

CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

CCD/PV.657
11 March 1975
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVENTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 11 March 1975, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. George Alvares Maciel (Brazil)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Argentina:

Mr. J.V.E. BERASATEGUI

Brazil:

Mr. G. ALVARES MACIEL

Mr. L.H. PEREIRA DA FONSECA

Bulgaria:

Mr. R. NIKOLOV

Mr. B. GRINBERG

Mr. I. PETROV

Burma:

U TIN MAUNG AYE

Canada:

Mr. W.H. BARTON

Mr. A.D. ROWE

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. V. SOJÁK

Mr. J. STRUČKA

Egypt:

Mr. M.A. NASR

Mr. N. ELARABY

Mr. S.A. ABOU-ALI

Ethiopia:

Mr. G. DEMISSIE

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. G. HERDER

Mr. H-J. MICHEEL

Mr. K-D. ERNST

Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. G.J. SCHLAICH

Mr. J. BAUCH

Mr. K. HANNESSCHLÄGER

Hungary:

Mr. M. DOMOKOS

Mr. D. MEISZTER

Mr. I. KÖRMENDY

India:

Mr. B.C. MISHRA

Mr. M.K. MANGALMURTI

Iran:

Mr. M. FARTASH
Miss C. TAHMASSEB

Italy:

Mr. N. DI BERNARDO
Mr. G. VALDEVIT
Mr. A. BIZZARINI

Japan:

Mr. M. NISIBORI
Mr. A. YATABE
Mr. T. AMARI
Mr. M. SASAKI

Mexico:

Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES
Mr. M. MARIN

Mongolia:

Mr. M. DUGERSUREN
Mr. P. KHALIOUNE
Mr. L. BAYARTE

Morocco:

Mr. S.M. RAHHALI

Netherlands:

Mr. C.A. VAN DER KLAUW
Mr. A.J. MEERBURG

Nigeria:

Mr. OLAJIDE ALO
Mr. M.G.S. SAMAKI

Pakistan:

Mr. M. YUNUS
Mr. K. SALEEM

Peru:

Mr. L. CHÁVEZ-GODOY
Mr. G. CHAUNY
Mr. G. CARNERO

Poland:

Mr. E. WYZNER
Mr. S. TOPA
Mr. T. FIEĆKO
Col. A. CZERKAWSKI
Mr. H. PAĆ

Romania:

Mr. C. ENE
 Dr. V. TUDOR
 Mr. G. TINCA
 Mr. C. IVASCU
 Mr. M. ROSIANU
 Major A. SASU

Sweden:

Baron G. HAMILTON
 Capt. U. REINIUS
 Mr. A. HERNELIUS

Union of Soviet Socialist
 Republics:

Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN
 Mr. N.V. PESTEREV
 Mr. I.P. GLAZKOV
 Mr. Y.P. KLUKIN

United Kingdom:

Mr. M.E. ALLEN
 Mr. J.G. TAYLOR
 Mr. A. WHITE
 Mr. C.H.V. McCOLL

United States of America:

Mr. J. MARTIN, Jr.
 Mr. R.W. DREXLER
 Mr. D.P. BLACK
 Mr. P. STOKES
 Mr. C.L. WILMOT

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIĆ

Zaire:

Mr. Y. YOKO
 Mr. LUKABU-K'HABOUJI

Acting Representative of the
 Secretary-General:

Mr. R. BJÖRNERSTEDT

Communiqué of the meeting

The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament today held its 657th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the Chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador George Alvares Maciel, representative of Brazil.

Statements were made by the representatives of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Japan, India, Mexico and the Chairman.

The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 13 March 1975, at 10.30 a.m.

*

* *

Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom): A number of previous speakers have referred to the question of my Government's ratification of the BW Convention. Thank you for allowing me this opportunity of clarifying the situation. All the necessary preliminaries for ratification by the United Kingdom were completed on 26 February at a special meeting of the Privy Council, and arrangements are in hand with the two other Depositary Governments for the simultaneous deposit of instruments which will bring the Convention into force.

Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): At the beginning of my statement today I should like to offer my sincere congratulations on the accession to this Committee of the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, Iran, Peru and Zaire, and also my cordial welcome to the distinguished representatives of these five countries. In principle, this Committee has to maintain a limited and small number of participating countries because of its character as a body to conduct concrete and substantial negotiations on disarmament. On the other hand, the discussions in this Committee will undoubtedly be invigorated further and rendered more significant by the participation of these countries with a genuine enthusiasm for promoting disarmament, creative thoughts and action. It is in this sense that we are pleased to have the five countries participate in the work of this Committee, and that we look forward to the positive contributions of the distinguished representatives of these five countries. I should also like to extend my hearty welcome to the new representatives of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Morocco, the Netherlands, Pakistan and the United Kingdom.

Now that 1975 is here we have only a quarter of a century left before we enter the twenty-first century. However, the world situation does not necessarily lead us to entertain the prospect of a bright future. As is well known, the world is faced with many difficult problems, such as energy, food, inflation, recession and even some regional tensions. Recognition of this world situation is not irrelevant to the state of progress in disarmament. Certainly there has been some progress which deserves appreciation, such as the limitation of strategic arms due to the efforts of both the United States and the Soviet Union. But it is far short of the general and complete disarmament which is our ultimate goal. Also, we are threatened by the danger of nuclear proliferation. It should be borne deeply in mind that against this background this Committee has come to be reconvened.

(Mr. Nisibori, Japan)

For many years past we have reiterated that we must achieve the cessation of the arms race and transform the momentum of arms expansion into that of disarmament, and that otherwise the world will plunge headlong into an irretrievable chaos. Unfortunately we must repeat this even louder. Nowadays the way in which we steer our craft will not fail to influence the course of human beings in their voyage toward the twenty-first century. So we have a big responsibility, and we must bear this constantly in mind.

In the light of what I have said now, I consider it quite timely that through the initiative of Nigeria the United Nations General Assembly decided at its twenty-ninth session upon a "Mid-term Review of the Disarmament Decade". This "Mid-term Review" will hopefully highlight the achievements since the beginning of the "Disarmament Decade", and problems which should be solved in the remaining five years. While we hope to hear the results of the "Mid-term Review" in due course, there is hardly any question about what are the important tasks facing us now.

I should first like to touch upon the strategic arms limitation talks now being conducted between the United States and the Soviet Union. It is true that these talks are bilateral. Nevertheless, in the light of the grave effects which they may have upon international relations, it is only natural that concern over these talks should be aired at this Committee.

I appreciate very highly the significance of the Agreement reached on 24 November last year between the two leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union concerning the limitation of the aggregates of both strategic offensive means of delivery and missiles equipped with MIRVs. In saying this, I am quite aware of the criticism that the ceilings, especially the ceiling on the number of missiles equipped with MIRVs, are too high. However, even the limitation with the ceilings which may be criticized as being too high is far preferable to a state where there is no limitation at all. For that reason I welcome the agreement of last November between the United States and the Soviet Union, in the hope that a formal agreement will be concluded at an early date, and would like to put on record the statement made by the President of the United States at the news conference on 2 December last year: "We have created the solid basis from which future arms reductions can be negotiated".

(Mr. Nisibori, Japan)

At the same time, I believe it incumbent upon both the United States and the Soviet Union to recall the undertaking made under the Non-Proliferation Treaty to pursue negotiations in good faith on measures relating to nuclear disarmament, and to negotiate in a positive manner various other measures of arms control and disarmament in order to shift the easing of tension on to a more solid basis. In my opinion, such measures should include a limitation upon flight tests of missiles. Accordingly I would strongly urge the United States and the Soviet Union to agree upon a wide-ranging programme of disarmament negotiations concerning the measures I have mentioned on such occasions as future summit talks.

Next is the question of a nuclear test ban. While this question is closely interrelated with the limitation of nuclear weapons, it must be recognized clearly that the absence of a comprehensive test ban twelve years after the conclusion of the Partial Test Ban Treaty in 1963 is the main cause of the lack of faith of public opinion in disarmament negotiations.

It is fresh in our memory that agreement was reached last July between the United States and the Soviet Union on a partial ban of underground nuclear weapon tests. I reiterate on this occasion the point I raised last summer at this Committee, that both the United States and the Soviet Union should strive without delay to achieve a comprehensive test ban on the basis of this Agreement. The joint declaration of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom made public on 17 February states that both Governments "will work for agreements limiting the number of underground nuclear weapon tests to a minimum". This gives us a glimmer of hope as a step forward towards our ultimate goal. Once the United States and the Soviet Union are agreed upon a treaty banning all nuclear weapon testings, it will certainly improve the international situation, even if some countries might refuse to accede to such a treaty. Also for this reason, I renew my call upon both the United States and the Soviet Union to make a decision on the matter.

At the same time, I appeal to any country attempting to conduct atmospheric nuclear weapon tests to desist from such tests, and the nuclear weapon States which are not yet Parties to the Partial Test Ban Treaty to accede as soon as possible to the Treaty.

The question of nuclear proliferation is no less important. Last year we became acutely conscious of the danger of nuclear proliferation as a result of many nuclear testings, including that of India. The peaceful use of nuclear energy is rapidly

(Mr. Nisibori, Japan)

adding to its importance, due to the energy crisis and the problem of resources. Understandably, this peaceful use of nuclear energy entails a potential danger of nuclear proliferation throughout the world.

Under the circumstances, the first step to avert a crisis is to recognize its existence. In this context, I would emphasize the significance of the fact that the United Nations General Assembly adopted last year by an overwhelming majority -- namely by 111 votes in favour, 3 against and 12 abstentions -- a resolution on the prevention of nuclear proliferation. The 111 votes in favour thus represented the will of almost the whole world on this question. The adoption by such an overwhelming majority of the resolution on the prevention of nuclear proliferation manifested clearly the need recognized by the whole world to make joint efforts to eliminate the danger of nuclear proliferation.

In this critical situation, I myself have been encouraged greatly by this fact. This resolution was intended, among other things, to focus upon the possible danger of peaceful nuclear explosions leading to nuclear proliferation. In the Introduction to the Report on the work of the Organization dated 30 August last year, the Secretary-General of the United Nations pointed out the danger of peaceful nuclear explosions leading to nuclear weapons proliferation, and suggested that the question of peaceful nuclear explosions in all its aspects should now be the subject for international consideration. Following these remarks, operative paragraph 3 of the resolution calls upon this Committee to include in its report to the United Nations General Assembly a section on its consideration of the arms control implications of peaceful nuclear explosions as a part of such international consideration.

On the basis of this resolution, I suggest now that this Committee should examine at the earliest opportunity the modalities of such consideration. That is to say, that this Committee should now start preliminary works autonomously; although it is necessary, of course, in further examination, to take into consideration the results of the study by the International Atomic Energy Agency and of the Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty in May. I earnestly hope that, through this consideration, some satisfactory international regime can be found which will enable non-nuclear-weapon States to share the benefits deriving from peaceful nuclear explosions while eliminating the danger of nuclear proliferation. The establishment of such an international regime would be an important step forward, now as well as for the twenty-first century, in promoting the peaceful use of nuclear energy while removing the danger of nuclear proliferation.

(Mr. Nisibori, Japan)

I would recall also that last year the United Nations General Assembly adopted unanimously resolution 3261G (XXIX) concerning "Strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use of nuclear weapons". Operative paragraph 2 of this resolution "Recommends to Member States to consider in all appropriate forums, without loss of time, the question of strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States". The fact that this question has been raised in the form of such a resolution is good evidence of the grave concern of many non-nuclear-weapon States.

This question having an important bearing upon that of preventing nuclear proliferation, I consider that the Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty is the suitable forum for its discussion. The provisional agenda of the Conference are known to include the consideration of resolution 255 (1968) of the United Nations Security Council. If further effective measures are taken through such deliberations and as a result remove the anxiety of these non-nuclear-weapon States, I believe that the Non-Proliferation regime will be strengthened further.

My country views with great apprehension the trend toward nuclear proliferation, and accordingly intends to co-operate positively with any international efforts for the prevention of nuclear proliferation. My Government has conducted with the IAEA on several separate occasions preliminary negotiations for concluding an agreement on safeguards preparatory to the ratification of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. As a result of the last preliminary negotiations undertaken in February, we were able to agree upon the contents of the agreement and initialled it. I am delighted at the news that the Agreement was approved by the Board of Governors of the IAEA on 5 March. After making other necessary arrangements, therefore, the Japanese Government intends to take the domestic measures required for the ratification of the Non-Proliferation Treaty as early as possible.

Last but not least is the question of banning chemical weapons. As to this question, I wish first to express my sincere pleasure at the fact that the United States has recently completed the steps required for its ratification of the Geneva Protocol of 1925. Thanks to this action of the United States, it may be deemed that the universality of the Geneva Protocol has been fully ensured, and it can safely be said that the objective conditions have been met for proceeding towards banning the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Nisibori, Japan)

My delegation submitted to this Committee on 30 April last year a draft convention for banning the development, production, and stockpiling of chemical weapons (CCD/420), with a view to making it a basis of the negotiations on the question. Also, during the summer session of this Committee, informal meetings with the participation of experts were held concerning the question. I earnestly hope that in the course of this year more concrete negotiations may take place on the basis of the achievements of the past year.

In this context, I regret that we have still to hear about the joint initiative referred to in the joint communiqué of the United States and the Soviet Union disclosed on 3 July last year. The delay in the arrival of the initiative promised by the communiqué certainly has the effect of back-peddalling the discussion on this question, which had just started moving forward. Therefore I desire earnestly that both the United States and the Soviet Union will present to this Committee their initiative on the basis of our draft convention as well as the views and suggestions made by other countries thereupon. I believe that I deserve to hear soon about the prospect of the initiative from representatives both of the United States and of the Soviet Union.

In this connexion, I wholeheartedly welcome the fact that the United States, the Soviet Union and also the United Kingdom, as we were reminded a few minutes ago by Mr. Allen -- that is to say, all the three Depositary Governments -- have recently completed the measures required at home for the ratification of the Convention of 1972 on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction, and accordingly that the entry into force of this Convention is only a matter of days. I am glad to inform you that my Government is also preparing to ratify the Convention; I earnestly hope that it will come into force at an early date.

At the beginning of the spring session of this Committee, I have emphasized the urgent need to take concrete steps for disarmament in the difficult circumstances surrounding us. I am convinced that these views are not only those of the Government and people of Japan, but also reflect the desires of the peoples of the world. May I end my general statement by emphasizing that this year must be the year of action?

Mr. MISHRA (India): I have listened very carefully to the statement of my friend Mr. Nisibori of Japan. He mentioned the danger of nuclear proliferation and in that context referred to India's nuclear test. Whatever the subjective considerations which persuaded the delegation of Japan to believe that India's peaceful nuclear explosion of May last year has added to the danger of proliferation of nuclear weapons, there is not the slightest objective evidence to indicate that this is the case. Nearly one year has passed since the peaceful nuclear explosion was conducted by India. What is the evidence that there has been proliferation of nuclear weapons as a result of that explosion? We firmly and sincerely believe that to treat India's peaceful nuclear explosion on the same level as the weapons tests conducted by other States is merely to divert attention from the all-important task of preventing the nuclear arms race.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico): The representative of Argentina, in his capacity as Chairman of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, made the following statement at the end of the last meeting:

"The representative of Burma, who is chairman for the week of the Group of Fifteen Countries, has requested me to inform the Committee that the delegations which attended yesterday's meeting of this Group wish the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to hold an informal meeting next week to examine certain questions concerning the organization and work of the ad hoc Group of Governmental Experts referred to in resolution 3261 F (XXIX) of the General Assembly."

My delegation wishes to know whether the Chairman can tell us now whether it will be possible to meet this request by the Group of Fifteen Countries.

The CHAIRMAN: I have been asked to read the following statement on behalf of the Co-Chairmen:

"After consulting other Members of the Committee, the Co-Chairmen propose that the informal meeting requested by members of the Group of Fifteen Countries be convened on Friday, 14 March, at 10.30 a.m. to examine certain questions concerning the organization and work of the ad hoc Group of Governmental Experts referred to in General Assembly Resolution 3261 F (XXIX)."

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.