been important. Another positive step was the agreement on the relevance of nuclear-weapon-free zones as an important measure of nuclear disarmament. A detailed portion of the Final Document had been devoted to this subject and the obligations to be undertaken by the nuclear-weapon States were satisfactory. Endorsement of the proposal for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East had been particularly gratifying.

However, the special session had made no real progress towards practical measures of arms limitation. The real breakthrough towards stopping the arms race still depended on the super Powers. The SALT II agreement was still awaited. The CTB, often promised, had not been completed. As it was now said that agreement on verification seemed near, it was preferable to wait for the completed treaty with adequate verification measures, thus, hopefully, assuring a more permanent treaty. The delegation of Iran would have preferred a progress report from the three negotiators regarding the results reached to date. However, it would study the report on the status of the negotiations promised by the negotiating Powers.

The representative of Sweden (Mr. Lars Norberg) introduced the sixth progress report of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events. He

proposed that the CCD at its next official meeting should take note of the report and that decisions should be made in accordance with paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 of the report, i.e.:

That a representative of WMO be invited to participate informally in the work of the Group in relation to the transmission of data through the WMO Communication Network;

That the Ad Hoc Group hold its next session in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, from 19 February to 2 March 1979; and

That the final report of the Group should be delivered during the summer session of 1979.

The "Schedule of CCD Meetings for 1978 Summer Session" (CCD/574) was circulated.

The next plenary meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 3 August 1978, at 10.30 a.m.

\*

\*

\*

Mr. ENEL (Romania)(translated from French): First of all I should like to welcome all the representatives who are participating in our work for the first time. I would like to associate myself with the good wishes expressed by previous speakers in addressing the distinguished representative of the Socialist Republic of the Union of Burma, Ambassador U Saw Hlaing, and the distinguished representative of Sweden, Ambassador Curt Lidgard. I would like to tell Ambassador U Saw Hlaing and Ambassador Lidgard that the Romanian delegation sincerely wishes to maintain and develop close co-operation and relations with their countries. Such relations have always existed between our delegations.

The Romanian delegation is participating in this session of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament with an eye very much on the future. Like the delegations which have preceded me, I have in mind the new prospects which the recent special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations has created for activities related to disarmament.

It is true that views on the practical results of the special session may vary according to the hopes placed by States in that important international debate. Nevertheless, some basic conclusions may be drawn which are irrefutable for those of us who have been involved in this particular activity for many years and will continue to be so in the future.

First, there is the fact that the convening of the special session stemmed from the contradiction, which has become chronic, between the continued acceleration of the arms race and its attendant dangers on the one hand, and the ineffectiveness of disarmament negotiations on the other.

Second, there is the fact that the participation of States in that international assembly, which was the largest and most representative ever held on disarmament, the large number of proposals and suggestions put forward during the deliberations and the efforts deployed by all delegations to achieve concrete results bear witness to a greater measure of concern about the serious effects of the arms race and the danger with which mankind is faced, and to an ever-increasing awareness of the need to make use of all means and possibilities of halting the arms race and engaging in real disarmament.

The fact, which has often been emphasized in this Committee, that disarmament problems are of keen interest to all States, was fully confirmed by the proceedings of the special session.

(Mr. Enc. Romania)

Finally, there is the fact that the United Nations has once again proved to be the most appropriate forum at present available to mankind for the discussion and negotiation of disarmament problems. If the special session managed to produce positive results, as we believe is generally considered to be the case, those results are due to the active participation of all States in both the discussion of problems and the adoption of decisions.

The session demonstrated that disarmament necessarily implies application of the requirements for the democratization of international relations, namely, the participation of all States in the adoption of decisions on an equal footing, and due consideration of the interests of all.

The proceedings and results of the special session devoted to disarmament have been analysed in depth in Romania at the highest political level. After considering the report of the Romanian delegation which participated in the work of the session, the Executive Political Committee of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party, at its meeting on 10 July last, expressed itself as follows:

"The special session of the United Nations devoted to disarmament is an important step in the new approach to the problems relating to the cessation of the arms race and the transition to general disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament.

Stressing the importance of the fact that all States had the opportunity to take part, in the United Nations framework, in the deliberations on this crucial problem of contemporary international life, the Executive Political Committee found highly positive the establishment of a more democratic framework for the solution of disarmament problems and the greater responsibility of the United Nations in that regard. By demonstrating the imperative need for disarmament, reviewing the immediate major objectives to be the subject of future discussions and concrete measures, and at the same time establishing an appropriate international framework, the special session of the United Nations has opened up prospects of real progress towards the ending of the arms race and towards disarmament ...

The Executive Political Committee expressed its conviction that now, more than ever, there was a need to intensify the united struggle of all the revolutionary and democratic forces of all peoples for the early cessation of the arms race and for concrete measures of disarmament, and especially nuclear disarmament."

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

The Romanian Government is thus convinced that the special session created the premises for a new approach to disarmament and opened up new avenues for future negotiations. The principles -- more democratic and established with the participation and consent of all States -- that are to govern the negotiations, the negotiation machinery with its global outlook, the rich heritage of ideas and proposals put forward at the session and inspired by the will to relaunch the negotiations on the way towards genuine results -- all these are new conditions which, in our view, justify hopes for the future.

The special session did not succeed in adopting a programme which was sufficiently detailed and which would compel disarmament measures, particularly in the field of nuclear disarmament. Only, however, through the adoption of practical measures for ending the arms race and for disarmament is it possible to assess the effectiveness of international action in this regard. Accordingly, the attainment of this goal must, in future, constitute the main task of the new deliberative and negotiating structures.

Romania, for its part, submitted to the special session a programme of measures that, together with the proposals formulated by other States, constitute a significant body of ideas and initiatives upon which to base disarmament negotiations. From this standpoint, the decisions adopted by the special session are only the beginning of a new stage, the outcome of which will depend on the firm attitude and concerted efforts of all States to translate existing proposals into tangible measures conducive to the cessation of the arms race and to disarmament.

In January 1979 we will have a new multilateral negotiating body on disarmament.

The new Committee on Disarmament has been established on a more democratic basis, in accordance with the general development of international relations. Its procedures and working methods, too, will be such as to have a positive impact on the future negotiations.

In our view, the specific provisions and the spirit of the Final Document adopted by the session create more favourable conditions than have obtained in the past for enabling the machinery designed by the session to contribute to the formation and mobilization of the political will of States, which should find practical expression in real disarmament agreements.

(M. Ene, Romania.)

While political will is undeniably a matter which comes within the competence and responsibility of each individual State, it is nonetheless formed in an international context. That is precisely one of the functions which we would like to see performed by the new structures set on foot by the special session.

The Final Document (A/IEG/S 10/2) brings out the shortcomings of the work we have done so far in this Conference. As noted in the Final Document, the agreements we have concluded relate only to measures of limited restraint while the arms race continues. These partial measures have done little to bring the world closer to the goal of general and complete disarmament (para. 17). The conclusion drawn is that, in spite of the best efforts of the international community, adequate results have not been produced with the existing machinery (para. 113).

At this particular point in time, when, as we know, various consultations are taking place and our capitals are reflecting on the manner in which the new machinery is to be activated, it is important, if the mistakes of the past are not to be repeated, to adhere strictly to the provisions clearly set out in the Final Document and to the spirit of the negotiations which resulted in their adoption.

The Romanian delegation wishes to affirm this point of view at the very outset.

I have seen fit to make these few comments because we believe that they are directly relevant to problems which we have discussed on many occasions. However, as I stated earlier, they are concerned first and foremost with the future.

The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament leaves behind it a useful body of negotiating experience in the field of disarmament and, above all, an abundant collection of working documents, ideas and proposals which have long been awaiting the attention they deserve. This valuable material will no doubt be of use to the new negotiating machinery, namely, the Committee on Disarmament.

So far as concerns the present session, the Romanian delegation endorses the views expressed by the delegations that have already spoken, to the effect that no effort must be spared, on this occasion either, to arrive at active negotiations on the problems included in our agenda. The priority problems referred to us by the General Assembly and on which we are required to submit a report to the thirty-third session should certainly occupy the foreground. To make progress in our work, we will of course need the minimum conditions for enabling this Conference to function as a collective body, with its members acting as partners in the discussion.

(Mr. One, Romania)

Given the prospects for a new stage, which we hope will be more promising, such a reversal of trend would be the most convincing way of demonstrating that all our countries, be they nuclear or non-nuclear, large or small, developed from the economic point of view or developing, are determined to respond by deeds to the appeal for action which was launched by the special session of the United Nations and to which we have all subscribed.

Mr. PARMASHI (Iran): It is a pleasure as always to greet my distinguished colleagues and friends in this conference room, and I would like to extend a special welcome to Ambassador U Sav Hlaing of the Socialist Republic of the Union of Burma and Ambassador Curt Lidgard of Sweden, who are participating in our meetings for the first time. I am confident that we will enjoy as pleasant relations with them as we did with their predecessors.

Our greetings go also to Ambassador Risto Iyvärinen, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and to Mr. Corradini, the Alternate Representative, who continue to offer their assistance to our Committee.

Since our last session in Geneva many changes have taken place, and we find ourselves in the twilight hours of this Committee's existence. These changes correspond to a large extent to recommendations made by members of the CCD. Thus it is with satisfaction and guarded optimism that we resume here. We should try to make the best possible use of the time available and prepare for the transition to a new negotiating body.

It seems appropriate to start with a discussion of the results of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and to assess its implications for our work. As we meet here in the aftermath of that historic gathering, the atmosphere is marked by sobriety and by hope. The sober attitude is inevitable after long weeks of exposure to the endless problems connected with preventing nuclear war and reducing the mountainous levels of armaments in the world. The enormity of the task as reflected in the Final Document of the special session evokes an even graver mood. This is not to imply that these problems were not widely recognized prior to the session, but presented in a compact single document they become more impressive.

Yet the feelings of hope are also strong. The commitments of 149 States to the goals of disarmament were given with greater firmness than we had anticipated. With interventions and working papers, Government after Government pledged to work towards disarmament objectives. While no specific disarmament measure was concluded at this meeting, the spotlight was thrown on the most crucial problems, and the Governments primarily concerned will, hopefully, feel the pressure to negotiate as rapidly and efficiently as possible.

(Mr. Partash, Iran)

Coming from the general to the specific accomplishments of this special session on disarmament, we find again a mixed bag. Certain results were satisfactory, especially in the area of the machinery for disarmament. The reorganization of the negotiating body goes far towards meeting the criticisms expressed from many sides. During the CCD's spring session, I stated that we would favour changes tending to render the Committee more efficient and, especially, allowing for the participation of all the nuclear Powers in its work. Thus we are pleased with the establishment of the new Committee on Disarmament. We particularly welcome the decision of the French Government to join this Committee and hope that in time all nuclear States will become members.

Similarly, the addition of a certain number of non-aligned States will surely broaden the perspective of our discussions. The newly structured Committee represents a wise compromise between the need to expand participation in the negotiating body and the need to keep its size to manageable proportions. Finally, we approve of the new system for assuring the chairmanship of the Committee, which has resolved a ticklish problem and has removed a serious political block.

Having taken note of the Chairman's statement regarding the understanding that all members of the CCD are members of the Committee on Disarmament, my Government stands ready to continue its active participation in the disarmament negotiations. We are anxious to contribute to the best of our ability to the success of the new negotiating body.

Another significant and useful move was the establishment of a new United Nations Disarmament Commission as a deliberative organ in this field. Composed of the full membership of the United Nations, this body will be open to ideas from the entire world. It will be able to deliberate broad concepts as well as detailed measures of arms limitation and make recommendations to the General Assembly. It should assure a thorough consideration of disarmament questions and a more coherent and co-ordinated debate in the First Committee. The functioning of the First Committee will also be greatly improved by the decision to have that Committee discuss only matters pertaining to disarmament and related international security issues.

In his closing statement, the President of the special session pinpointed the strengthening of the negotiating machinery as the central focus of the session. But that was not the only purpose or even the main purpose of the conference. The overhauling of the disarmament machinery was a necessary and significant accomplishment, but it cannot alone assure any substantial limitation of armaments. Unless the special session has also provided a serious impetus towards the resolution of at least some outstanding issues, the modest success of its structural reforms will have been in vain. We must beware of the familiar French expression, plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose.

(Mr. Partash, Iran)

What can be said then about the substantive achievements of the special session? The fact of producing a consensus document is in itself important. Despite the omission of many controversial points, some of those included in the text are also noteworthy. One such point is the establishment of clearly stated priorities which confirm the primacy of nuclear disarmament and keep the other issues in correct proportion.

Another concession to reality is the recognition throughout the text of the underlying security concerns of States in connexion with the disarmament process. Repeated references are made to the need for protecting the security of States as they give up traditional reliance on armaments. Equal emphasis is placed on strengthening the United Nations security system and its fundamental role in the maintenance of international security. There is also confirmation of the incompatibility of the arms race with on-going efforts to realize the New International Economic Order and of the link between disarmament and development. In spelling out these basic principles, the Final Document has brought disarmament into a more contemporary context.

The programme of action containing a list of measures which have long been on the disarmament agenda could hardly be termed innovative. However, one positive step is the agreement on the relevance of nuclear-weapon-free zones as an important measure of nuclear disarmament. A large portion of the Final Document is devoted to the various aspects of creating such zones, and these paragraphs are among the most detailed in the text. In view of the position which our delegation has consistently taken regarding the obligations of the nuclear-weapon States towards nuclear-weapon-free zones, we are satisfied with the undertakings the nuclear powers are asked to give. It is a significant step forward to have included these obligations in a consensus document.

The specific reference to a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East is particularly gratifying, as is the endorsement of the proposed preliminary declarations which the States of the area should make. Furthermore, the suggestion that the Security Council might be given a role in the implementation of this measure could also help to launch this initiative.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

We find thus that some contribution to the principles of disarmament has been made, and that the direction of further disarmament efforts has been clarified. But in terms of practical results the special session was regrettably unable to clear the obstacles which have thwarted all our efforts to date to achieve real progress in disarmament. It was unable to make any serious inroads on the essential issues, or to offer any new solutions. The real breakthrough towards the goal of stopping the arms race and scaling down nuclear stockpiles has still to come, and it depends on the policies and measures pursued by the super Powers.

The special session stressed nuclear disarmament as the first priority of disarmament negotiations. We are still awaiting a SALT II treaty. Hopes were high for some form of agreement in time for the special session. We hear now that agreement will be forthcoming before the end of the year. Although impatient with these frequent delays, we continue to hope that these promises will finally be realized. Unfortunately, as regards nuclear measures, we have no alternative to super Power agreement.

The accomplishment of a comprehensive test ban has also eluded us. Here our frustration is greater still, for this agreement should have been reached not months, but years, ago. We appreciate the fact that the trilateral negotiations are in their final stages. Therefore, it would perhaps not be wise to undermine the progress made so far. There is no question that nuclear testing could have ceased long ago, and the majority of United Nations members have voted innumerable times for such a cessation. Under the circumstances, however, when agreement on verification seems near, it is preferable to await a complete treaty. If a treaty with provision for adequate verification and the mechanisms for carrying it out can be agreed, there should be a much better chance of achieving a permanent accord.

Thus we are encouraged by the relatively optimistic statements regarding the trilateral talks. Although verification is the familiar sticking-point, we understand that the problems to be resolved are mostly of a technical

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

nature and that agreement is really within reach. It is then not illusory to expect that we will soon be considering and negotiating a draft text of such a treaty.

Given this situation, we were eager to have a progress report on this, the most vital and important subject before our Committee. Although this was not possible, we look forward to hearing the statement promised by the negotiating Powers regarding the status of the trilateral negotiations. We hope that it will be possible to have a relevant discussion of the subject.

Thus, as far as the work before us is concerned, everything remains to be done. We would urge the United States and the Soviet Union to redouble their efforts towards their joint initiative for a ban on chemical weapons. Well aware of the serious verification problems involved in this field, we nevertheless trust that some progress can soon be reported to our Committee. At the same time, we should continue our discussions on the agenda items awaiting attention. The importance of each one of them was confirmed by the special session, and there is no need to delay our work in these topics.

We have no choice but to pursue the negotiating process. We have no choice but to continue an unrelenting search for measures to limit armaments. It was French President Valery Giscard d'Estaing who remarked so aptly during his visit to New York that the two traditional adversaries of disarmament are the scepticism of public opinion and resignation to the inevitable. The history of disarmament negotiations gives ample cause for both scepticism and resignation, but we must fight against these tendencies if we are to make headway towards the goals set forth by consensus in the Final Document.

Mr. NORBERG (Sweden): The Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events held its sixth plenary session from 24 to 28 July. The progress report of the Ad Hoc Group is now in front of you as Conference Room Paper 51/Rev.1.

In the view of the Swedish delegation, the Group has had a very useful session and has got well under way organizing its work in accordance with its terms of reference of 4 May 1978 (CCD/570).

We welcome the fact that at this session the Group has been enlarged with a representative from Austria.

You will notice that in paragraph 6 the Group suggests that a representative of WMO be invited by the CCD to participate informally in the work of the Group in relation to the transmission of data through the WMO Communication Network. . . .

In paragraph 8, the Group calls attention to the fact that the time originally allotted by the CCD for the final report -- "The Group should report the results of its work to the Committee during its spring session of 1979" (CCD/570) -- would be insufficient to provide as detailed and comprehensive results as the CCD might wish. On the one hand, the topics to be dealt with are narrower than those reported upon in the first final report of the Group. But they should on the other hand be treated in greater technical depth. This was considered by the Group to be unachievable within the present procedural limitations, with experts engaged only part-time and meeting only during the sessions of the CCD or CD. The experts have estimated, however, that postponement of the delivery of the report to the next summer session, instead of the spring session, should remove the difficulty.

So to conclude, may I formally propose that the Committee take note of the sixth progress report of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and to Identify Seismic Events. I also propose that decisions be made in accordance with paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 of the progress report:

To invite a representative of WMO to participate informally in the work of the Group in relation to the transmission of data through the WMO Communication Network;

That the Ad Hoc Group will hold its next session in the Palais des Nations in Geneva from 19 February to 2 March 1979; and

That CCD/570 will be amended, changing "spring" to "summer" in the fourth line from the bottom.

(Mr. Norberg, Sweden)

In order to give delegations sufficient time to study the report, these decisions could be taken at the next official meeting of the CCD, on Thursday this week.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of Sweden for his statement. Mr. Norberg has suggested that we should, at our next meeting, on Thursday, take note of this report officially and make decisions on certain paragraphs in it. Is this acceptable to the Committee? Would any distinguished delegate wish to comment on this proposal? I see no one. We will therefore consider this matter during our next meeting, on Thursday.

Before I read the draft communiqué, I would like to say that it was brought to my attention, after our meeting started this morning, that we have with us Mr. J.S. Mehta, Foreign Secretary of India, and I should like to extend a warm welcome to him on behalf of the Committee.

Mr. LIKHATCHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Mr. Chairman, after listening to the communiqué which you have read out and of which I do not have the text, I should like to say, with reference to the part relating to that passage of the statement of the distinguished representative of Romania, Ambassador Ene, in which he speaks of the organ where negotiations are to take place, that one should, I think, use the terminology which is contained in the Final Document of the special session. Here, the formula used is different from that used in the Final Document. May I ask, therefore, that when the Secretariat draws up the final communiqué, the wording be in line with that of the Final Document of the United Nations Special Session devoted to Disarmament. If my memory is correct, in the Final Document one spoke of an "organ for negotiation which is appropriately constituted", whereas here in the communiqué we speak of a "negotiating organ which is established". This is not the same thing. I would ask you to be so kind as to see to it that the wording is in line with the Final Document of the special session devoted to disarmament.

Mr. ENE (Romania): I would like to thank the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union for the attention with which he listened to my statement and also to the text which I gave to the Secretariat to be included in the final communiqué.

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

Of course, the substance of the statement of the representative of the USSR poses me no problems, but there is a matter of procedure which I would like to raise. I think that there was an understanding in this Committee that whatever text is given to the Chair to be included in the final communiqué on the understanding that this reproduces whatever a delegation has said, the text is the entire responsibility of that particular delegation. It is my understanding that the same should be applied in this case. So, as long as this refers to the statement which was made by my delegation, I think that this procedure should be maintained.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of Romania. I wonder if I could have just one moment to consult the Secretariat.

I take the point which has been made by the distinguished Ambassador of Romania, and think that, as I understand from the consultation on my right, the problem is to find wording for the communiqué which reflects exactly what the Ambassador of Romania said in his statement, and I can see that there may be some differences in the contraction here. I wonder whether we might agree that I speak with the distinguished delegates from Romania and from the Soviet Union and try to agree upon words which reflect, to the satisfaction of the Romanian delegate, what he said, and which conform with the procedure which the representative of the Soviet Union has reminded us of.

Is it, therefore, satisfactory that we be left to agree upon the formula, or would any delegate wish to have a break and make sure that we agree this before the meeting adjourns?

Mr. ENE (Romania): Mr. Chairman, I will certainly follow your advice, but would first of all like to make a point very clear, that what I have said should be reflected appropriately, according to my words and my ideas, in that final communiqué.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Ambassador. I think that it is quite understood by the Chair that the wording in the communiqué must be, in your judgement, a reflection of what you said in your statement.

Mr. LIKHATCHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I should like to clarify the fact that the Soviet delegation does not object to the communiqué reflecting what was said by the distinguished representative of Romania, but we do object to the fact that what is said on behalf of the Committee does not correspond, as it should, with the Final Document.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union, and also take note of the point which he has made.

Can we therefore leave it, with those statements, to be settled by the Chairman in consultation with two Ambassadors concerned?

Subject to this decision, may I therefore take it that the communiqué is adopted.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.