

CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

CCD/PV.664
8 April 1975
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOURTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 8 April 1975 at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Gerhard Herder (German Democratic Republic)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Argentina:

Mr. V.E. BERASATEGUI

Brazil:

Mr. G.A. MACIEL

Mr. M. TORRES DA SILVA

Mr. L.H. PEREIRA DA FONSECA

Bulgaria:

Mr. R. NIKOLOV

Mr. B. GRINBERG

Mr. I. PETROV

Burma:

U THAUNG IWIN

Canada:

Mr. W.H. BARTON

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. V. SOJAK

Mr. M. STEMBERA

Egypt:

Mr. A. EL-ERIAN

Mr. A.E. KHAIRAT

Mr. N. ELARABY

Mr. S.A. ABOU-ALI

Ethiopia:

Mr. G. DEMISSIE

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. G. HERDER

Mr. H-J. MICHEEL

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. G.J. SCHLAICH

Mr. K. HANNESSCHLÄGER

Hungary:

Mr. M. DOMOKOS

Mr. D. MEISZTER

Mr. I. KÖRMENDY

India:

Mr. B.C. MISHRA

Mr. M.K. MANGALMURTI

Mr. H.N. SUKHDEV

Mr. P.R. SOOD

Iran:

Mr. H. AMERI
Miss C. TAHMASSEB
Mr. D. CHILATY

Italy:

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

Japan:

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

Mexico:

Mr. M. MARIN

Mongolia:

Mr. M. DUGERSUREN
Mr. P. KHALIOUNE

Morocco:

Mr. A. SKALLI
Mr. S.M. RAHHALI

Netherlands:

Mr. C.A. van der KLAAUW

Nigeria:

Mr. B.A. CLARK
Mr. OLAJIDE ALO
Mr. M.G.S. SAMAKI

Pakistan:

Mr. M. YUNUS
Mr. K. SALEEM

Peru:

Mr. L. CHAVEZ-GODOY

Poland:

Mr. E. WYZNER
Mr. S. TOPA
Mr. A. CZERKAWSKI

Romania:

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

Sweden:

Mr. G. HAMILTON
 Mr. U. REINIUS
 Mr. J. LUNDIN
 Mr. J. PRAWITZ

Union of Soviet Socialist
 Republics:

Mr. A.A. ROSCHIN
 Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN
 Mr. N.V. PESTEREV
 Mr. I.P. GLAZKOV
 Mr. Y.P. KLUKIN

United Kingdom:

Mr. M.E. ALLEN
 Mr. A. WHITE

United States of America:

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

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC
 Mr. S. KRIVOKAPIC

Zaire:

Mr. Y. YOKO

Acting Representative of the
 Secretary-General:

Mr. R. BJÖRNERSTEDT

Communiqué of the meeting

The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament today held its 664th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the Chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador Gerhard Herder, representative of the German Democratic Republic.

Statements were made by the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany, Egypt, India, Sweden, Zaïre, Japan and by the Chairman.

The delegation of Japan presented a document entitled "Modification of the wording used in a draft convention (CCD/420) on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction" (CCD/452).

The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 10 April 1975, at 10.30 a.m.

*

* *

Mr. SCHLAICH (Federal Republic of Germany): First I should like once again to express on behalf of my delegation our appreciation of the friendly reception we have been given on various occasions both here and elsewhere on the accession of the Federal Republic of Germany to this Committee.

Disarmament and arms control are on the one hand matters of great military and technological complexity, involving problems which cannot be resolved without the advice and assistance of highly-qualified experts. But on the other hand disarmament and arms control are first and foremost the outcome of political decisions with no less an objective than the safeguarding of peace. Such decisions are difficult and are only possible in an international atmosphere in which the will to reduce tensions and foster co-operation prevails. Although it would be wrong to succumb to illusions about still-existing conflicts of interest, we share the view that such a will to reduce tensions now exists, on the basis of which positive decisions on disarmament and arms control will be possible.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany feels that from its special position in the heart of Europe it has played its part in helping to create this atmosphere of détente. It is in this spirit of continuing the policy of détente, of consolidating and extending it, that my Government will now try to play an active part in the only disarmament negotiations that have a world-wide foundation. This delegation has already expressed its thanks for the confidence placed in the Federal Republic of Germany as manifest in its admission to the CCD. In this as in previous sessions, the role of the CCD in the sphere of disarmament and arms control, and the responsibility that attaches to it, have been stressed many times. And how far my own Government shares these views could surely not have been demonstrated better than by our joining the CCD.

The well-considered political and geographical balance of this Committee is, we feel, an essential basis from which to seek realistic ways and means of resolving the problems confronting us. Nothing would be more harmful to the cause of disarmament and arms control than to lose sight of reality. We therefore consider it logical that the special responsibility of the super-Powers, which is nowhere more apparent, than in disarmament and arms control, should express itself appropriately in the Committee's deliberations and negotiations. When I speak of this special responsibility I do not however exclude ourselves, like other delegations, from putting forward proposals regarding the Committee's methods of work or, in keeping with the purpose of the composition of this Committee in its present form, from considering how we can improve our work and make it more efficient.

(Mr. Schlaich, Federal Republic of Germany)

The Federal Republic of Germany has been a member of the United Nations since 1973, having up to then been a member of all the specialized agencies; and since that time it has played an active part in the disarmament debate of the General Assembly. My Government has used the opportunity to explain its attitude on questions of disarmament and arms control in general and on some of the particularly urgent problems in this sphere. In view of those statements it was only logical for the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to vote in favour of nearly all the resolutions of the 29th General Assembly which will have a particular bearing on this year's work of the CCD.

The only exception was the resolution for a comprehensive test ban treaty. However, in the explanation of our vote on that resolution, No.3257 (XXIX), we made it quite clear that we gave our unqualified support to its aims but could not go along with its wording, which we felt was somewhat unbalanced. The Federal Republic of Germany is in favour of a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapon tests because this necessary supplement to the Partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963 would be a decisive step towards limiting the nuclear arms race and thereby securing the policy of non-proliferation. I wish to stress once more that we will do all we can to help to resolve the outstanding problems.

Securing the non-proliferation policy and reinforcing its main pillar, the Non-Proliferation Treaty, has rightly been referred to also in this session of our Committee as the decisive task of our time in disarmament and arms control. The concern expressed here is also shared by my Government. No country on earth will be able to shirk the responsibility of refraining from any action that would be conducive to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. To bring this into harmony with the legitimate wish of all nations to have a fair share in the progress and results of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy is the declared objective of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

That Treaty drew a clear line between nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear weapon States. This means that the depositary States must take the necessary further steps to meet their obligations under the Treaty just as conscientiously as we ourselves are prepared to meet our commitments as a non-nuclear-weapon State. We feel it is necessary, particularly with a view to giving the Treaty world-wide validity and effect, to avoid any impression that the Treaty could also be used for purposes other than nuclear disarmament and arms control. The Federal Republic of Germany, which undertook as early as 1954 not to manufacture nuclear weapons,

(Mr. Schlaich, Federal Republic of Germany)

is therefore strongly in favour of strengthening the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It feels, moreover, that the Review Conference due to be held in May can have a decisive effect on the fate of the Treaty and hence of the system of non-proliferation it supports.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany shares the opinion that the Review Conference has ultimately nothing to gain by spending time on modifying the wording of the present Treaty, which we all know is not perfect. It is more important that the Review Conference should produce favourable results which will make the Treaty in the truest sense of the word more attractive to those countries who have not yet signed it and in this way make for a durable non-proliferation policy. The Conference must make it clear that in the long run it is more advantageous to any country, irrespective of its level of technological development, to accede to the Treaty and help to strengthen it by the very fact of its membership. The Federal Republic of Germany is willing to contribute, in a manner befitting its status as a non-nuclear-weapon State with considerable abilities and capacities in nuclear technology, to the success of the Review Conference, in which it will participate in a capacity depending on the progress made by its EURATOM partners in the ratification process.

As representative of a co-sponsor of resolution 3261 D (XXIX) and of one of the countries which proposed that the International Atomic Energy Agency should appoint a special committee to study the problem of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, there is no need for me to emphasize how much importance we attach to this question. We, too, are of the opinion that the feasibility of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes and the benefits they can bring, judged by the present level of technological development, cannot yet by any means be considered established. In addition -- and this in our view is definitely connected with the first point -- there still appears to be a lack of objective criteria for distinguishing between nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes and those for the development of weapons.

It is therefore only logical and consistent that, in addition to the IAEA, the CCD should consider the problem of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under the specific aspect of their implications for arms development. The threat to the policy of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is obvious, and clarification is called for, especially by those countries who have special experience in this field and who are also engaged in an intensive exchange of views. Arrangements acceptable on a world-wide basis could prove indispensable. Article V of the Non-Proliferation Treaty

(Mr. Schlaich, Federal Republic of Germany)

is an obvious starting-point for further deliberations. Moreover, my delegation shares the view expressed by other delegations that the CCD was well advised to leave this topic until the summer session, by which time it will have available not only the results of the Review Conference, which will play a major role in this respect and, we hope, offer guidance for our future work, but also the IAEA study.

On behalf of my Government I have informed the Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General to the CCD of our intention to follow as closely as possible the work of the Ad hoc Group of government experts set up to study the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Without wishing to anticipate our detailed statements on these points to the Ad hoc Group, I wish to say that the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany welcomes the proposed comprehensive study, particularly because the prerequisites for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones will differ from region to region, on account of certain geographical and political factors, to such an extent that it would appear necessary to mention this point.

Let me merely say in advance that, in the view of my Government, being part of a nuclear-weapon-free zone can on no account be a substitute for accession to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, nor can it serve as an excuse for not applying the Treaty's rules. At any rate my delegation wishes the Ad hoc Group every success in what will certainly not be an easy task.

No less important in my Government's view than the problems relating to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons are those questions to which the CCD is also called upon to devote special attention. This applies in particular to the protracted and complex negotiations on a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons. On this question, too, the position of the Federal Republic of Germany is quite clear. The Federal Republic of Germany is party to the Geneva Protocol of 1925, and moreover gave in 1954 an internationally-binding undertaking not to manufacture chemical weapons and subjected itself to appropriate controls within the Western European Union. The Federal Republic of Germany has therefore also voted for the resolutions relating to a ban on chemical weapons which the General Assembly has adopted since we joined the World Organization. My Government supports a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons.

However, we do not overlook the fact that in this connexion there are still some rather complex matters to be clarified with regard both to the definition of chemical agents to be covered by the ban and to the question of satisfactory verification. We appreciate the preliminary work already done by this Committee as well as the

(Mr. Schlaich, Federal Republic of Germany)

constructive contribution made by many of the countries represented here towards the solution of these problems, to mention only the Japanese draft treaty of 30 April 1974. If it proves that the difficulties that have up to now stood in the way of a comprehensive ban cannot be removed for the time being, we too feel that the Committee should examine whether at least meaningful partial solutions on a step-by-step basis would not be possible while we continue to aim for a comprehensive ban. The recently-announced joint American-Soviet initiative could have a deblocking effect in this connexion.

If during the negotiations certain fundamental principles are observed, such as ensuring that research and production for peaceful purposes are not impaired, that adequate controls are guaranteed, and that the ban to be agreed shall be applicable to all countries in the same way and without any discrimination, then progress should be possible.

The resolution on "Prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health" confronts the CCD with a completely new task. Generally speaking, my Government feels it to be right that efforts to achieve disarmament and arms control should not relate solely to existing military instruments but should also include efforts to detect possible developments and guide them into channels where they cannot be used for military purposes. This applies in particular to developments which can help to meet the urgent needs and thereby contribute to the progress of mankind, as well as to developments the use of which could have devastating consequences. This presupposes a particularly careful approach based largely on established scientific knowledge if we want to be sure that possible favourable developments are not also nipped in the bud.

That is why we welcome the announcement by Mr. Roshchin that his Government is willing to give the CCD further information about the substance of the initiative and the sphere of application of the proposed international convention. In our view the questions posed in exemplary fashion by Mr. Allen will be particularly helpful, since to a certain degree the nature and intensity of the co-operation of the Governments represented here will depend on the answers given to them, for experts will have to be found and interventions carefully prepared. The same applies to the reflections made by other speakers, particularly by Mr. van der Klaauw. We also hope that results of expert talks of interested parties will lead to further initiatives in this field.

If the CCD achieves tangible results in these fields it will have taken several important steps towards comprehensive and balanced disarmament, which should always remain the ultimate goal of our endeavours.

Mr. EL-ERIAN (Egypt): It is my pleasant duty on behalf of the delegation of Egypt to greet and extend a cordial welcome to the representatives of the new members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament: the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Iran, Peru and Zaïre. The participation of these five new members in the Committee underlines the unfailing interest of many States in the problem of disarmament and their desire to contribute actively to its solution.

My delegation wishes also to welcome the representatives of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Morocco, the Netherlands, Pakistan and the United Kingdom, who are newly assuming the important task of leading their delegations. We are confident that we shall continue to entertain with them the relations of friendship and co-operation which we have had with their predecessors.

I am also gratified to see the Secretary-General represented here by Mr. Björnerstedt, and wish to avail myself of this opportunity to express to him and his assistants our deep appreciation of the assistance and co-operation which they always extend to all of us.

Since the adjournment of the meetings of the CCD last August, a number of international developments have taken place which have their impact or bearing on our work. The continuing trend towards détente has given hope to the possibility of easing international tension and the intensification of efforts for the promotion of international peace and co-operation and the solution of the ever-increasing economic, social and technical problems. The road to détente and international co-operation may be long. On it difficulties are often met and road blocks are sometimes encountered; but the important thing is the determination to pursue it and the firm conviction to replace confrontation by co-operation.

Though the international situation in general has been marked by the easing of tension, it is regrettable that in certain parts of the world tension still prevails and the danger of war and destruction continues to haunt many peoples. Egypt's efforts to ease tension in the Middle East and to defuse the explosive situation have unfortunately been met by obstruction resulting from the intransigent Israeli policy. Our endeavour during the last few months, in the process of marking further steps conducive to the creation of the climate appropriate for realizing a peaceful settlement and enabling the Geneva Peace Conference to reach that goal, have met with Israeli obstruction.

(Mr. El-Erian, Egypt)

However, Egypt continues to pursue its search for the restoration of peace in our part of the world, which will enable us to concentrate our energy on the challenging task of economic and social development. We are sustained by the positive reaction which has been universally accorded to the statement made by the President of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the People's Assembly on 29 March. I should like to refer in particular to President Sadat's declaration regarding the reopening of the Suez Canal on 5 June and the renewal of the United Nations Emergency Force's mandate for a period of three months. I should like to quote from the statement of our President:

"We shall reopen the Suez Canal for the benefit of our people and for the benefit of the world. - The peoples of the world who attach importance to the Canal as a sea lane for their trade have all given us their support, and we, as they, like to see it as an avenue to prosperity".

President Sadat also stated:

"I shall allow the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Emergency Forces for three months instead of the six month period first because I do not wish to confront the international community with a pressing crisis, and on the other hand because I should like the world to know that the time before us, as well as our patience, is not without limits".

In line with its consistent policy to seek a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, Egypt has requested the Soviet Union and the United States of America, in their capacity as co-chairmen of the United Nations Peace Conference on the Middle East, to reconvene it and to make the necessary consultations and arrangements.

Since the adjournment of the meetings of the CCD last August, the General Assembly has adopted a number of resolutions on disarmament, arms control and other related matters which are, as a number of speakers have pointed out in this debate, of great qualitative and quantitative importance. As the representative of Pakistan stated at the 658th meeting of the CCD:

(Mr. El-Erian, Egypt)

"The interest shown by the 29th session of the General Assembly in disarmament matters is a pointer to the concern of the peoples of the United Nations at the present world situation on the one hand, and to their hopes and aspirations for a better and more secure future on the other". (CCD/PV.658, p.12)

Some of the resolutions on disarmament passed by the General Assembly at its last session entrust specific responsibilities to the CCD. The position of my delegation on most of those questions has been repeatedly stated in previous sessions of the Committee. In my statements at our 637th and 653rd meetings I had the opportunity to reaffirm our approach to them.

On the subject of chemical weapons I stated that the Japanese draft convention (CCD/42C), together with the draft convention presented by the socialist delegations (CCD/361) and the working paper submitted by the ten non-aligned States delegations (CCD/400), constitutes an adequate basis for meaningful negotiations towards the attainment of an agreed text on this urgent and important question.

On the question of a comprehensive test ban, I have underlined the fact that the General Assembly reiterated in its resolution 3078 A its conviction that "Whatever may be the differences on the question of verification, there is no valid reason for delaying the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban".

Today I intend to confine my comments to the subject of nuclear-free zones and the subject of prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health.

My Government has constantly given its active support to the principle of nuclear-free zones. It has contributed its share to the adoption by the Organization of African Unity of the 1964 Declaration regarding a nuclear-free zone for Africa which was endorsed in General Assembly resolution 2033 (XX). In the United Nations the delegation of Egypt to the First Committee of the General Assembly supported the initiative and efforts of our sister countries of Latin America for a nuclear-free status for their region which led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

(Mr. El-Erian, Egypt)

At the last session of the General Assembly the delegation of Egypt joined the delegation of Iran in sponsoring the item entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East". The delegation of Egypt to the First Committee pointed out certain basic principles which it considered pertinent to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in that region: first, an engagement by the States of the region to refrain from producing, stockpiling, acquiring or possessing nuclear weapons. Second, an engagement by the nuclear Powers to refrain from introducing nuclear weapons into the area or using nuclear weapons against any State of the region. Third, the establishment of a system of effective international control to ensure the implementation of these obligations. This would affect the nuclear States as well as the countries of the region.

I do not intend to elaborate at this stage on the principles and criteria to govern the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We appreciate the fact that Egypt has been chosen as a member of the group of experts which is studying this question. The delegation of Egypt to the group of experts will elaborate on Egypt's approach to the envisaged comprehensive study.

The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone means the total absence of nuclear weapons, but it does not mean a prohibition from enjoying the benefits of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, especially for developing countries in their rightful request for economic development. In this connexion the delegation of Egypt would like to reaffirm the provisions of both article 4 and article 7 of the Non-proliferation Treaty concerned respectively with the inalienable rights of all parties to the Treaty to develop the research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, and the right of any group of States to conclude regional treaties in order to ensure the total absence of nuclear weapons from their respective territories.

The Review Conference of the non-proliferation Treaty which is scheduled for May would offer an ample opportunity for strengthening the Treaty. Egypt is firmly in favour of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The delegation of Egypt took an active part in the elaboration and drafting of the Non-proliferation Treaty.

(Mr. El-Erian, Egypt)

Consistently with this policy, Egypt was among the first countries to sign the Non-proliferation Treaty. But the refusal of Israel to sign this treaty left Egypt with no choice but to stop short of ratifying it. In his statement in the general debate of the General Assembly at its last session, Mr. Ismail Fahmy, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, stated Egypt's readiness to ratify the Non-proliferation Treaty the moment Israel adheres to that Treaty and becomes a party thereto.

The subject of preventing meteorological and environmental warfare has recently received the attention of the international community. The delegation of Egypt has given its enthusiastic support to the initiative taken by the delegation of the Soviet Union in this field at the last session of the General Assembly. We believe it is necessary to tackle this question with speed and vigour and that no effort should be spared to work out an acceptable formula. We are aware of the technical complexities and intricacies involved, yet this very fact should serve as an incentive to spur the process of negotiation in order to reach agreed principles and to adopt the most effective measures.

The element of time in this worthy endeavour is crucial. Scientific and technological progress and achievements are transforming what was considered only a few years ago as science fiction into reality. Action by the international community to prohibit any modification or alteration techniques for military purposes is both timely and necessary. Partial steps in this direction have been taken into consideration in the Outer Space Treaty and in the Treaty on prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor. Yet it is essential to provide for a global and comprehensive prohibition by pursuing further our endeavours to fill all the existing gaps.

My delegation heard with appreciation the statement of Mr. Roshchin on 4 March in which he informed the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament of the intention of the Soviet delegation to elaborate further on this important subject by providing all the relevant explanations.

(Mr. El-Erian, Egypt)

In concluding this statement, which I have the honour to make on the eve of my departure to assume my new post as Ambassador to the Swiss Confédération, I wish to close it on a note of hope and optimism. A hope has been generally expressed in this debate that the Year 1975 would mark concrete progress in the work of the CCD, which has been admittedly slow in the last few years.

It has been pointed out by a number of speakers in this debate that, while we meet here, the Soviet and United States negotiators are working out here in Geneva the specific provisions of a second-stage SALT Agreement. In Vienna, members of NATO and the Warsaw Pact are continuing their efforts to reach agreement on mutual and balanced force reductions in Central Europe. The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe is intensifying its efforts to complete its task of preparing draft texts and recommendations and pave the way to a summit conference. During the last year a number of international problems assumed much wider dimensions than before. But the last year has equally known tremendous efforts and the convening of important conferences in an effort to lay the foundations for a new international economic order.

What is the place and role of the CCD in all those efforts for solving mankind's problems of security and co-operation? My delegation continues to give its unfailing support to the CCD. We fully agree with Mr. Martin, the representative of the USA, that constructive dialogue has become its hallmark and that its dedication and seriousness of purpose have made it a most effective multilateral forum for dealing with arms-control and disarmament questions.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Ambassador, for your statement. It is really with profound regret that I listen to your announcement that you have been transferred to another post. I should like to use this opportunity to express, and I think I can do it on behalf of all the members of this Committee, our thanks for your work and your contribution to the success of the CCD. Allow me to wish you on behalf of all of us best success in your new work, and as long as you remain in Geneva I hope you will continue your friendly relations with all of us, the members represented here in the CCD. Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

Mr. MISHRA (India): My delegation would like to join the previous speakers in extending a warm welcome to the delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, Iran, Peru and Zaïre. We are very happy to have them among us, and we feel confident that their presence will give a new impetus to the disarmament negotiations.

I should also like to welcome our new colleagues in the Committee and wish them all success. We are also happy to have Mr. Björnerstedt with us in his new capacity as Acting Representative of the Secretary-General.

The Committee is meeting after a lapse of more than six months. In this period many important developments have taken place. The United Nations has carried out its annual review of disarmament topics and passed several important resolutions. It has also renewed its faith in the CCD as the principal multilateral negotiating forum for disarmament.

In this context it is imperative to recall that the main task of the Committee is to negotiate an agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control. It is therefore a matter of deep concern that no serious discussions on the subject have taken place for several years. The Committee must once again revert to GCD and focus its attention on measures of actual disarmament. It goes without saying that the highest priority should be accorded to nuclear disarmament and the elimination of weapons of mass destruction.

The Government of India has been consistently opposed to nuclear weapons, which are weapons of mass destruction. Ever since the world witnessed the devastating effects of nuclear weapons on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it has been clear that such weapons cannot be used in war to achieve any political or military objective even by those nations which already possess them. The existence of nuclear weapons, on the other hand, enhances tensions and insecurity among nations and makes the task of establishing durable world peace more difficult. India has therefore, along with a majority of nations in the world, called for the achievement of nuclear disarmament as an objective of the highest priority. India has been among the first countries to work relentlessly in various international forums for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. It is for this reason that India is opposed to all moves and suggestions which might shift the focus of the international community from the over-riding objective of nuclear disarmament. India has also objected to the Non-Proliferation Treaty because, among other reasons, it is not a treaty which will lead to arms limitation and disarmament.

(Mr. Mishra, India)

For nuclear disarmament the first requirement is stoppage of the production of nuclear weapons and a cut-off of the production of fissile material for weapons purposes. It will then be easy to devise a universal non-discriminatory system of safeguards. A step on which the CCD should concentrate immediately in order to control the nuclear arms race is a comprehensive agreement to ban all nuclear-weapon tests, an agreement which will find universal acceptance. The Indian delegation has always been of the opinion that there is no justification whatsoever for continuing with nuclear-weapon testing. Strategic superiority in nuclear weapons has ceased to be a relevant factor because of the over-kill capacity of the two super-Powers. It is immaterial whether the enemy can be killed twice or five times. The General Assembly, in its resolution 3257(XXIX), condemned all nuclear-weapon tests in whatever environment they may be conducted, and asked the CCD to give the highest priority to the question of a comprehensive test ban agreement. Unfortunately, in the spring session of the CCD, which is about to conclude its work, we have not gone even one step forward in this direction.

And now a new trend is surfacing in our debates on nuclear disarmament. I referred to it briefly in my statement of 13 March when I said that it has now become fashionable to talk about the danger of horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons and to hint that it is the direct result of the peaceful nuclear explosion experiment carried out by India last year. We are the first to be concerned about the problem of nuclear proliferation. However, our analysis of the causes which may prompt it to happen differs very greatly from what many delegations here would like us to believe. In actual fact we are not aware that the Indian experiment has caused other countries to undertake the development of nuclear weapons. We wish to threaten no one with nuclear weapons, and it is clear that, if any country were to decide to take this step, it would do so for its own reasons.

In connexion with peaceful nuclear explosion technology, we have heard the argument that intentions do not matter but that what matters is the technology of conducting nuclear explosions. The argument goes further, that a country should therefore be restricted from developing explosion technology. While one can understand the appeal that a country should not go in for nuclear weapons, it is difficult to accept the principle that a technology should be restricted to some because it may be used for weapons purposes by others. This is a strange argument. We are being asked to fight

(Mr. Mishra, India)

the wrong enemy. We cannot stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons by controlling the development of peaceful explosion technology.

In this context it is relevant to refer to the proposal of the representative of Japan that we should devote a week during our summer session to the concentrated study of the arms-control implications of PNEs. In this connexion he cited the authority of General Assembly resolution 3261 D (XXIX). But operative paragraph 3 of that resolution clearly establishes a relationship between the arms-control implications of PNEs and a comprehensive test ban agreement. Further, General Assembly resolution 3257 requires us to give the highest priority to the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban agreement. Are we going to ignore the main subject and concentrate on a peripheral aspect?

We had an inkling of this danger last year when the First Committee of the General Assembly was considering the draft resolution which later acquired the number 3261 D (XXIX). At the 2018th meeting of the First Committee I had the occasion to say:

"The International community has time and again stressed in its deliberations and resolutions that priority should be given to nuclear disarmament. The draft resolution which was introduced this afternoon by the representative of the Netherlands, for all its good intentions, will have the effect of transferring the attention of the international community to other, less important, matters such as the regulation of peaceful activities connected with nuclear technology."

Later in the same statement this paragraph is relevant:

"Perhaps the General Assembly next year will consider this question again, and perhaps a resolution on the subject of peaceful nuclear explosions will be adopted. Will that prevent the testing of nuclear weapons? Will that make a contribution to stopping the nuclear arms race, much less to nuclear disarmament? The non-proliferation Treaty did not prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons, precisely because it was not designed to prevent the nuclear arms race. Any regulation of peaceful nuclear explosions at this stage which is not placed in the context of universal adherence to a comprehensive test ban treaty or agreement, any such regulation, will make no contribution in that direction. All it will do is detract in a significant manner and in a significant measure from the single-minded efforts needed to unify opinion against the nuclear arms race and for nuclear disarmament. This is what I meant when I said on Monday last that the nuclear arms race seems to be taken for granted, and that the efforts of some delegations are only in the direction of regulating peaceful nuclear explosions."

(Mr. Mishra, India)

To sum up, we feel that only nuclear-weapon tests are relevant to the question of nuclear-arms development and proliferation. As far as the question of regulating PNEs is concerned, it can only be taken up after achieving a comprehensive test ban.

The question of nuclear-weapon-free zones is a subject which has once again attracted great attention. Various approaches regarding the formation of nuclear-weapon-free zones are currently being mentioned. In certain cases we find that a continental approach has been adopted, while other proposals speak of much smaller regions. Some suggestions go to the extent of saying that even one country can form itself into a nuclear-weapon-free zone. There is divergence of views regarding the peaceful activities which could be permitted for countries belonging to such zones. Again, there are different views on the question of transit of nuclear weapons through the area covered by a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

We have listened carefully to the views and suggestions on these and other points concerning nuclear-weapon-free zones. While we do not doubt the good intentions with which these have been made, we feel that a much more careful examination of this subject is necessary to see which of the suggestions and proposals stand up to careful scrutiny. We are therefore happy to note that the CCD has succeeded in setting up a group of qualified governmental experts to study the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones pursuant to resolution 3261 F (XXIX). We are happy to participate in this group. We feel that such a study would contribute to a better understanding of the problem.

India has always supported the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones wherever appropriate. It is our considered view that certain essential considerations should be met to ensure their viability and success. These require that an appropriate region should be selected taking into account the security environment of the region as a whole, and that there should be prior consultations and agreement on the main features of the proposed zone among the countries which intend to join it. Further, there should be full freedom in respect of the utilization of nuclear energy, including nuclear explosions, for peaceful purposes. It should also be remembered that membership of a military alliance or pact in the context of great-Power rivalry could seriously prejudice the possibility of the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in a particular region.

On the question of chemical weapons, although progress has been slow there have been some hopeful developments. We welcome the adherence to the Geneva Protocol of 1925 by the United States. This makes all major States parties to the Protocol of 1925.

(Mr. Mishra, India)

The CCD can give serious consideration now to a CW convention which would not be discriminatory. We are still of the opinion that a comprehensive ban is desirable. However, we are prepared to listen with an open mind to the various ideas and suggestions in regard to a step-by-step approach. In this context we await the joint initiative promised by the Soviet Union and the United States.

In regard to environmental warfare, we consider that the Soviet initiative is very timely in order to prevent the development of such warfare techniques while they are in their infancy. If such techniques are ever used in warfare, they are likely to cause widespread and indiscriminate suffering. We, however, share the general feeling that more technical information is required to enable us to understand the intricacies of the problem. We would request the countries advanced in this field to provide us with whatever technical information is available to them.

To conclude, I should like to refer to the question of convening a world disarmament conference. Our views on the question are best summarized in a recent communication to the United Nations Secretary-General. It was said:

"A world disarmament conference convened after adequate preparation, at an appropriate time and with the participation of all States, can play a useful role in promoting the cause of securing lasting world peace based on disarmament. The conference can mobilize and focus world public opinion on the highest priority objective of nuclear disarmament and elimination of all weapons of mass destruction. The conference can secure the participation of militarily-significant States like France and China in disarmament negotiations and provide a fresh impetus to disarmament efforts. The conference can work out general guidelines and establish priorities for the negotiating body."

Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden): The Swedish delegation attaches great importance to the question on our agenda regarding prohibition of action to influence environment and climate for military and other hostile purposes. As you may recall, the Swedish delegation raised the matter in our Committee at last year's spring session and also took an active part in the deliberations on these questions in the General Assembly last autumn.

(Mr. Hamilton, Sweden)

The CCD has been requested to proceed as soon as possible to achieve agreement on the text of a convention; and we expect that this item on our agenda will be taken up for profound discussion during our summer session. As Mrs. Thorsson pointed out in her statement on 6 March, the Swedish delegation believes that before we can achieve substantive results in this field it will be necessary to have the advice and help of experts. These would, we hope, be able as a first step to elucidate the concepts involved in these highly complex problems. The basis of an expert meeting would be the Soviet draft convention already before us, and other material which might be put forward. From informal contacts that we have had with other delegations we have reason to believe that our thoughts are widely supported. We are at the same time fully aware that several delegations will have difficulties in providing experts due to the new areas involved.

To be able to prepare in the best way our work for the coming session, I wish to propose formally that the Committee convene a meeting of experts on the prohibition of action to influence environment and climate for military and other hostile purposes, to be held informally during the coming summer session before our deliberations on these questions. The exact date of this expert meeting might perhaps be decided later on.

Mr. YOKO (Zaire) (translated from French): My delegation is happy to be able to speak in this great international forum where major questions of capital importance for the survival of mankind are debated. It deeply appreciates the numerous expressions of sympathy extended to it by the representatives of States members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament whenever they have spoken since the opening of this fourteenth session. On behalf of my country I should like in turn, as a newcomer, to express to them my heartfelt gratitude for contributing towards the enlargement of this Committee and for helping my country to become a member of this important forum for multilateral negotiations on disarmament.

(Mr. Yoko, Zaïre)

I should like to thank in particular the co-Chairmen of this Conference and the representatives of the other countries which have recently been admitted as members of this Committee, namely the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, Peru and Iran. I wish to welcome, in my turn, the new representatives of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Morocco, the Netherlands, Pakistan and the United Kingdom. I also salute the presence here of Mr. Björnerstedt, Acting Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and of all his staff, whose devotion and skill so usefully further the activities of this Conference. Lastly, I should like to thank all the other members of the Committee whose continued presence ensures the value and progress of the Committee's work.

My delegation wishes to recall that the ultimate goal of this Conference is to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The enlargement of the CCD must therefore be regarded as an expression of mankind's awareness of the need to associate an ever-growing number of increasingly dynamic States in multilateral disarmament negotiations for international peace and security. My country, which has benefited from this international trust, affirms its steadfast intention of sharing with the other members of the Committee the duties they undertake within the sphere of their competence.

The immense pride which my country feels at being admitted to the CCD does not make it forget the gravity of the security problems which trouble the world in general and Africa in particular. On this point I should like to say that the efforts so far exerted fall far short of the hopes which the establishment of the Committee has aroused in the world. Some results have been achieved, and already represent some progress. This is seen in particular in the partial agreements concluded on specific questions with a view to refraining from armament or to disarming. Unfortunately these bilateral or multilateral sectoral agreements have not yet started an overall movement towards general and complete disarmament. To be convinced of this fact it is only necessary to recall the hesitation and even opposition aroused by every attempt to give effect to the proposal to convene a world disarmament conference.

(Mr. Yoko, Zaire)

In this connexion, allow me to recall the disappointment which my delegation felt in October 1974 at the Conference of Government Experts convened by the International Committee of the Red Cross on "Weapons that may cause unnecessary suffering or have indiscriminate effects". A good many delegations of developed countries then maintained that most of the problems came within the competence of the CCD and had already been deeply discussed. I believed in the good faith of such declarations. The little experience which I now have of the Committee's achievements enables me to say that the statements made at Lucerne were delaying tactics designed to retard substantive negotiations on major disarmament questions.

The spheres of competence of the CCD are numerous and complex. Since it is difficult for me to touch upon them all at the same time in this brief statement, it seems useful to confine myself to a few sectors only, namely -

- (1) chemical and bacteriological weapons;
- (2) proliferation of nuclear tests and weapons; and
- (3) manipulation of the climate and environment.

I should like on behalf of my delegation to say something on each of these three sectors.

(1) Chemical and bacteriological weapons

The United Nations has adopted numerous resolutions on biological weapons. It has made systematic efforts in this field, and since 1968 has drafted a series of texts which express the concern and disquiet of the peoples of the whole world. Once again the responsibility of the CCD is involved, for it is the only multilateral organ charged with the conclusion of negotiations on disarmament.

But what report can the CCD submit to the General Assembly at its thirtieth session? What concrete, practical and tangible results can it then present on chemical weapons and chemical means of warfare? Unfortunately the reply to this question is also likely to be evasive and dilatory, on a problem whose solution may enable mankind to survive. Hope is not lost. The CCD has already the merit of having negotiated the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction.

(Mr. Yoko, Zaïre)

This shows my delegation the importance of the effort made recently by the USSR, the United States and the United Kingdom to enable this important Convention to enter into force.

My delegation informs the CCD that the Republic of Zaïre is at present examining this Convention with a view to ratifying it. Thereby it hopes to be able to contribute to the cause of international peace and security. It is also my country's wish that all States Members of the United Nations and any other peaceloving nation should accede to this Convention as quickly as possible. The greater the number of adherents, the more effective will this international instrument be as a basis for international co-operation on disarmament.

Another move--and not the least important--is the accession of the United States to the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925. This act has been welcomed by many members of the CCD as an important step in the disarmament process. We hope that by the fiftieth anniversary of its signing many countries will have ratified this Protocol, whose objectives and principles are essential for the effective progress of our work.

May I recall that the General Assembly assigns to the CCD precise tasks to be carried out in the near future? And, in the particular case of chemical weapons, the negotiations are to enjoy high priority with a view to reaching early agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of the development, production and stock-piling of chemical weapons and for their destruction. This is a difficult task, but one commensurate with the object at stake, which is peace.

II. The proliferation of nuclear tests and weapons

A supply of nuclear weapons is the boast of only a few countries: the nuclear Powers like the United States of America, the USSR, the United Kingdom, France, China and India. It has not made for détente, still less for peace, in the world -- a fact made obvious by the anguish that nuclear weapons have caused for the whole of mankind. We are obsessed by an unceasing belief that a new and unexpected world war would be catastrophic for the entire world. The third world war will clearly be more murderous

(Mr. Yoko, Zaïre)

and devastating than the first two. Our object is to achieve complete nuclear disarmament. However, the CCD is following this road very timidly, and we must therefore confine ourselves to limiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons itself enunciates a general principle which obliges the States Parties to negotiate in good faith effective measures for nuclear disarmament. By this provision we feel that the draftsmen of the Treaty sought to broaden the present framework of co-operation on partial measures limited to some aspects of nuclear weapons. It is our hope that the current negotiations between the United States of America and the USSR will lead to an agreement, if only a bilateral one in this area.

The Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons has been in force since 1968. A large number of countries have acceded to it; but this has not cleared the way to a general agreement for a complete ban on nuclear tests. We therefore have to make do with little and to prize the agreement signed last year by the United States and the USSR on the partial prohibition of underground nuclear-weapon tests. This beginning could extend and form a valuable basis for a multilateral agreement.

Denuclearized zones

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones at the instance of the States in each zone is one of the measures that can do most to halt the proliferation of these instruments of mass destruction and to make progress towards nuclear disarmament. The aim is that the States concerned in the region forming a nuclear-weapon-free zone should proclaim solemnly their intention to refrain, on a basis of reciprocity, from producing, testing, obtaining, acquiring or in any other way possessing nuclear weapons.

Those States need reliable safeguards to enable them to undertake such responsibilities in earnest.

Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa

With its slim resources, Africa has entered the war against underdevelopment. It has to win the struggle it is waging against adult illiteracy and to provide education for the entire school-age population; it has to combat the frequent endemic or

(Mr. Yoko, Zaïre)

epidemic diseases that affect the health of thousands of people; it has to overcome its people's lack of vital goods and services and conquer the drought in the Sahil. In these conditions a ruinous nuclear arms race would not favour the peace and well-being of the peoples of Africa.

The Declaration made by the Heads of State of the OAU on the Denuclearization of Africa confirms the priority of development over military, and particularly over nuclear, considerations. Ten years have passed, but that Declaration is still as relevant as ever. Accordingly we believe very sincerely that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones would be an effective contribution.

My country is greatly interested in the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the different continents. It regards this as a collective responsibility which all States must co-operate to fulfil. This is one of the reasons why my Government has asked to participate in the Ad Hoc Group of Governmental Experts instructed to carry out a comprehensive study of denuclearized zones. It is for my Government a further opportunity to take part in any effort which can lead to real progress in negotiations in this important field of disarmament. My delegation wishes to express its gratitude to the CCD for agreeing to this request and designating Zaïre as one of the countries empowered to send experts to the Ad Hoc Group. Everything will be done to deserve that trust.

The concern underlying the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is perfectly understandable. These zones are regional structures intended to prohibit or prevent any further spread of nuclear weapons. If these aims are to be achieved, it is equally important to set up an effective system of safeguards for the countries within these zones. We should be very pleased to hear the views of the nuclear Powers on this point. Clarification will help us to move ahead in our discussions and particularly in our work within the Ad Hoc Group.

III. Climate and environment

Our Government welcomes the efforts already made to protect the environment and climate, particularly by the USSR, which has taken the useful step of drafting a convention prohibiting action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human

(Mr. Yoko, Zaire)

well-being and health. My country is endeavouring to contribute to the adoption of international regulations designed to protect and indeed improve the climate and environment for the benefit of the people of today and of future generations. This is why my delegation humbly believes that the CCD could take the Soviet draft convention as a valuable basis for discussion and, without too much delay, move on to negotiations. It seems to us necessary to further effective international co-operation for this purpose.

I venture to hope that the CCD will as speedily as possible produce some positive results from its negotiations concerning protection of the environment. The General Assembly is expecting us to agree as soon as possible on the text of a convention prohibiting interference with the environment for military or other hostile purposes incompatible with the maintenance and promotion of the well-being and health of the human race. We are also invited to submit a report on the results achieved, for consideration by the General Assembly at its thirtieth session. But how can these results be achieved when negotiations have not effectively begun on the basis of the draft convention which is submitted to us?

In connexion with the environment I should like to quote from the address delivered by Citizen Mobutu Sese Seko, President of the Republic of Zaire, to the General Assembly in New York on 4 October 1973. He said:

"I believe also that it is my duty to draw the attention of this august Assembly to the collective responsibility of the human race. All leaders are not responsible only to their own nationals but also to all their counterparts. Indeed, it is no longer enough to sweep the street outside your own house to have done your proper duty; you also have to see if your neighbour has done the same as you and particularly if he is not passing over to you the dirt he is causing in his own household.

"Now the whole world is talking of the disappearance of the human race because of the pollution in all environments. The misfortune in such cases is that we are witnessing a true inflation of texts and books which, in their desire to draw attention, in fact do the opposite.

(Mr. Yoko, Zaïre)

"Without any doubt, it is a matter of prestige to possess the atomic bomb or even more the thermonuclear bomb, but to make it operational, and particularly to miniaturize it, you obviously have to carry out tests with it, and that is not always convenient. We condemn all nuclear tests wherever they may be and we do not condemn any one country more than another. In this particular area, we do not agree with the atomic countries which are asking all others to ratify the Non-Proliferation Treaty. For our part, we have ratified it with enthusiasm, but we do not manufacture bombs or even bullets. But the countries concerned are telling us every day about the invention of evermore sophisticated armaments. Now what is responsible about this?

"In Zaïre we are flattered when we are considered as the champions of the protection of nature. But what is the use of this national effort if our efforts are cancelled out by people thousands of kilometres away from us?"

In conclusion I should like to say that the world of today is aware of the economic and social impact of the armaments race and of military expenditures. In fact, intensification of the arms race is an insidious threat to the well-being of mankind and threatens the very survival of the human species. I believe that the whole wealth of nations ought to be applied to improving the quality of life of peoples instead of being used, as it still unfortunately is, for the manufacture of weapons of destruction, which is an abuse by Governments of their national finances and technology. Their respective peoples will sooner or later condemn this misuse of resources essential for the improvement of living conditions. I do not doubt that this year, in which membership of the CCD has been enlarged, we shall spare no effort to deal with all the problems which the General Assembly has recommended for negotiation in priority.

I should like, in ending this statement, to add my voice to those of the speakers who have preceded me, more particularly to that of Mr. Nisibori, the eminent representative of Japan, and declare in hope that this year 1975 really must be a year of decision and achievement.

Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): As usual, I have listened not only with great attention but also with keen interest to the intervention of my good friend Mr. Mishra. I wish to make just one point. In his statement he has posed the question, "Are we going to ignore the main subject (he refers to the comprehensive test ban) and concentrate on a peripheral aspect (he refers to peaceful nuclear explosions)?" On this point, as a result of the exchange of questions and answers which took place between Mr. Mishra and myself at the last meeting, we have confirmed that we are in general accord with each other. As I stated at that time, Japan has been second to none in pursuing its sincere and serious efforts to achieve the final goal of CTB. Nobody can deny this fact.

However, I do not agree with Mr. Mishra's description of PNE as a "peripheral aspect". It is a problem of the greatest importance at the present time. Irrespective of whether delegates mentioned it or not, the question of PNE was hanging heavily in the minds of all the representatives in the General Assembly at its last session. That was the reason why the resolution on this question was adopted with near unanimity.

My delegation wishes to reiterate the importance we attach to the CTB, but at the same time exactly the same amount of importance we attach to the problem of PNE. This problem has such large and wide-ranging implications that it would not be appropriate for us to describe the question as just one of the peripheral aspects of the CTB. Both are equally very important.

Mr. MISHRA (India): We heard with some sadness the announcement of our colleague Ambassador Dr. Abdullah El-Erian of Egypt that he would leave us soon for another assignment. For my part I must say that I shall miss his wise guidance in various formal and informal meetings and, above all, his friendship here. But we hope that we shall see him again and again in the years to come.

I am grateful to Mr. Nisibori of Japan for his statement this morning. I am glad that he has reiterated the importance which he and his country attach to the achievement of CTB. In this connexion I should merely like to remind him and the other distinguished representatives present here that, while we do have resolution 3261 D which requests the CCD to submit a report on the arms control implications of PNEs, that is to be only a part of the report. In resolution 3257, passed by the same session of the General Assembly, the highest priority has been assigned -- in fact we have been requested to assign the highest priority -- to CTB. Let us not quarrel about equal or partial importance. The CTB has been assigned, or at least we have been requested to assign to

(Mr. Mishra, India)

it, the highest priority. I am afraid, and I say it with regret, that we in this Committee have not given that importance to that particular request of the General Assembly.

Mr. EL-ERIAN (Egypt): Mr. Chairman, I have asked for the floor to say how deeply I was moved by your kind words. You have not been with us for a long time. However, it has been long enough to enable us to appreciate your high qualities, your dedication to the work of the CCD and your cordiality. I always see in your kind words about me an expression of the friendship between your country and Egypt.

I wish also to thank my good friend Ambassador Mishra, whom I have known for many years. I also shall miss his wise counsel which I used to seek on a wide range of problems.

The meeting was suspended at 12.30 p.m. and resumed at 1.00 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN (German Democratic Republic): I have been asked to make the following statement on behalf of the Co-Chairmen:

The delegation of Japan has suggested that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament hold informal meetings on the question of the arms-control implications of peaceful nuclear explosions within the framework of a CTB, note being taken of operative paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 3257. The Co-Chairmen propose that the first of these meetings take place on Monday, 14 July, at 10.30 a.m.

It was so decided.

Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): Allow me to express my gratitude to you and, through you, to all the representatives around the table for the patience and indulgence they have shown to let us have a ten-minute recess, though it has been prolonged so much, during which time we have finally come to agreement on the convening of informal meetings on the arms-control implications of PNE, though a certain condition has been attached, during our summer session as my delegation proposed.

As you may imagine from the exchange of questions and answers which took place at the last meeting between Mr. Mishra and myself, consultations and negotiations were conducted between us with the assistance of some friendly colleagues during this recess. Half an hour was not wasted, because we now see eye to eye with each other.

Now I will confine myself to expressing my satisfaction over the compromise reached on the decision just announced by you, Mr. Chairman, and also to taking this opportunity to express the earnest hope of my delegation that, when the informal meetings are held,

(Mr. Nisibori, Japan)

experts on this important problem will be sent by as many Governments as possible. With the participation of those experts, deliberations at our informal meetings will be more usefully and profitably conducted where opinions will be exchanged in a freer atmosphere. I hope that the convening of these informal meetings will facilitate our work and contribute a great deal to the fulfilment of the important duty entrusted to us by the General Assembly, so that we can work out a meaningful report expected of us.

As I looked around, I felt very much encouraged and heartened to see many delegates nodding their heads with approbation when I expressed the hope that as many countries as possible will send their experts to participate in the informal meetings. My delegation and our experts will be the first to extend the most cordial welcome to those experts.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that the United States will be happy to participate in these informal meetings and that, in response to Mr. Nisibori's plea, we will send an expert.

Mr. MISHRA (India): It is never a pleasure to quarrel with Mr. Nisibori of Japan. I am very happy that we have been able to reach a solution which has been approved by the Committee as a whole. We are also very happy that through this decision the relations between the arms-control implications of PNEs and the CTB have been fully recognized and that a note has also been taken of paragraph 7 of resolution 3257 of the last session of the General Assembly. I would like to thank the distinguished Ambassador of Japan and other representatives who have participated in our discussion for the spirit of compromise and understanding that they have shown.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.